



Samplaí den Fhrith-Sheimíteachas in Irisí Éireannacha / Gaelacha sa chéad leath den 20ú hAois

Dorothy Ní Uigín

<https://doi.org/10.13025/e1st-zs71>

Réamhrá

Ní raibh pobal mór Giúdach ag cur fúthu in Éirinn ag tús na 20ú haoise (3898 an líon Giúdach atá áirithe ar Dhaonáireamh 1901) agus don té nach raibh ag breathnú go géar ar chúrsaí polaitíochta in Éirinn, ní raibh an frith-Sheimíteachas, ar bhonn forleathan, le tabhairt faoi deara ag aon am ar leith in Éirinn sa chéad leath den 20ú haois. Maíonn Natalie Wynn, áfach, (2012: 1) ‘...one of the major weaknesses in the existing historiography of Irish Jewry, [is] the failure to consider the true extent and impact of antisemitism on Ireland’s Jewish community’, agus áitíonn sí nach raibh an pobal beag Giúdach anseo saor ar fad ón ngéarleanúint a bhí le tabhairt faoi deara go soiléir ar Mhór-Roinn na hEorpa sa tréimhse seo. Míníonn Gerald Moore (1984: 1):

It would of course, be an exaggeration to suggest that Anti-Semitism was as rampant in Ireland as in Europe. At the same time it emerged often enough to suggest that, if the Jewish population was to expand to any serious degree, the level of anti-Semitism would correspondingly increase as it in fact did in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

San alt seo, breathnaítear ar dhá iris ar leith a foilsíodh sa chéad leath den aois seo caite – *Aontas Gaedheal agus Aiséiríge/Aiséirí* – agus ceistítear an léargas iad na samplaí seo ar an bhfrith-Sheimíteachas ar bhonn forleathan in Éirinn, nó an mionsamplaí iad de thuairimí agus de dhearchthaí a rug greim ar shamhlaíocht daoine ar bhonn i bhfad ní b’fhorleithne i dtíortha Mhór-Roinn na hEorpa sa chéad leath den 20ú haois?

Cúlra: Art Ó Gríofa agus D.P. Moran

Tugann Terry Eagleton (1995: 291) ‘...monarchical anti-Semite,’ ar Art Ó Gríofa, ‘...a Birmarckian and anti-Dreyfusard, an anti-socialist chauvinist loyal to the cause of British imperialism...’, agus dar le Keogh & McCarthy (2005: 20):

...the founder of the Sinn Féin movement, Arthur Griffith...allowed anti-Semitic views to be published in his newspaper, the United Irishman. In late 1899 Griffith wrote in the United Irishman: ‘I have in former years often declared that the Three Evil Influences of the century were the Pirate, the Freemason, and the Jew’...

Is léir an íoróin sa mhéid seo i bhfianaise gur ainmníodh an *United Irishman* i ndiaidh ghluaiseacht Wolfe Tone, gluaiseacht a thacaigh le coincheap an aontais agus an chomhoibríthe idir Éireannaigh den uile chreideamh. Sa bhliain 1904, mar shampla eile den fhrith-Sheimíteachas, thacaigh an *United Irishman* leis an mbaghchat ar Ghiúdaigh a tharla i Luimneach (féach: Keogh, D. & McCarthy, A., (2005) *Limerick Boycott 1904: Anti-Semitism in Ireland*), agus maíonn Gerald Moore (1984: 78):

...if anti-Semitism was to be found in Irish nationalism it was in Arthur Griffith’s Sinn Fein movement and in David Moran’s philosophy of Ireland (sic) Ireland. At the first convention of Sinn Fein in November 1905, Oliver St. John Gogarty told the assembled delegates that they were the victims and tools of the most disgraceful and Jewish-ridden government in the world’ (United Irishman, 9 Nollaig 1905, 5)

I 1906, d’fhoilsigh Oliver St John Gogarty, a luadh thuas, dhá alt chiníocha in *Sinn Féin* an Ghríofaigh, a raibh an frith-Sheimíteachas le feiceáil go soiléir iontu.

Maidir le D.P. Moran, a luadh i sliocht athfhriotal Moore thuas freisin, bhí a fhealsúnacht siúd beagán eagsúil le ceann an Ghríofaigh mar gheall ar an tábhacht a leag sé ar an nGaelachas agus ar an nGaeilge ina chuid scríbhinní. Deir Moran in *The Philosophy of Irish-Ireland* (1905: 1, agus ar ndóigh foilsíodh go leor de na píosaí seo i bpáipéar an Mhóránaigh, *The Leader*, freisin):

A characteristic way of expressing thought, a distinct language, is usually the most prominent mark of a nation. Then there will be found a native colour in arts, industries, literature, social habits, points of view, music, amusements, and so on, throughout all the phases of human activity.

Agus níos faide anonn sa leabhar sin (1905: 26), deir sé:

We must retrace our steps, and take as much of our inspiration as possible from our own country and its history. We must be original Irish, and not imitation English. Above all, we must re-learn our language, and become a bi-lingual people. For, the great connecting link between us and the real Ireland, which few of us know anything about, is the Gaelic tongue. A national language will differentiate us from the rest of the world, and keep us ever in mind that we are an entity of original and historic growth, not a parasite stuck on to the side of England because our own heart was too weak to keep the vital spark in us. A distinct language is the great weapon by which we can ward off undue foreign influence, and keep ourselves surrounded by a racy Irish atmosphere.

Níl an frith-Sheimíteachas féin le feiceáil chomh soiléir céanna i scríbhinní an Mhóránaigh, ach tá roinnt tagairtí ginearálta, a bhfuil rian an chiníochais orthu le tabhairt faoi deara anseo is ansiúd ina chuid scríbhinní aige mar sin féin. In *The Philosophy of Irish-Ireland*, léiríonn sé tábhacht an Ghaeil agus an ghaelachais i saol na tíre agus i dtógáil an náisiúin; deir sé, mar shampla (1905: 36–7):

No one wants to fall out with Davis's comprehensive idea of the Irish people as a composite race drawn from various sources, and professing any creed they like, nor would an attempt to rake up racial prejudices be tolerated by anyone. We are proud of Grattan, Flood, Tone, Emmett, and all the rest who dreamt and worked for an independent country, even though they they had no conception of an Irish nation; but it is necessary that they should be put in their place, and that place is not on the top as the only beacon lights to succeeding generations. The foundation of Ireland is the Gael, and the Gael must be the element that absorbs. On no other basis can an Irish nation be reared that would not topple over by force of the very ridicule that it would beget.

Dar le Tom Garvin (1987: 70) ‘...the Leader expressed a fear rather than a hatred of the Jews, a fear which was derived from a clear and well-organized perception of the incompetence and vulnerability of Irish Catholics’.

Bhí cosúlachtaí ní ba láidre le feiceáil idir Ó Móráin agus Ó Gríofa maidir le cúrsaí eacnamaíochta agus geilleagair, áfach. Mar a dúirt Dónal McCartney faoi Ó Móráin (1967: 48): ‘Part of his greatest work was his relentless ‘Buy Irish campaign’, which afforded voluntary protection to Irish industry...’ agus is rud é seo ar thacaigh Ó Gríofa go láidir leis freisin.

Mar sin, bhí samplaí den fhrith-Sheimíteachas le tabhairt faoi deara in iriseoireacht náisiúnach na tíre go luath san 20ú haois, i bhfoilseacháin de chuid Airt Uí Ghríofa go háirithe. Cuireann Keogh (1998: 54) síos ar fhrith-Sheimíteachas seo Uí Ghríofa agus daoine eile sa tréimhse seo mar fhrith-Sheimíteachas *eacnamaíochta* .i.e. ní raibh aon bhunús reiligiúnda leis

an míshástacht seo, agus is tréith é seo atá láidir sa fhrith-Sheimíteachas trí chéile in Éirinn – agus ar fud na hEorpa, d’fhéadfaí a mhaíomh – sa chéad leath den fhichiú haois. Cuireann Tom Garvin (1987: 113) béim ar an ngné eacnamaíochta d’fhealsúnacht an Ghríofaigh freisin:

Griffith... was scarcely typical of the separatists. He was not very taken by linguistic revivalism and certainly was sceptical about the idea of basing the new Ireland on rural society; he wanted an industrialized Ireland, built up behind tariff barriers... A common and perhaps accurate criticism of Griffith was that what he really wanted was not a resurgent Gaelic Ireland, but Sacsá nua darab’ ainm Éire ... or a Gaelic Manchester...

Tá an méid seo a leanas le feiceáil sa chéad eagrán d’iris eile de chuid an Ghríofaigh, *Éire-Ireland*, páipéar laethúil a foilsíodh idir Deireadh Fómhair agus Nollaig, 1914:

‘Eire’ is teidiol don phaipéar so. Ise chialluigheann an teidiol son na gur paipear i gcoir muinntire na hEireann e. Ni i gcoir na Sasanach na i gcoir na mBelgeach na i gcoir na bhFranncach do clobhuaileadh e ach i gcoir muinntire na hEireann ... Is cuma linn caide an tuairim ata ag duine mar gheall ar chreideamh na mar gheall ar chursaibh poilitidheachta, ma’s fearr leis Eire na ein tir eile no impreacht eile. An te ata ar thaobh na hEireann cabhrochaimid leis. Sin bun agus barr an sgeil. Sine ar Soisgeal. Eire ar ri agus ar mbannrioghan. Sgeimhle o Dhia ar namhaidibh na hEireann.

Is fíorannamh a fheictear ailt Ghaeilge i bhfoilseacháin an Ghríofaigh – rud atá suntasach ann fein – agus sa cheann áirithe seo is léir a dhearcadh cosanta maidir le forbairt na tíre, cé go bhfuil sé suntasach go bhfuil cúrsaí creidimh luaite anseo chomh maith. Is léiriú é seo, d’fhéadfaí a mhaíomh, go raibh béim i bhfealsúnacht an Ghríofaigh ar dhul chun cinn agus ar chosaint na hÉireann a bhí fréamhaithe ina dhearcadh ar chúrsaí geilleagair, agus ní ar chúrsaí creidimh *per se*. Ní raibh an teanga ná an cultúr láidir san ideolaíocht seo ach oiread. Bhí an teanga lárnach san fhealsúnacht a chraobhscaoil an Móránach, áfach, agus bhí rian den fhrith-Sheimíteachas, agus den chiníochas le tabhairt faoi deara in irisí na beirte.

Aontas Gaedheal

Sna 1930í, foilsíodh líon suntasach alt a raibh rian den fhrith-Sheimíteachas iontu in irisí agus nuachtáin Chaitliceacha in Éirinn – *Irish Catholic*, *Cross* etc – ach níor admhaíodh go neamhbhalbh in aon cheann acu gurbh irisí frith-Sheimíteacha iad gur bunaíodh *Aontas Gaedheal* sa bhliain 1935.



Léaráid 1: Clúdach an chéad leathanach de chéad eagrán *Aontacht Gaedheal*, 31.5.1935

Deirtear sa chéad eagrán de gur páipéar frith-Sheimíteach é: ‘Please note that the policy of this paper, while anti-semitic, is not one of attack on the Jewish Religion’ (31.5.1935: 8), agus maítear in eagarfhocal an eagráin sin: ‘It is a notorious fact that a jew will not start a factory in any country where he is not allowed to exploit the natives’. Deirtear freisin go bhfuil an eagraíocht ba chúis lena bhunú – *Aontas Gaedheal: Ireland for the Irish* – ag cur chun cinn:

...the industrial and cultural development of the country by Irish men, as distinct from development by foreigners, to preserve our ancient Christian heritage and to promote that spirit of unity so utterly essential to our national regeneration.

The policy of this paper is that, as this country happens to be Ireland, Irishmen and not any brand of foreign influence should control its destinies, that Jewish or any other foreign influence should be absent from our councils, that Irishmen should learn to trust and back each other in business, that the bitterness of the past should be forgotten and that the stigma applied to the Irish of always being ready to fight each other should be wiped out by the Irish themselves.

Is féidir comparáid a dhéanamh anseo le frith-Sheimíteachas eacnamaíochta Uí Ghríofa a luadh thuas, agus le fealsúnacht ‘Éire Éireannach’ an Mhóránaigh. Maíonn Gerald Moore faoi *Aontas Gaedheal*, áfach (1984: 139–40):

Opposition to the Jews was not based on economic grounds alone. It was implicit in the policy of Aontas Gael that the presence of Jews was a barrier to an Irish-Ireland revival which was cultural as well as industrial. . . Underlying their anti-alien sentiments was an incipient racism which equated Irish with Catholic.

Bhí dearcadh bhaill ‘Aontas Gaedheal’ maidir lena raibh i gceist le ‘Gael’ casta, mar is léir óna ndearcadh faoin nGaeilge; bhí a ndearcadh faoin teanga éagsúil le dearcadh an Mhóránaigh a pléadh thuas; deirtear sa chéad eagrán de *Aontas Gaedheal* (31.5.1935: 2):

Abolish the Fainne. It is retarding the revival of Irish as a spoken language. . . The Fainne served a useful purpose. It has now outlived its service and its retention will act as a drag on the language revival movement. . . The Fainne is today the badge of the classes and not the masses.

Feictear ceangal idir fealsúnacht an Mhóránaigh agus tuiscintí bhaill ‘Aontas Gaedheal’ faoin teanga níos faide anonn san alt, áit a ndeirtear: ‘People are beginning to associate in their minds the Fainne with the professional classes, with the higher civil servants and the “would be” higher civil servants’. Bhí an ceangal leis an saol Gaelach briste ag lucht an Fháinne, dar le lucht ‘Aontas Gaedheal’, agus ní raibh tuiscint cheart acu ar an ‘Irish-Ireland’ a shamhlaigh an Móránach. Ina ainneoin seo, áfach, Béarla is coitianta a úsáidtear ar leathanaigh na hirise,

cé nach rud neamhghnách é go mbeadh foilseachán a raibh teidil Ghaeilge air ag úsáid an Bhéarla mar mheán cumarsáide ag an am. Bhí a leithéid coitianta sa tír fiú agus an Athbheochan Teanga i mbarr a réime.

In eagrán 28 Meitheamh 1935 (28.6.1935: 5) tá fógra ar *Aontas Gaedheal: 'Irish-Ireland: Irish Arts! Irish Games! Irish Industry! Irish Language! Irish Literature!'* – teachtaireacht ina bhfuil macalláí fhealsúnacht an Mhóránaigh le tabhairt faoi deara. In eagrán an 21 Meitheamh de *Aontas Gaedheal*, deir 'Searchlight' (21.6.1935: 8):

...It must be remembered too that Christ on one occasion showed anger. It was not against the adulterous or the poor, it was against the money changers in the Temple. Christ said the poor would be always with us. He never said want. Want is demoralising and the prototypes of the money changers of the Temple are the godless and the Masonic-Jewish capitalists of today. There has been a persecution of Jews in Germany. There are bars to emigration into other lands.

There is no mention in the constitution of 'Aontas Gaedheal' of the persecution of individuals if they act in accordance with the laws of a Christian state.

Is unfortunate Ireland alone to be left the prey and dumping ground of the undesirables of the earth and place-hunting politicians? It has gone on too long. It must stop...

Tá tionchar an Mhóránaigh le tabhairt faoi deara anseo arís, agus faightear tagairtí rialta don 'Éire-Éireannach' a shantaigh an Móránach ar leathanaigh na hirise. In alt eile a léiríonn an frith-Sheimíteachas go soiléir deirtear:

A stranger at this time, coming to Dublin, not knowing the history of this country, not knowing the native names in this city, especially if this stranger had come in from any country bordering on the Holyland might well be excused if he thought that he was visiting New Jerusalem instead of Dublin... (7.6.1935:3)

In eagrán 13 Meitheamh (12.6.1935: 3), tá roinnt scéalta grinn atá thar a bheith frith-Sheimíteach le feiceáil san iris freisin, agus is ar an ábhar sin nach bhfuil siad curtha ar fáil anseo.

Is deacair an méid tacaíochta a fuair an eagraíocht ‘Aontas Gaedheal’ nó an iris *Aontas Gaedheal* a thomhas. Níl figiúirí dáiliúcháin ar fáil lena aghaidh. Is léir, áfach, ó litreacha a foilsíodh san iris go bhfuarthas roinnt tacaíochta ón bpobal. Foilsíodh an litir thíos, mar shampla, in eagrán 28 Meitheamh 1935:

Sincere congratulations on your past four issues of the Weekly Post.

It is, without doubt, a national asset, and well worth the support of every honest minded Irishman and woman. There are many streets in our capital cities which appear to be owned by the unspeakable Jew. It would be of interest to have details of the matter brought to light by your Journal, which has been a luminous glow to other thoughts, and the ray of the searchlight might with advantage be focussed upon the Jew owned streets in our Irish capital.

ANTI-JEW (Dublin)

Seachtain roimhe, ar eagrán 21 Meitheamh (21.6.1935: 3), tá litir thacúil ó ‘GEARÓID’. Níl fianaise ag údar an ailt seo gur Gearóid Ó Cuinneagáin, duine a phléitear thíos, a scríobh an t-alt, ach tá roinnt de na tuiscintí a léirítear anseo ag teacht leis na tuiscintí a léirigh an Cuinneagánach ní ba dheireanaí in *Aiséirí*. Deir ‘GEARÓID’ sa litir seo:

Without a doubt, our State is endangered by the stranglehold of Semitism. The normal expansion of our industrial life is retarded by the mushroom factories of the Jew, who employs child labour at slave wages, to the exclusion of adult labour. The displacement of the adult worker is a grave matter, and deserves the serious attention of the Government.

It is to be hoped that the lead given by your paper will be followed with enthusiasm, and that the petty strifes of politicians will not be allowed to cover up the evils which you have set out to unmask.

Tá comhad faoin eagraíocht a bhunaigh *Aontas Gaedheal* (bunaíodh an eagraíocht ‘Aontas Gaedheal’ féin in Eanáir 1935) – le fáil sa Chartlann Náisiúnta i measc na gcomhad atá ag an Roinn Dlí agus Cirt, ‘*Crime and Security Division*’. Léiríonn an méid sin inní an Stáit ina leith, agus i measc na gcáipéisí atá sa chomhad seo, tá tuairiscí leis na Gardaí faoi imeachtaí an Aontais. Tugtar cur síos ar an eagraíocht i dtuairisc a scríobh an Garda John McGloin (13.3.1935) mar:

...an Association of the “Irish-Ireland” type aiming to promote the industrial development of this country. The Association is opposed to industrials operating here under foreign influence, particularly where persons from abroad are given employment which the Association considers Irishmen should secure. It is also opposed to the lending of money by Jewish moneylenders at an extortionate rate

of interest. It may be taken that for the present at least the Association is non-political as such. It is supported largely by business men and other influential citizens who, in the main, are supporters of the present Government.

I dtuairisc eile (30.4.1935), a leag an tArd-Cheannfort Thomas Clarke isteach faoin eagraíocht ‘Aontas Gaedheal’ tuairiscíodh go raibh iarracht ar bun ag an ngrúpa páipéar seachtainiúil a fhoilsiú. Luadh Maurice Twomey, Seán Russell, Fintan Walsh agus Paddy Smiddy sa tuairisc seo, agus deirtear ‘*It is thought that the paper, if produced, will be utilised principally to forward the policy of Aontas Gaedheal.*’ Tharraing an eagraíocht agus an foilseachán aird, ní hamháin in Éirinn ach thar lear freisin. In eagrán 7 Bealtaine 1935 den *Jewish Daily Bulletin* a foilsíodh i Nua-Eabhrac, dúradh:

Another disquieting feature is the establishment of an organization known as “Aontas Gaedheal” with its slogan “Ireland for the Irish” . . . It aims at excluding all foreigners from the commercial life of the country and specifies such occupations as instalment selling establishments and individual money lenders as being occupations mainly in the hands of foreigners. While the term “foreigner” as used here may apply equally to Hottentos as to Welshmen or to Englishmen, it was made abundantly clear . . . that Jews were the “foreigners” specified.

Is cosúil, áfach, nár mhair an eagraíocht ‘Aontas Gaedheal’ rófhada, agus níor foilsíodh ach cúig eagrán de *Aontas Gaedheal Weekly Post* féin. Sa tsúil siar ar an mbliain 1935 atá ar fáil i gcartlann de chuid an *American Jewish Committee*, deirtear an méid a leanas:

In July 1935, an attempt to inject Jew-baiting into political affairs in Ireland came to naught when Aontas Gaedheal Weekly Post ceased publication after five weeks existence. The paper had advocated the creation of an anti-Jewish party in the Irish Free State, and the elimination of Jews from public life. Press and public ignored the weekly.

Gearóid Ó Cuinneagáin¹ agus *Aiséirighe*

Bhí an Ghaeilge agus an Chríostaíocht lárnach i bhfealsúnacht *Aiséirighe* a tháinig ar an saol i mí Dheireadh Fómhair 1944 agus bhí dílseacht don chultúr ina bunchloch i bhfealsúnacht a bhunaitheora, Gearóid Ó Cuinneagáin.

Dúirt Proinsias Mac an Aonghusa, i gcuntas iarbháis ar an gCuinneagánach, an méid a leanas faoin iris; mhaígh sé gur ‘Náisiúnachas thar na bearta, Caitliceachas den chineál is faide ar dheis, agus teoiricí eacnamaíochta agus polaitíochta leithéidí Hitler agus Salazar’ a bhí ann, agus tá a fhios againn freisin go dtugadh Ó Cuinneagáin ‘An Ceannaire’ air féin amhail ceannairí Faisisteacha na Mór-Roinne sa tréimhse sin.

Deir Seosamh Ó Duibhghinn in *Ag Scaoileadh Sceoil* (1962: 59) gurbh iad ‘Saoradh na tíre chun stát fíor-Chríostúil i gcúrsaí geilleagracha agus comhdhaonnacha, a bheas mar eisiompláir ag an domhan go huile, a bhunú...’ na cuspóirí a bhí ag an gCuinneagánach. Bhí baint mhór ag Gearóid Ó Cuinneagáin le cúrsaí náisiúnacha, teanga agus iriseoireachta ar feadh a shaoil. Bhunaigh sé Craobh na hAiséirí de chuid Chonradh na Gaeilge sa bhliain 1940 agus Ailtirí na hAiséirí, sciathán polaitiúil den Chraobh, a d’fhoilsigh *Aiséirí* mar mheán bolscaireachta ina dhiaidh sin. Foilsíodh an chéad eagrán de *Aiséirí* i mí Dheireadh Fómhair 1944, agus tháinig deireadh leis in Aibreán 1975.

D’eagraíodh Craobh na hAiséirí ranganna Gaeilge, bhíodh cruinnithe sráide aici, agus rinne sí iarracht an Ghaeilge a chur chun cinn mar theanga bheo nua-aimseartha. D’fhás an eagraíocht go sciobtha ag an tús agus faoi thús na 1940í, bhí os cionn 1,200 ball ag Craobh na hAiséirí. Dhírigh lucht na Craoibhe, dar le Proinsias Mac an Bheatha, (1967: 109):

...ar mheas a thuilleamh do chainteoirí Gaeilge sa chathair agus don chéad uair riamh thugamar an Ghaeilge amach as na cúlseomraí agus rinneamar ceist beo-te de chuid lár na cathrach di. Ba mhian linn freisin go mbeadh gléasanna na fichiú aoise á n-úsáid go fairsing in obair na hathbheochana – raidió, scannáin, ceirníní gramafóin, an preas agus an cló, bratacha agus póstaerí agus buíonta ceoil, agus fós an greann agus an gáire, ab fhada in easnamh ar ghluaiseacht na Gaeilge.

Chreid an Cuinneagánach agus baill eile de chuid Chraobh na hAiséirí go raibh go leor rudaí in easnamh i gConradh na Gaeilge ag tús na ndaichidí agus d’ionsaigh siad na seanmhodhanna oibre a bhí ag an gConradh. Bhí an Chraobh ní ba radacaí ná an Conradh féin ó thaobh cúrsaí eacnamaíochta agus náisiúnachais de. Mar a dúirt de Creag: ‘Bhí stíl is dearcadh ach (sic) nach raibh inréiteach le stíl is dearcadh na ndaoine a bhí i gceannas sa Chonradh is ba é deireadh an scéil é go raibh siad scartha, díbeartha, is neamhspleách gan baint acu le Conradh na Gaeilge’ (de Creag, 1984).

1 Tá saol agus saothar Ghearóid Uí Chuinneagáin pléite go mion ag R.M. Douglas (2009) in *Architects of the Resurrection*. Féach freisin an t-alt faoi cheann de na hirísí a raibh baint ag an gCuinneagánach leo, *Deirdre*, le D. Ní Uigín (1992) in *An tUltach*.

Ailtirí na hAiséirí agus scoilt

Le linn 1942 tháinig an pholaitíocht go mór chun cinn i gCraobh na hAiséirí, agus chinn Gearóid Ó Cuinneagáin sciathán polaitíochta den Chraobh a bhunú: Ailtirí na hAiséirí. Sa chéad phaimfléid a d'fhoilsigh Ailtirí na hAiséirí (a athfhoilsíodh in *Aiséirí* i mí Feabhra agus Márta, 1950), deir Ó Cuinneagáin:

Our social and economic objectives will be Christian, the utilisation of the wealth of the whole island for the benefit of the whole people of the island. . . Even something more is, however, required to guarantee invaluable permanent national solidarity; complete cultural and political unity.

LEADERSHIP: CHRISTIAN CORPORATIVISM.

...It is imperative for national progress that we modernise and make truly Christian and Gaelic our imposed alien parliamentary system of government.

A single individual at the head of state affairs, strong enough to be independent of and dictate to all vested interests. That is the Gaelic tradition. The inefficient and corrupt party political system to be abolished. One national party to be established in the tradition of the great national movements of the past.

Dar le Proinsias Mac Aonghusa gur '[c]eap magaidh a bhí sa bhfear (Ó Cuinneagáin) a d'fhéach air féin mar Adolf Hitler na hÉireann. Is fíor-chorrdhuine a raibh a fhios aige cé a bhí i gceist nuair a fógraíodh a bhás sa bhliain 1991.' (1991: 18). Tá éagóir déanta ag Mac Aonghusa ar an gCuinneagánach sa chás seo, áfach, mar a mhaíonn R.M. Douglas (2009: 3):

In electoral terms, Ailtirí na hAiséirí was one of the more successful fascist parties to appear in a Western democratic country; the reasons for its rise, at a time when fascism was being comprehensively discredited elsewhere, provide an explanation for the hitherto-unappreciated prevalence of right-wing extremism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism in mid-twentieth-century Ireland.

Agus deir Seosamh Ó Duibhginn, ar ndóigh, (1962: 55–6):

Ba dhearmad a cheapadh, áfach, go raibh saol na hÉireann ar fad gan bhrí san am. Bhí corraíl agus suathadh intinne i measc na nGaeilgeoirí. B'iad Gearóid Ó Cuinneagáin agus Proinsias Mac an Bheatha an bheirt ba mhó le rá san obair seo. Bhí fuinneamh agus díograis thar an gcoitiantacht ag roinnt leo. D'fhág a gcuid smaointe agus a gcuid imeachtaí lorg chomh mór sin ar ghluaiseacht na teanga go seasann siad amach ón gcuid eile sa tréimhse sin mar bheadh beirt fhathach i measc abhac ann. Níor réabhlóidithe iad. Níor éirigh leo aon athrú mór a dhéanamh i saol na ndaoine ná i saol an náisiúin. Ach murar éirigh ba i ngeall ar thoscaí nach

raibh neart acu orthu é. Ní raibh mianach an treoraí iontu, ná an oiliúint ná na cáilíochtaí. Dá n-éiríodh leis na deachtóirí ar an Mór-Roinn chuile sheans go dtabharfadh an sruth leis iad go réim shuntasach, ach nuair nár éirigh, cailleadh sa trá iad...

Bhí siad ag déanamh aithrise ar cheannairí na ngluaiseachtaí míleata deachtóireachta a tháinig chun blátha ar an Mór-Roinn sna tríochaidí, ach go mbíodh Dia agus an Chríostaíocht mar dheilín breise acu i dtús agus i ndeireadh a gcuid cainte.

Maíonn Ó Duibhginn freisin:

D'éireodh, [le hAiltirí na hAiséirí] b'fhéidir, dá mbeadh níos mó den stuaim ag roinnt le Gearóid Ó Cuinneagáin. Tá paidreoireacht agus síorchaint faoin gCríostaíocht, fiú i dtír chríostúil, ceart go leor, ach ní ghnóthódh siad suíochán sa Dáil duit, go háirithe da mbeadh an sagart paróiste ag stocaireacht don chríostaí a bheadh i do aghaidh... Measaim féin, áfach, gur chuir Aiséirí fuinneamh i saol an náisiúin. Mhúscaíl sé spiorad san aos óg éirimiúil. Thaispeáin sé go raibh na Gaeilgeoirí beo, agus rinneadh dul ar aghaidh dá bharr...

Feictear fealsúnacht Uí Chuinneagáin go soiléir ar leathanaigh *Aiséirí*. I gcás na Gaeilge, deir sé an méid seo i bpaimfléad de chuid na nAiltirí (agus in athfhoilsiú ar *Aiséirí* i bhFeabhra 1950):

... it is quite possible for everyone in the south under forty, and everyone in the north under thirty to become a Gaelic speaker within five years provided that full intelligent use is made of the talkie films, the radio, the low-priced gramophone record, newspapers, publications, the native speaker, the educational system, the power and influence of government officials and of the churches...

... Those of us with knowledge and experience of the republican movement appreciate that republicanism as a doctrine is not enough either...

The grace of God is essential and a people or movement that while professing Christianity hesitates to put into practice the principles of Christianity in its national life will not secure that requisite grace...

Maidir leis an bhfrith-Sheimíteachas, maíonn Adams ‘...*In the later stages of the war... however, hostility to Ireland’s Jewish minority became an increasingly overt feature of Aiséirighe discourse*’. Ar phaimfléad de chuid na nAiltirí a foilsíodh i 1944, (*‘Aiséirighe for the Worker’*, 11) mar shampla, tá tagairt indíreach do Ghiúdaigh in alt den teideal *‘Hire Purchase’* – nós a cheanglaítear le Giúdaigh go minic:

Under a Christian Social Order the worker would be able to provide for his family without the aid of credit at all. The shame we feel in credit, the way we try to hide it from other the fact that we have to use hire purchase, is in itself proof that it is not natural that we should have to depend on it.

Tá samplaí suntasacha eile den Fhrith-Ghiúdachas eacnamaíochta le feiceáil san alt *‘Ireland’s Jewish Problem’* a foilsíodh in eagrán an Mhárta, 1946 de *Aiséirí*.

Ba chosúla le Salazar na Portaingéile ná le haon duine eile de na ceannairí Faististeacha é Ó Cuinneagáin, agus luann sé féin Salazar go minic ina chuid scríbhinní. Dar le Adams (2009: 33) gurbh amhlaidh a bhí de bharr *‘Salazar had accomplished his top-down revolution without bloodshed’*. Ar ndóigh, chosain Ó Cuinneagáin é féin agus na hAiltirí ó na líomhaintí gur ghrúpa Faististeach iad sa phaimfléad *Aiséirighe for the Worker* (1944: 17–8); dúirt sé ansin:

Aiséirighe has been assiduously misrepresented in certain quarters as ‘Fascist’ and ‘Dictatorship’... In the vocationally-organised State, proposed by Aiséirighe (and advocated in the Papal Encyclicals) the worker is guaranteed direct representation in the National Council through his trade union. It is quite unnecessary for him to burden himself with the expense and extravagance of a political party for this purpose...

In ainneoin an tséanta seo, áfach, tháinig an idé-eolaíocht a bhí acu leis an méid a bhí á rá ag grúpaí faisisteacha eile san Eoraip ag an am a raibh an frith-Sheimíteachas ina bhunchloch dá bhfealsúnacht acu.

Críoch

Níl thuas ach blaiseadh den fhrith-Sheimíteachas a bhí le sonrú in Éirinn sa chéad leath den 20ú haois agus a bhfuil a fhianaise le feiceáil i bhfoilseacháin na tréimhse sin. Cén fáth, mar sin, nach raibh an ghné seo de shochaí na tíre ní b’fheicealaí ag an am agus an bhfuil cúiseanna ar leith ann nár fhás an frith-Sheimíteachas anseo mar a d’fhás sé i roinnt tíortha ar an Mór-Roinn? Tá cuid de fhreagra na ceiste sin sa scagadh thuas: ní raibh líon na nGiúdach sa tír sách mór leis an bhFrith-Sheimíteachas ar bhonn forleathan a ghiniúint (Moore, 1982: 1);

bhí roinnt de na ceannairí, leithéidí Ghearóid Uí Chuinneagáin, ‘róchríostúil’ nó ‘róghaelach’ don phobal trí chéile (Ó Duibhghinn, 1962) agus tugann Adams míniú soiléir eile air seo ina leabhar faoi Ailtirí na hAiséirí nuair a deir sé (2009: 40):

The prevalence of Anti-Semitic, anti-parliamentary and anti-liberal ideas between 1919 and 1939 does not imply that the country was poised to follow in the wake of Germany and Italy – or even Portugal, Spain or Austria – had the Second World War not supervened. There was no general crisis of Irish democracy...

Ní raibh míshásamh láidir leis an mbunaíocht pholaitíochta le sonrú sa tír ag an am, agus i ndiaidh uafáis Chogadh na Saoirse agus Chogadh na gCarad ag tús na fichiú haoise, ní raibh fonn ar an bpobal mór an bonn a bhaint den Stát óg ná den Phoblacht nuabhunaithe ina dhiaidh sin. Is ag iarraidh an chuid sin de stair na tíre a fhágáil ina ndiaidh a bhí tromlach na bpolaiteoirí sa tír ag an am, agus bhí amhlaidh i gcás thromlach an phobail mhóir freisin.

Leabharliosta

Leabhair

Douglas, R.M., (2009) *Architects of the Insurrection: Ailtirí na hAiséiríge and fascist ‘new order’ in Ireland*. Manchain: Manchester University Press.

Eagleton, T., (1995) *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger*. Londain: Verso.

Garvin, T., (1987) *Nationalist Revolutionaries in Ireland: 1858–1928*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Keogh, D., (1998) *Jews in Twentieth-Century Ireland: Refugees, Anti-Semitism and the Holocaust*. Corcaigh: Cork University Press.

Keogh, D. & McCarthy, A., (2005) *Limerick Boycott 1904: Anti-Semitism in Ireland*. Baile Átha Cliath: Mercier Press.

Maume, P., (1996) *The rise and fall of Irish Ireland: D.P. Moran & Daniel Corkery*. Cúl Raithin: Ollscoil Uladh.

- Moran, D.P., (1905) *The Philosophy of Irish-Ireland*. Baile Átha Cliath.
- Miller, D., (1973) *Church, State and Nation: Ireland, 1898-1921*. Baile Átha Cliath: Gill & Macmillan.
- Ó Duibhginn, S., (1962) *Ag Scaoileadh Sceoil*. Baile Átha Cliath: An Clóchomhar Teoranta.
- Ó Duibhginn, S., (1982) *Tuairisc*. Baile Átha Cliath: An Clóchomhar Teoranta.
- Ó hUid, T., (1960) *Ar Thóir mo Shealbha*. Baile Átha Cliath: Foilseacháin Náisiúnta Teoranta.
- Ó hUid, T., (1985) *Faoi Ghlas*. Cathair na Mart: Foilseacháin Náisiúnta Teoranta.
- Saperstein, M., (1989) *Moments of Crisis in Jewish-Christian Relations*. Philadelphia: SCM Press, London & Trinity Press International.

Ailt

- de Creag, A., (1984) *Alt ar Lá*, 20 Lúnasa.
- de Paor, L., (2002) 'Twisting the Knife.' *The Irish Times*. 29 Márta. 12.
- Douglas, R.M., (2006) 'The Pro-Axis Underground in Ireland, 1939-1942.' *The Historical Journal*. 49, 4. 1155-83. Cambridge University Press.
- Feeney, W.J., (1986) 'D.P. Moran's *Tom O'Kelly and Irish Cultural Identity*.' *Éire-Ireland: A Journal of Irish Studies*. Fómhar. 21(3) 17-26.
- Goldstone, K., (1998) 'Christianity, conversion and the tricky business of names: images of Jews in nationalist Irish discourse.' *The Expanding Nation: Towards a Multi-Ethnic Ireland*, Imeachtaí Comhdhála, i gColáiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath. 31-40.
- Inglis, B., (1960) 'Moran of the *Leader* and Ryan of the *Irish Peasant*.' O'Brien, C.C. (eag.) *The Shaping of Modern Ireland*. Londain: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 108-23.
- Mac Aonghusa, P., (2002) 'Aiséirí Faisisteach na Gaeilge.' *Foinse*. 24 Márta, 18.

- McCartney, D., (1967) 'Hyde, D.P. Moran, and Irish-Ireland.' Martin, F.X. (eag.) *Leaders and Men of the Easter Rising*. Londain: Metheun. 43–54.
- McNamara, M., (2018) 'The day Irish and Jewish joined forces against British fascists.' *The Irish Times*. 26 Feabhra.
- Moore, G., (1981) 'Socio-Economic Aspects of Anti-Semitism in Ireland, 1880–1905.' *The Economic and Social Review*. 12, 3. Aibreán. 187–201.
- Ní Uigín, D., (1992) 'Deirdre'. *An tUltach*. Nollaig, 34–9.
- Ní Uigín, D., (1995a) 'Amárach: Nuachtán faoi bhreith an bháis ón tús.' *Comhar*. Márta & Bealtaine, 18-21, 15–8.
- Ní Uigín, D., (1995b) 'Craobh na hAiséirí, Glún na Buaidhe agus Bunú Inniu.' *Irisleabhar Mhá Nuad*, 75–110.
- Ní Uigín, D., (2000) 'Ionad na Gaeilge i dTréimhseacháin Airt Uí Ghríofa agus i dTréimhseacháin eile de chuid Shinn Féin idir 1900 agus 1922.' *Garm Lu*, 20–32.
- Ó Gráda, C., (2005) 'Settling in: Dublin's Jewish Immigrants of a Century Ago.' *Field Day Review*. 1, 87–100.
- Wynn, N., (2012) 'Jews, Antisemitism and Irish Politics: A Tale of Two Narratives.' *PaRDeS: Zeitschrift der Vereinigung für Jüdische Studien*, eV 18 (2012), 51–66.

Tráchtais Neamhhoilsithe

- Moore, G., (1984) *Ant-Semitism in Ireland*. A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Ulster Polytechnic.

Nuachtáin & Irisí

Aiséirighe / Aiséirí

Amárach

Aontas Gaedheal Weekly Post

Catholic Bulletin

Deirdre

Éire

Inniu

Scissors and Paste

Sinn Féin

The Leader

United Irishman