

Church & State

A Pluralist Review Of Irish Culture

Iraq: Our Fifth Anniversary

Post-Modern Gaels?

Barak Obama's Pastor On 9/11

A Journey Around Tom Dunne (4)

Second American Revolution

No. 92

Second Quarter, 2008

Price: €2.00/£1.50

Iraq: Our Fifth Anniversary

The most truthful and the most subversive thing a small state could say in the present condition of the world is that there is no role for small states in the determination of international affairs, and that it will therefore go along with whatever the great bully who is bearing down on it hardest is intent on doing.

We do not suppose that Bertie Ahern wanted to destroy the Iraqi state. Ireland had extensive trade relations with Iraq in the 1980s, and Irish people who had been to Iraq knew from personal experience that it was a liberal, secular state with a social welfare system provided impersonally by the state rather than under moral supervision of religious authority. It was a European kind of state and was engendering a society of the European kind.

Iraq acted to take possession of Kuwait in 1990. It did so with the permission of the United States. The USA, which had been arming the Iraqi regime for many years, then changed its mind for an undisclosed reason, and demanded in very bellicose terms that Iraq should withdraw from Kuwait, and it set about organising a United Nations war against it. The Soviet Union was beginning to fall apart at that juncture and therefore did not veto a UN war on Iraq.

A great United Nations Army was raised and drove the weak Iraqi Army out of Kuwait, slaughtering it from the air during its disorderly retreat. The US and UK decided not to press on to Iraq. A reason given was that the UN resolutions did not authorise invasion of Iraq. But, twelve years later, when deciding to invade and destroy its regime and state, and failing to get a resolution authorising this, they said they did not need a fresh resolution because the old resolutions of 1990-91 gave them the authority to invade and destroy.

In 1991 they called on the people of Iraq to rise up against the state. The call met an enthusiastic response in parts of Iraq. There was nothing surprising in that. When a combination of the strongest states in the world deploy overwhelming military power against a small state, and call on people to rise up against the defeated state under Great Power auspices, it should not be a matter for surprise when they do so in great numbers.

Such a situation is entirely outside Irish experience. It conflict with England was not like that—except perhaps in a small way with the British threat of 1921-2 which caused a majority of the Irish to submit to the Treaty ultimatum. But it should be possible to imagine it in some degree.

Iraq was a progressive state, and it was in the process of establishing a progressive society. Progress is a combination of development and destruction. What was in the process of development in Iraq was a liberal, secular national society. What was being suppressed in the course of this development was the old religious forms of social life. Therefore what responded most enthusiastically to the call for insurrection issued by Whitehall and Washington was the religious underlay that had not been absorbed into the liberal, secular national development—tribalism and what we now call Islamic fundamentalism.

If Washington and Whitehall believed that there was a liberal, secular social stratum that was being suppressed by the 'regime' or 'dictatorship', and that this would assert itself under their protection, they were quickly disillusioned. When they saw what they had unleashed—or revived—they collaborated with the 'regime' in suppressing it. They allowed the regime to act freely in suppressing the fundamentalist insurrection, and in the circumstances to allow was to collaborate.

When the fundamentalist insurrection was suppressed and the regime restored itself, drastic sanctions were imposed against the state.

These sanctions had two purposes. One was military, and was achievable, and was achieved. The other was 'moral' and incoherent and therefore unachievable. The moral purpose was given absolute precedence over the military purpose.

In December 1990 the American Secretary of State, James Baker, met Tariq Aziz, the Iraqi Prime Minister, in Switzerland, and warned him that Iraq would be nuclear bombed if it used biological or chemical weapons in defence against the Americans in the war which America was preparing. Baker knew that they had weapons of this kind because he had supplied them. They had been supplied when Iraq was doing America's work against Iran. When Iraq was wrong-footed by the US over Kuwait and America became the enemy, these weapons became useless to Iraq. It could not be doubted that Baker's threat was in earnest. America had nuclear-bombed Japan twice for trivial reasons—merely to accelerate victory for a few weeks, or perhaps even a few days. It had not been condemned for this by any international body, and no subsequent President had criticised Truman for doing it. The threat to obliterate Baghdad was therefore not an idle threat, and America could do so without fear of retaliation in kind.

Whatever biological or chemical weapons Iraq had been given by America were only battlefield weapons. The nuclear threat ensured that they were not used on the battlefield, and so they were useless.

That left the possibility of Iraq making a nuclear bomb and the means of delivering it. It was a highly improbable possibility under the post-1991 UN supervision.

The Iraqi nuclear project was abandoned in the early 1990s. The US was informed of this by somebody who had been engaged in it.

If the purpose of the sanctions was to reduce Iraq to a conventional military power of the third or fourth rank, this was achieved by 1995. Most of the states which voted for the UN sanctions then wanted to lift them. But Britain and the US had the power to veto any proposal to end them. Even though only two states in the world supported the continuation of the sanctions, they were continued in the name of all the states of the world. That is how the United Nations works.

The US made it clear that the sanctions would continue for as long as Saddam Hussein was in place. Those were the terms on which Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said that the death of half a million children as a result of the sanctions was worth it. (The figure was the estimate made by a UN Agency.)

But, in view of the experience of 1991, how might Saddam be got rid of without producing in Iraq a development of the kind that had happened in Iran, and that Saddam had made war against with active US support?

There was no answer to that conundrum. But it didn't matter whether there was an answer or not. Clinton would maintain the sanctions while Saddam was in place, regardless of the unavailability of an acceptable alternative. He flirted with the notion of a *coup d'état* to be enacted by dissident Baathists, but he seems to have had the sense to see that they were only resentful fantasists and he didn't try it.

Iraq was invaded and its system of state—its entire state administration—was destroyed as a spin-off response to the attack on the World Trade Centre, with which—as everybody knew, Saddam Hussein had nothing whatever to do: it was done by his enemies. The thing was so made that even France—which likes to be where the fighting is in order to keep in training—would not go along with it.

But Ireland went along with it. Bertie made Shannon Airport available for it. Why? Because the US was intent on destroying Iraq, and Ireland was inconveniently placed on the flight path of the bombers. It would have been a minor inconvenience to the US if it had not been allowed to use Shannon for that war. And the US, great democracy that it is, punishes those who cause it even minor inconvenience. (Note: this is not sarcasm. We are trying to describe the world as it is.)

The Irish Government, though pledged to a peaceful foreign policy—except when the United Nations requires it to make war—made war on Iraq without UN authorisation. And then it lacked the courage to stand by what it had done—and was continuing to do.

The Fianna Fail intellectual—Martin Mansergh—who acquired certain talents in his English Public School, argued that the Government preserved Irish neutrality in the war by abandoning it—as an American General once argued that a Vietnamese village was destroyed as the only way to save it. The argument was that American military planes were accustomed to using Shannon as a stop-over point, and that it would have been a breach of the customary practices of neutrality to deprive them of the use of the airport in this instance just because they happened to be engaged in a war that was not authorised by the UN, and that was being conducted in the face of a failure by the US and UK to get UN authorisation for the war.

The UN has served Irish Governments as a substitute for a foreign policy for almost half a century. It was a diplomatic fig-leaf. The fig-leaf was torn away in 2003, revealing that what it concealed was nothing.

Bertie Ahern went to war without UN authority. That is what he should be remembered for, instead of paltry sums over which the corrupt Mahon Tribunal is hounding him.

US/UK say that their invasion of Iraq, and their systematic destruction of the state, was lawful. They say they did not need a specific UN resolution authorising it in order to make it legal.

They do not say, straight out, that nothing they choose to do can be illegal under the UN system of law. But that is the reality of it. When the UN was being established—and Ireland was being excluded from it in punishment for conducting an independent foreign policy between 1939 and 1945—an essential condition of its establishment was that its founders should not be subject to its laws.

Its founders were the two Great Powers who dominated the world in 1945, the United States and the Soviet Union. The British Empire, which started the war, ceased to be a dominating Great Power in the course of it—chiefly because, having started the war, it lacked the will to fight it in earnest, and depended on others to do so. But it was still a major power in 1945, and it played a central part in brokering the deal between Washington and Moscow that led to the formation of the United Nations Organisation. The essential feature of the deal for both Moscow and Washington was that the UN should have no authority over their affairs.

Two other states were included as founding members of the UN with exemption from its authority in order to take the

To page 4

Contents

	Page
Iraq: Our Fifth Anniversary Editorial	2
Executions Under Saddam (Amnesty figures)	5
The CIA's Afghan War Report (<i>My Enemy's Enemy</i> by G. Crile)	
Benign Tyranny? C.S. Lewis	5
Once Upon A Time In Tibet . . . The <i>Frontiers Of Empire</i> View	6
Pearse And Casement Tim O'Sullivan (report)	7
Post-Modern Gaels? Stephen Richards (review of Friel play)	8
Wikipedia & The War Of Independence Pat Muldowney	10
Vox Pat: by Pat Maloney (British-backed Clerics; Rosary Beads and Mass Cards; Tullylease To Christ Church; Priest Shortage; Guinness; Sports Ban; Proxy Wedding; Lisbon Referendum; Clerical Landlord)	11
The Irish Times John Martin (report)	11
"Coolcrease Complaints Rejected By Broadcasting Commission" (report)	13
A Journey Around Tom Dunne Brendan Clifford (part 4)	14
NIPSA: Palestinian Relief (report)	18
The Second American Revolution And The Sense Problem In The West Desmond Fennell (part 1)	19
A Religious View Of 9/11: Pastor Wright	22
Iran: Puncturing The Zionist Dream? (report, with <i>David Morrison</i> letter)	23
De Valera's Fne Ghaedheal (report: <i>Brian Murphy</i> letter)	23
Quo Vadis? Pat Maloney (Thoughts on 2006 Census)	24

The web addresses for the Church & State and associated sites are as follows:—

Church & State:

<http://www.atholbooks.org/magazines/cands/index.php>

The Heresiarch:

<http://heresiarch.org>

Athol Books:

<http://www.atholbooks.org>

Aubane Historical Society

<http://aubane.org>

There is a great deal of interesting reading on each and all of them. Go surf and see!

Church & State

Editor: Pat Maloney

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Euro 10 (Sterling £7.50) for 4 issues from

**P. Maloney,
C/O Shandon St. P.O., Cork City.**

All Correspondence should be sent to this address.

bad look of the thing. China was accorded equal status with the US, the UK and the USSR on American insistence. China, under Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang regime, was an American client state. But three years later the Kuomintang regime collapsed and a new regime was established by Mao Tse-tung. For the next thirty years Washington vetoed any change in the Chinese representation at the UN. The UN therefore had to recognise the overthrown Chiang regime as the only legitimate government of China even though it held only the island of Formosa (Taiwan). During that period Washington held that Taiwan was an integral and inalienable part of the Chinese state, and that the Chinese Government was residing there while suppressing a rebellion in the rest of the state. And so for half the 60 years of the UN's existence the most populous country in the world was excluded from UN membership.

When the Chinese mainland state was finally admitted to the UN, the US reversed its position on Formosa and demanded that Peking should recognise it as an independent state.

The most likely occasion for the start of a Third World War has at times been, and may again be, a declaration of independence by Taiwan. Peking has declared that it will not allow it, and the US at times indicated that it would use its military power in support of it.

Taiwan cannot cease to be under Chinese sovereignty in 'international law'. Peking, with its Security Council Veto, can prevent it. But if the USA and China went to war over the issue of Taiwanese independence, that war could not be indicted as an unlawful act by either party under UN law, since both parties are exempted from UN law by their Vetoes.

The fifth Veto Power, France, followed Britain in declaring war on Germany in 1939. It also followed Britain's example in not prosecuting its declared war while Germany was occupied with the invasion of Poland. Early in 1940 France again followed Britain in trying to get involved in war against the Soviet Union in Finland, while leaving its declaration of war against Germany in place.

In May 1940 Germany responded to the Anglo-French declarations of war and quickly defeated the Anglo-French army that had been squatting on its frontier for nine months. Britain took the remnant of its Army home but maintained its declaration of war, being made safe from invasion by its still dominant Navy and Hitler's lack of a

will to invade. France, its Army defeated and no longer capable of major battle, made an Armistice with Germany. Under it the Government moved to Vichy while part of the country was occupied by Germany pending a settlement with Britain.

The Vichy Government was condemned and made war on by Britain but recognised as legitimate by the US. By means of its collaboration with Germany France preserved its Empire. De Gaulle rebelled against his Government in June 1940 and organised a French army in exile, which exerted a negligible influence on the course of the war. In 1945 it was pretended that the Vichy Government was not a representative continuation of the 1939 Government, but was merely a Quisling puppet. France was not punished for collaboration, even to the degree that Ireland was for neutrality. It was restored to its place amongst the Great Powers, complete with its Empire. It was made a Vetoist member of the UN on Churchill's insistence, as a European counter-weight to Washington's client-state of China. And it immediately resumed the business of making war, using the normal methods—the methods Germany had used against it. In May 1945 an independence demonstration in the city of Sétif in Algeria could not be suppressed by police, so the city was attacked with bombers and tanks. Seventy Europeans were killed along with thousands of Algerians. Dozens of Algerian villages were destroyed. Then there was war against the Vietnamese independence movement. And the later 'police' operation in Algeria was conducted chiefly by means of torture.

Behold the United Nations!

The British wars in Malaya and Kenya, conducted by means of concentration camps and race manipulation, its minor wars in Cyprus and Aden—these are the few wars which we can remember despite the officially-induced amnesia—these were wars of the era of the United Nations. So were the French war in Vietnam, Algeria and wherever else. So were the American overthrow of the Government of Guatemala at the behest of the United Fruit company in the 1950s and all the other interventions in South America, and of course Vietnam. So was the joint Anglo-French-Israeli invasion of Suez (Egypt) with which the UN was prevented from interfering but which was stopped by the US for its own purposes.

These wars were not aberrations. The UN did not fall short of its ideal when allowing them. Allowance was made for them when the rules of the UN were

being drawn up. If the UN had not allowed for them it would never have come into being. The UN is a Great Power arrangement constructed by Great Power realists.

The astonishing thing—the thing which is so much in conflict with the carefully arranged reality of the UN that it almost inclines one to believe in miracles—is that there is widespread belief in a UN ideal of an entirely different kind—an ideal which can be expressed in the old phrase, "*heart of the heartless world*". The UN is in fact organised heartlessness. Insofar as there is any reality for the contrary idea of it, that is because some of the agencies created by the League of Nations in the 1930s were continued by it in a strictly subordinate capacity.

The purpose of this cultivated ideal UN is to enable people who believe in it to be strung along by the spin doctors of whichever Vetoist power bears down on them.

Belief in the old Catholic *Litanies* was much more sensible than belief in this spurious idealised version of the UN. The UN belongs to the here and now, and its structure prevents that idea from being realised. The Catholic *Litanies* operated in a different dimension of life, unconnected with military power.

US/UK acted without UN authority when invading Iraq but they did not act unlawfully because under UN rules they had the right to act without UN authority in such matters without acting unlawfully. The blunt statement of that indisputable fact that demolishes the UN idea of the idealists. But Britain never puts it that way because it does not want to disillusion the UN idealists. Idealists are manipulable. So it operates by argumentative opinions instead, encouraging the idealists to continue to have faith—and to be manipulable.

Surely it is a good thing that Saddam, a tyrant, was overthrown!

And at a cost of the lives of a million Iraqi civilians, it was still a good thing? Well, you can't make an omelette without breaking eggs.

What is a tyrant? The word had definite meaning once. All it means now is a kind of demon—an individual who somehow dominates millions of people against their will by use of a small, corrupt coterie attached to him. It was obvious long before the invasion that Saddam did not stand in that kind of relationship with the population of Iraq. The Baath system was an organised form

of the liberal, secular potential of the peoples thrown together by Britain for reasons of Imperial expediency, which had nothing to do with the possibilities of good government.

But it's now good crying over spilt milk. We are where we are, as Brigid Laffan the voice of the EU, likes to say, and we must move on.

Of course the Baath did move on. It made a liberal, secular state out of the incompatible elements thrown together by Britain. And then Britain and America broke it up with our help. Taking the liberal, secular potential of Iraq to be the milk, it is well and truly spilt and there is no more to be got. The only thing that can be done is cry over it and make way for the Islamic fundamentalism, which the events of 1991 showed to be the alternative.

If anything like the contemplated omelette had been made with the broken eggs, the million dead civilians would lie very easy on our conscience as casualties of progress. But where is the

omelette? Never mind the omelette of the liberal, secular state constructed by the Baathists, with party-politics added. Where is even the omelette of a functional Islamic fundamentalist state?

Can even the most hardline idealist keep trotting out the millions allegedly murdered by Saddam in defence of their deadly ideals? Most of those millions died in a war against Islamic fundamentalism in Iran which was supported in one way and another by those who invaded Iraq in 2003. The Amnesty International figures for people killed by 'the regime' in Iraq during the ten years before 2003 are too small to be mentioned any longer—a mere couple of hundred (see box). And Amnesty cannot be accused of being soft on Saddam. It was an instigator of the War of 1991.

The invasion has cost at least a million lives, and counting—though neither the invaders nor their idealist supporters are counting any casualties except their own. And there is still no omelette in sight.

Executions Under Saddam

In the December 2004 *Labour & Trade Union Review* David Morrison quoted Amnesty figures showing that executions in Iraq were a diminishing quantity during the latter years of Saddam's rule:

"Amnesty International estimated that "scores of people, including possible prisoners of conscience, were executed" in 2002, a similar number in 2001, and "hundreds" in 2000, and nobody can accuse Amnesty International of being soft on Saddam Hussein."

(See <http://web.amnesty.org/report2003/irq-summary-eng>; <http://web.amnesty.org/web/ar2002.nsf/mde/iraq?Open>; and <http://web.amnesty.org/web/ar2001.nsf/webmepcountries/IRAQ>)

The article was called *Iraq: Ultimately more lives will be saved?* and can be read in full at:

<http://www.david-morrison.org.uk/iraq/ultimately-x.htm>

Report

The following are the opening words to George Crile's book, *My Enemy's Enemy, The Story Of The Largest Covert Operation In History: The Arming Of The Mujahideen By The CIA* (Atlantic Books, 2003)

The CIA's Afghan War

"In little over a decade, two events have transformed the world we live in: the collapse of our Cold War nuclear foe, the Soviet Union; and the discovery, after 9/11, that we face a new global enemy in the form of militant Islam. Both have profoundly affected the United States, and in each instance Americans were caught by surprise, unable to explain what had triggered these events.

9/11 was a watershed, as stunning in its boldness as it was frightening in its message. To this day, we know little about how it all worked or what was in the minds of the men who carried it out. Other than a shared religious identity, about the only common denominator among the nineteen terrorists was having spent time in Afghanistan.

The fact that Afghanistan was the

cradle of the attack should not have come as a surprise, for both the territory and the Islamic warriors who gather there are familiar to our government. Throughout the 1980s the Afghan mujahideen were, in effect, America's surrogate soldiers in the brutal guerrilla war that became the Soviet Union's Vietnam, a defeat that helped trigger the subsequent collapse of the Communist empire.

Afghanistan was a secret war that the CIA fought and won without debates in Congress or protests in the street. It was not just the CIA's biggest operation, it was the biggest secret war in history, but somehow it never registered on the American consciousness. When viewed through the prism of 9/11, the scale of that U.S. support for an army of Muslim fundamentalists seems almost incomprehensible. In the course of a decade, billions of rounds of ammunition and hundreds of thousands of weapons were smuggled across the border on the backs of camels, mules, and donkeys. At one point over three hundred thousand fundamentalist Afghan warriors carried weapons provided by the CIA; thousands were trained in the art of urban terror. Before it was over, some 28,000 Soviet soldiers were killed.

At the time, it was viewed as a noble cause, and when the last Soviet soldier walked out of Afghanistan on February 15, 1989, the leaders of the CIA celebrated what they hailed as the Agency's greatest victory. The cable

from the CIA station in Islamabad that day read simply: "We won." But the billions spent arming and training the primitive tribesmen of Afghanistan turned out to have an unintended consequence. In a secret war, the funders take no credit—and no doubt that's why the mujahideen and their Muslim admirers around the world never viewed U.S. support as a decisive factor in their victory. As they saw it, that honour went to Allah, the only superpower they acknowledge. But for the few who know the extent of the CIA's involvement, it's impossible to ignore the central role that America played in this great modern jihad, one that continues to this day..."

Benign Tyranny?

"Of all tyrannies, a tyranny exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive. It may be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies. The robber baron's cruelty may sometimes sleep, his cupidity may at some point be satiated; but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end, for they do so with the approval of their consciences."-

C. S. Lewis
(1898-1963), British Novelist

Lieut.-Colonel R.L. Kennion, C.I.E. and 'Pousse Cailloux'

In view of current Western outrage and concern about Chinese oppression of Tibet, it is as well to recall some earlier British/Tibet incidents. Below are two extracts from a collection called *Frontiers Of Empire* published by William Blackwood and Sons in the midst of the Second World War in 1942, when the Empire was still the Empire and Britain felt secure in holding India and still thinking of extending its influence to the east and to the north. It is clearly meant as light reading for the soldier, and the book could fit neatly in a jacket pocket. The extracts are introduced by a quotation from Brendan Clifford's introduction to Roger Casement's *Crime Against Europe*

Once Upon A Time In Tibet . . .

[Britain Attempting To Force Tibet Into The World Market]

Britain had since the 1870s been trying to open up trade with Tibet from India. Agreements were signed at various times, but Tibetans just didn't trade. At one point the Tibetans agreed that the British should build a trade mart on the Tibetan side of the border, but then built a wall behind it which blocked it off from the rest of Tibet. In 1904 an Army was sent in, commanded by Sir Francis Younghusband, who played a part in the aggravations leading to the Boer War. Younghusband killed about 600 Tibetans and captured Lhasa, the capital. Under British occupation Tibet made a trade agreement which led to some actual trade. Tibet was fined half a million pounds for having resisted.

Younghusband was a very great English Christian . . . His biography was written by George Seaver, former British Army officer and Dean of Ossary. Dean Seaver says that Tibet was governed by a "monstrous tyranny", between which and the ways of the Buddha "there was as little in common as there was between the sublime humanity of Christ's music and the debased inhumanity of mediaeval priestcraft". The monstrous tyrants mistook the leisurely British approach to them for weakness: "How often have the tolerance and easy good nature of the British—both individuals and as a race—proved liable to misconstruction..."

[Brendan Clifford's Introduction to *The Crime Against Europe*, p55: the quotations is from *Francis Younghusband, Explorer And Mystic* by George Seaver, London 1952, p226.]

[An Unwanted Approach]

A postman is usually a welcome individual... In the days before the expedition to Lhasa, the Dalai Lama of Tibet was one to whom letters, those at least bearing an Indian postmark, were distinctly unwelcome—in fact he refused

them. During Lord Lansdowne's Viceroyalty a tentative knock had been made on the Tibetan front door, tightly closed against India on the eastern side. Lord Curzon later on knocked more loudly and persistently, but with no result. The door did not move on its hinges. To be accurate, it opened one way only. Tibetans were freely allowed to pass south to sell their wool and shop in the bazaars of India, but the road was still closed against traders from the south. Other unfriendly and aggressive actions were proved against the Tibetan Government, breaches of the frontier and things of that kind. Then it came known that the Tibetan door on the north side had been opened wide. A Russian postman, the Buriat Dorjief, travelled backwards and forwards carrying letters between his Holiness and the Tsar on all sorts of subjects, while the latter, by one of those occult metempsychoses common in Tibet, was reputed to have become an incarnation of a Tibetan Saint. It seemed certain, in short, that the Power which had recently absorbed, if not assimilated, vast areas in Turkestan, would shortly proceed to devour Tibet, thus bringing about a coterminous frontier with India, a prospect no Viceroy could view with unconcern.

[Kennion was secretly sent into Tibet by Curzon with a message, was discovered, and was interviewed by the Garpon of Gatak:]

...my boxes of sweet biscuits, crystallised fruit and such-like were opened, and under the influence of tea with tinned milk and lots of sugar the potentate thawed. The talk ranged from Royalties to railways, telephones to tea-gardens, elephants to aeroplanes—flying machines had even then left the earth—but of all the achievements of Western civilisation I described, one only seemed to arouse in him a sense of astonishment—a certain noble British cow that in twelve months had yielded 1000 gallons of milk!

"And why", he suddenly asked, "do

you British living in this wonderful country wish to possess our poor land?"

"God forbid", I said; "my Government's one desire is for friendly relations between the two countries, that both should enjoy the benefits of trade and that Tibet should be independent and strong. What they do not desire is that Tibet should be absorbed by the Power that is yearly extending her boundaries in Asia." I might truthfully have added that, unlike the Russians, the British have not and never had had a policy a policy of expansion in the East. The fact that millions of Indians had now been brought under British protection and government—to their incalculable advantage—had entirely been brought about by the misgovernment and hostility of their former rulers...

[Kennion's letter from Curzon was returned by the Lhama with no reply:]

I have often thought that there was one who must have regretted the return of Lord Curzon's letter even more than I did—the Grand Lama himself. The next event was the bursting open of the front doors of Tibet by the Younghusband Mission, and in the following year a Treaty, dictated in the very Potala itself—but not with the Grand Lama, for he had fled.

[From *A Country Postman* by Lieut.-Colonel R.L. Kennion in *Frontiers Of Empire*]

[Britain's 1904 Invasion Of Tibet]

['Pousse Cailloux' then takes up the story of the Younghusband Expedition, in which he participated:]

...In 1903 Lord Curzon, Viceroy, was confronted with a situation critical to one to whom the safeguarding of India by the inviolability of her frontiers, and a strenuous antipathy to the Russ wherever found, were very stuff o' conscience. Briefly, Russia was trying to gain a protectorate over that mistily unknown and obstinately mediaeval land of Tibet, whose steady exclusiveness had formed the principal safeguard of India's northern frontiers; while Tibet, like a scraggy elderly virgin, was beginning to simper in return. Within a very short space of time the Government at home—not yet undermined by hostile demagogues—had given permission that the matter might be undertaken; and Lord Curzon had sent for the one man whose past record and abiding steadfastness of character warranted his being chosen for a task the difficulties of which none could gauge, since they were unknown.

The diplomatic aim was clear, that of obtaining an unconditional surrender from a Government composed of obstinate monks who had joined hands

with our enemy. That the surrender could be brought about only by military force nobody, least of all the leader of the expedition, doubted for a moment; our history of unsuccess in verbal dealings with these people was notorious...

[A substantial expedition was put together by Younghusband, who succeeded in penetrating into Tibet despite the lack of concrete information about conditions there and the logistical difficulties. Eventually they met with the enemy.]

They settled in a swarm at a point some seven miles in advance of where sat Younghusband... With the Mongolian inborn faith in a wall, a faith dating from prehistorical times—whether the defence were across a valley, round a city, or about the fringes of an empire—these Tibetans built them a wall where the open plain was narrowed by a large frozen lake and an outlying spur of one of the ranges. From the edge of the lake to the bottom of the cliff they built it, thus barring the track by which we would advance. Inveterate builders, as all Tibetans are, they ran it up in a night. It was their equivalent for 'full stop'. No compromise...

It was, alas, a match to a powder magazine. Some hours later, the wall and the plain beyond it were a shambles. Pass quickly over what happened; many of you will have read of it in all its ghastly details...

Thereafter it was war, pure and simple. We passed over the wreckage of Guru and its wall, fought the fight of the Red Gorge, as spectacular a piece of mediæval warfare as could be wished, and presently found ourselves at the town of Guyantse. A town, save the mark; but one of three in all Tibet, the other two being Lhasa and Shigatse; none of them bigger than, say, the small township of Reigate, in Surrey. I say mediæval warfare, since we, a modern force, were stripped of half our advantage by the ever-present transport question which shortened our stride in even the simple war-gear of those days, particularly in ammunition for the mountain battery which proved later our main means of blowing an entrance into the extraordinarily solid buildings which the Tibetans defended against us; and in the rabbit-warren alleys between houses packed together for warmth, a gas-pipe gun was quite as effective as a rifle...

[If Younghusband had had to bring sufficient food for his expedition deep into Tibet, the expedition would have been made virtually impossible. However . . .]

...Those whose business it was to

make inquiry into the habits and customs of the Tibetans had elicited the fact that of each yearly exiguous harvest of the village one quarter went direct to the monastery, in invariable excess of the requirements of the monks, who hoarded it, selfishly oblivious of the fact that the village population was habitually on short commons.

...it was a foregone conclusion that barley kept in the natural all-the-year-round cold storage of Tibet would not have deteriorated; and it was on this grain that our leader determined that we all, from himself down to the last mule of the transport, should live till we get to Lhasa... he argued, here were we in a holy land, among monks and monasteries; we were advancing on the Holy of Holies; *a fortiori*, the closer we got to Lhasa the holier would the land become, and the more frequent the monks and monasteries...

In short, we, in sufficient force and equipment to make our arguments decisive, were to cut loose from our line of communications and to launch forth across the roof of the world, independent of help or support or of anyone to come to our assistance if things turned out wrong...

Fifteen hundred men, three thousand mules, every man and beast laden to ultimate carrying power with every necessity from a cartridge to a box of medical comforts. Saving only food, we were a marching Army and Navy Stores, and, on the single file track, we measured eight miles from advanced guard to rearguard.

...
On the first evening our confidence in our leader had exact confirmation. At twelve convenient miles from our starting-point the valley opened out. There, in the middle, stood a small village by the river bank; and there, perched above it on the cliff side, the inevitable attendant monastery.

...Nor had we even to fight for what he wanted... there is little doubt that their past experience of defeat prevented their wasting their strength on the minor defences which would have made our daily task far harder.

It would leave a gap in our understanding of the state of affairs were we not to digress for a moment and see the wherefore of the supplies on which we counted. Tibetan Buddhism has little in common with the teachings of the Master; it is, in fact, nothing but a preaching of universal devildom; not a vague and collective demonology, but with a specified and particularised devil appropriate to every place, action and motive of the simplest daily life. Between the all-pervading aggressive demons and the simple and hard-living people who fear them, the lama places

himself as the one and only shield.

The protection afforded is the vain repetition of endless and meaningless formulæ and the observance of set ritual; further, these things are of no value in themselves, but only as prescribed by, and with the direct sanction of, a lama... For all this protection full payment is exacted... which keeps these self-indulgent parasites in the inertia which glowers from their sodden and soulless faces...

In six weeks of patient persistence Younghusband worried a compete and comprehensive treaty out of the Tibetans. Their leaders, ecclesiastical and civil, fought him point by point. At every turn they were simply worn down by the firmness of a man of the very existence of whose type they had previously had no conception. Throughout it all, he never once had to threaten the destruction of Lhasa. Undoubtedly the power to do it lay in our hands; equally undoubtedly, the Tibetans knew it...

A few days later we started homewards, the treaty in our pocket...

[From *A Footnote* by 'Pousse Cailloux',
Frontiers Of Empire]

Tim O'Sullivan

Report of letter sent to
Sunday Business Post

Pearse And Casement

In his piece on Patrick Pearse (23 Mar) Emmanuel Kehoe has taken some currently fashionable assumptions more seriously than they deserve. The notion that Pearse was attracted to children in a sexual way is based mainly on one poem written in Irish; 'A Mhic Bhig Na gCleas'. To produce the desired effect it is translated naively into English where then the suggestive undercurrent of the English word "tricks" can be brought into play. One poem, and one in translation at that, makes a meagre and unsteady crutch for an argument. Poetry does not allow itself to be interpreted with the cold precision algebra does.

Later in his piece Kehoe described Roger Casement as "most likely ...a vigorous pederast" "in those countries in which he did such great good." But why would someone interested in doing great good wilfully compromise their chances of success by engaging in "vigorous" activity which, then being illegal, carried the risk of imprisonment and disgrace? It is hard to credit. Those who believe the disputed Casement diaries have been forged do so as what they are expected to believe strikes them as strange and inconsistent.

Stephen Richards

A review of *Making History*, by Brian Friel, as performed by the Newpoint Players, Newry, at the Ballymoney Drama Festival, 2008

Post-Modern Gaels?

For those of us troubled by the failure of *Church and State* to commemorate adequately or at all the 400th anniversary of the Flight of the Earls (September 1607) the solution is to do it in 2008 instead. Maybe you had been under the impression that not much happened in 1608, but on St. Patrick's Day in that year the Ulster Earls suffered a further calamity. They were going over the St. Gothard Pass with their entourage near the Swiss village of Andermatt at the tail end of what had been the worst winter in living memory when, in the course of traversing a frozen bridge, one of their packhorses stumbled. This particular horse was carrying all their treasure, which fell into the ravine and has never been seen since.

They were on their way to Rome at the time. One might question why they didn't take ship from Marseille, or wait till the summer before attempting to cross the Alps, or why all their valuables were piled on one animal. Further instances of bad management and aristocratic recklessness (otherwise known as stupidity) brought most of them to an early grave. Rory O'Donnell who had succeeded his brother Red Hugh as Earl of Tyrconnell, was dead by the late summer of 1608, apparently of a fever brought on by sleeping out in the Roman marshes. He was only 33. Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone, was one of the last to die, in 1616 at the fairly venerable age of 66.

Brian Friel's play dates from 1988 when he was in his very mature phase as a playwright. I must admit I hadn't heard of it before. It toured at that time in connection with the Field Day theatre group, and presumably it has been revived as appropriate to the anniversary. I'm informed also that this play isn't simply a product of Friel's historical imagination but is at least partly based on a novel by somebody else, so Friel may not be solely responsible for the various factual howlers with which it's littered. Of course these may not be howlers at all but strictly in the Shakespearean tradition of making free with the raw material of chronology. However, Friel seems to have a didactic purpose in mind, which is to do with received myth, so it is odd that he comes out with a few myths of his own. The ambiguous title of the play obviously

prefigures Roy Foster's revisionist preoccupations.

The action opens with O'Neill meditating over a spray of broom and listening with only half an ear as his secretary, the Old English Harry Hovenden, brings him up to date with various matters requiring his attention, one of which, ominously, is that the Devlins are unhappy with a legal decision and intend to take the dispute to the new English courts. O'Neill comes across as a refined, Anglicized type, like his Unionist namesake of the 1960s, lacking the stomach for the hard times he's living in, and somewhat distracted. Distracted he may well be, as he has just secretly married Mabel Bagenal, of the "Staffordshire mongrel" family ensconced in Newry, in a Protestant ceremony.

O'Neill's cultural outlook was already complicated enough without this latest twist, for he had spent most of his childhood and teenage years in England, under the care of the Sidney family in Ludlow, where he would have been familiar with Sir Philip Sidney, the author of *Arcadia* and exemplar of knightly courtesy. Like Moses therefore he's brought up in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and, like Moses, he throws it all up to suffer affliction with his own people. In O'Neill's case, at least as we're led to understand it, this is a reluctant commitment. As soon as he hears the Spanish forces are to land in Kinsale (where's that? asks O'Donnell) he knows the game is up. If he had been left a little more "wiggle room" by the government in Dublin he would have gladly steered clear of this war.

By the start of the 1590s it was clear that the government was no longer going to leave Ulster alone. It had been left to its own devices over the preceding 300 years or so, ever since the demise of the Anglo-Norman Earldom of Ulster. True, the McDonalds of the Isles had established themselves in North Antrim in the early fifteenth century, and at times there were Scottish mercenaries from the Western Isles lending their services to one side or the other in the Ulster clan wars, but none of this could destabilize the patchwork society of the Ulster Gaels with its kaleidoscopic feuds and alliances. Friel's O'Neill is able to see that the new post-Reformation English

state presents a challenge that is qualitatively different from anything that has preceded it. Little by little the English are going to whittle away what is left of his real political power to leave him as at best a hollowed-out figurehead, like the Indian native princes of the nineteenth century. To use a more contemporary analogy, O'Neill might have been content to be in the same position as one of the German princes or dukes, owing formal allegiance to the Holy Roman Emperor but enjoying substantial *de facto* independence.

That option was never going to be open to him. The English were on a mission to civilize the wild Irish, to bestow on them the blessings of their legal and administrative system whether welcome or not, and, of course, to make them conform to the established church. At that time a popular reformation in Ireland would have been highly desirable but since it showed no sign of happening then the next best thing was to clip the wings of the Gaelic chieftains so that Ireland could never be a bridgehead for a Spanish invasion of England.

Whether or not the English in later centuries had something to be paranoid about in relation to Napoleonic France, Imperial Germany or Baathist Iraq, it must be conceded that in the later sixteenth century the Tudor Protestant state really was hanging by a thread. Elizabeth had been excommunicated by the Pope in 1570, which made her fair game for any Counter-Reformation assassin, just as in fact happened to William the Silent in 1572. That was also the year of the St. Bartholemew's Day Massacre when the Protestant nobility of Paris was more or less exterminated; and, of course, in 1588 a successful landing by the Armada could have put paid to the English nation and its Church for good. The Hapsburgs' dynastic interests and their Counter-Reformation interests would have been equally enhanced. French participation in the Thirty Years' War a generation later would have been at the least doubtful, so the partial Hapsburg successes recognized by the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 would have been complete, and at a much earlier date.

The point, which I don't want to labour, is that the English were entitled to experience a measure of jumpiness when they considered their western flank in the 1590s. Even if the remaining Gaelic lords weren't pining for a firm Catholic hand on their shoulders, the prospect of a Spanish hegemony was bound to be agreeable to them. Spain had no strategic or theological reason for wing clipping, and every reason for keeping its Irish allies sweet.

By contrast the Tudors had no

prospect of being able to kill the Gaels with kindness. A permissive approach, even if it had been politically or psychologically possible, would have left the big security questions unanswered, with no guarantee of any trickle-down effect in terms of loyalty. The Gaelic Irish, and indeed many of the Old English, were always going to fail the Norman Tebbit cricket test: when the battle got going they were not only going to be cheering on the other side but joining them too.

Hugh O'Neill understands the relentless way the English conquest of the North is going to shape up, and their policy of divide and rule. When Maguire in Fermanagh is goaded into rebellion O'Neill muses about the dilemma this puts him in. Either he can ride out with the Crown forces as a trusty lieutenant of the Queen and help to put down his own kinsman, and still not be left in peace, or else he can unite with Maguire in an attempt to free Ulster from English administrative encroachment, and be penalized all the more when the rising would inevitably fail. There is no way out of this dilemma, except maybe a huge Spanish invasion centred on the one of the northern ports.

Whereas O'Neill is the civilized and cynical analyst of realpolitik, O'Donnell, presumably Red Hugh O'Donnell, is portrayed by Friel as a glorified cattle-rustler. The contrast was well acted by the Newpoint Players. They certainly didn't ham it up because it's all there in the text. I'm not sure what contemporary (1988) parallels Friel might have in mind. It could be that he's simply mocking the type of physical force Republicanism that he perceives to be more interested in the former than in the latter. His O'Donnell is at least as preoccupied with settling old scores with O'Doherty and MacSweeney as he is with dismantling the English forts that are beginning to hem him in.

If O'Neill is equally at home in two worlds, it's doubtful if someone with the manners of O'Donnell would have been accepted in either. Friel no doubt has his own dramatic purposes, but I would have thought that the two would have shared a very similar cultural outlook. As well as that, they had a personal bond that went back at least to 1585 when O'Donnell as a youth had been lured on board a Tudor ship off Rathmullan and kidnapped. O'Neill had gone on a successful mission to rescue him from Dublin Castle.

After the introduction of Mabel Bagenal there is the later visit of Mabel's sister Mary, who is decidedly out of sympathy with all she sees around her and tries with some success to instil in Mabel some discontent with her lot.

Throughout these scenes we have a Catholic Archbishop, Peter Lombard (1555-1625), flitting in and out with the latest news from the Catholic courts of Europe. I hadn't heard of him before but there is a nice little entry about him in the *Encyclopaedia of Ireland*:

"Born in Co. Waterford, educated at Westminster School, Oxford and Louvain. He was appointed Catholic Archbishop of Armagh in 1601, at the request of Hugh O'Neill... He was at first an enthusiastic supporter of O'Neill's Catholic Crusade during the Nine Years' War; he later tempered his position in relation to the Crown in the wake of the completion of the English conquest of Ireland in 1603. The execution for treason of Cornelius O'Devany, Catholic Archbishop of Down and Connor, in 1612 played an important role in convincing Lombard that the Catholic Church should play a less confrontational role in Irish politics, in a bid to defuse royal hostility. Central to this strategy was his contention that episcopal appointees should not be associated with the Earl of Tyrone.... He was the author of *De Hibernia Insula Commentarius Stromaticus* (1600), an account of the war of the 1590s."

We'll come back to him later.

Anyway, with Lombard's active encouragement O'Neill and O'Donnell raise the rebel flag and we next come across them hiding in the Sperrin Mountains, drinking peaty water out of the sheughs, as they try to get back from their last stand round Kinsale. News comes of the death of Mabel in childbirth. O'Neill has learned by heart his abject recantation of his shameful misdeemeanours and his plea to be restored to the Queen's favour.

The early Stuart years are skipped over, as is indeed the decision to leave Ireland for good, and we're then transported to Rome. The impression is given of a long lapse of time, and O'Neill is drinking and womanizing without much money for either pursuit. It seems that Lombard is only now writing his history, and not getting much co-operation from O'Neill in helping to construct an iconic portrait.

Insofar as Friel is using the historical background to convey some messages of his own, these are first of all the cultural gulf between Reformation England and Gaelic Ulster, than which no two societies could be more different; and, secondly, the dishonesty of the soundbite approach to history.

The first of these is illustrated by horticultural references. Mary Bagenal visiting her sister brings her a selection

of seeds, dill, and borage, and coriander, so that she can start to cultivate a herb garden. This is what the Bagenals have been doing on a larger scale in south Down. The Gaelic agricultural economy is pastoral, like the Bedouin, or the Masai, and therefore to the English eye the Gaelic landscape appears as a howling wilderness. Mabel Bagenal is amazed to look out her window at endless herds of cattle. This isn't the "sweet disorder in the dress" that Herrick was later to admire. It is unnerving. It's matched by the disorder indoors where O'Neill is more Gaelic aristocrat than English aristocrat in his insistence on having a number of concubines around the place, to Mabel's impotent fury.

The Gaels had to be taken in hand, and one way to do this was to use the land for tillage and not for feckless pasturage. Tillage is an interesting Anglo-Saxon word, even more interesting than I thought:

*"Where is she so fair whose unear'd womb
Disdains the tillage of thy husbandry?"*
(Shakespeare, Sonnets).

The yeoman, the independent freeholder farming his own land, didn't feature in the Gaelic social structure. He has now disappeared and his place has been taken by the huge agribusinesses that have turned the east of England into a small-scale version of the Canadian prairie, so Mabel Bagenal might be equally appalled if all she could see was a vast field of wheat stretching to the horizon.

The Irish rural landscape hasn't exactly prospered in the interim either, despite enclosure having been taken to extreme lengths. The last areas of common mountain have been parcelled out, to no discernible advantage to anyone, except maybe the barbed wire manufacturers.

All this talk of tillage is of course only a metaphor for the steamrolling progress of the English language, legal system and social structure that, despite various ups and downs, was to pulverize Gaelic Ireland over the next century. O'Neill knows in his heart that the eventual cultural conquest can be checked but not turned back. The English believed that what they were doing was right.

The English obsession with progress has been remarked upon interestingly by others, not least in these pages, and I wouldn't want to add much. I have never really understood Tennyson's line: *"Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay"*. It could be said that Anglo-Saxon culture isn't very happy with societies that appear static, that just seem to bob along from one generation to the

next. Macaulay, writing in 1828, at the start of the self-confident era that culminated in Tennyson, says this:

"Yet even this remedy [the Christian/Pagan conflict] was not sufficiently violent for the disease. It did not prevent the empire of Constantinople from relapsing, after a short period of excitement, into a state of stupefaction, to which history furnishes scarcely any parallel. We there find that a polished society, a society in which a most intricate and elaborate system of jurisprudence was established, in which the arts of luxury were well understood, in which the works of the great ancient writers were preserved and studied, existed for nearly a thousand years without making one great discovery in science, or producing one book that is read by any but curious enquirers. There were tumults too, and controversies, and wars in abundance: and these things, bad as they are in themselves, have generally been favourable to the progress of the intellect. But here they tormented without stimulating. The waters were troubled; but no healing influence descended. The agitations resembled the grinnings and writhings of a galvanised corpse, not the struggles of an athletic man."

Macaulay in a speech in the House of Commons at the time of the Opium Wars was later to express his impatience with Cathay itself.

This brings us on neatly to O'Neill's understanding of his place in history, as explored in his dialogue with Lombard. If history is just a series of disconnected events it ceases to be a narrative, and without a narrative there is no meaning. So, in my view anyway, some form of teleological understanding is implied in the study of history. This of course is seldom clear at the time and indeed is contentious long after the time. But the contention is between competing narratives, not between narrative and non-narrative. And we could add that Gaelic society hadn't been and wasn't a development-free zone. It was developing in its own way at its own pace. The problem was that England had a self-conscious desire to 'be the change'. If the drive had been purely motivated by a desire to spread the Protestant faith, or impose political conformity, it could have been manageable, but it was a combination of both, with the benefits of civilization added on.

Lombard is keen to provide an uplifting narrative that will comfort future generations. It doesn't have to concern itself overmuch with the actual facts: an alternative reality will be created, and the fateful struggles of the 1590s ending with the departure of the Gaelic lords

will be seen as one of the noble epochs of Irish history.

O'Neill objects that this is a lot of hooley. The whole business was a mess from start to finish; and even when they were taking ship at Rathmullan in 1607 the MacKeegans were pelting them with stones. Lombard holds to his platonic ideal, but O'Neill can't see any meaning in it at all. He is an early post-modern, according to whom we have to be mature enough to leave the soundbites behind; and the only true soundbite is that all soundbites are suspect.

But if we think we aren't going to find any coherence the chances are we won't. Life is messy, but probably each one of us can find different layers of meaning in the jumbled narratives of our own lives. In the same way the Irish nation can work out and even re-interpret from time to time the meaning of the seemingly chaotic events of Easter 1916 and the Summer of 1798. I could add that every Protestant schoolboy in Northern Ireland used to be well aware that the Pope was hand in glove with William of Orange. That was an interesting thing to know but the knowledge didn't empty the events of meaning. It somehow gave the meaning added piquancy, it was a form of *gnosis* that everybody knew.

I close with an extract from the *Daily Telegraph* of 20th March:

"Two bestselling authors have accused the Vatican of blacklisting them in Italy after they discovered secret documents that suggest a Pope had funded William of Orange, a Protestant hero.

"Rita Monaldi and her husband Francesco Sorti have sold more than a million copies of their historical novel *Imprimatur* across Europe.... [It] was dropped by Mondadori, its Italian publisher, after the first print run of 15000 copies, despite reaching number four on the best seller list on its release in 2002. Mr. Sorti said *Mondadori* decided not to reprint the book because of pressure from the Vatican.

".....the revelation that Innocent was supporting a heretic and enemy of the Church embarrassed the Holy See and was seen as an impediment to Innocent's path to sainthood.

"The Vatican began the canonisation process in 2002, at roughly the same times the book was published. When the book came out it was strongly criticized by leading Catholics and by the media. Since then, Mr. Sorti said he and his wife had been forced to leave Italy and settle in Vienna.

"A journalist from *Rai*, the state broadcaster, who asked not to be named, said that the book had become 'a taboo.'"

Pat Muldowney

An example of how the editing process works on Wikipedia

Wikipedia And The War Of Independence

Wikipedia is a web-based encyclopaedia which is composed by readers and is subject to alteration/correction by other readers. An unsatisfactory feature of the process is that the people concerned can choose to be anonymous. (In printed Encyclopaedias the entries tend to be signed.)

The paragraph on the First Dáil in the article on Irish War of Independence seemed inadequate to me. It reads as follows:

"The First Dáil

"More directly, the war had its origins in the formation of a unilaterally declared independent Irish parliament, called Dáil Éireann, formed by the majority Sinn Féin MPs elected in Irish constituencies in the Irish (UK) general election, 1918. In the general election of 1918 Irish voters showed their disapproval of British policy by giving Sinn Féin 70% (73 seats out of 105) of Irish seats. Sinn Féin promised not to sit in the UK Parliament at Westminster, but rather to set up an Irish Parliament. This parliament, known as the First Dáil, and its ministry, called the Aireacht, declared Irish independence by reaffirming the 1916 declaration. The Irish Volunteers were reconstituted as the 'Irish Republican Army' or IRA. The IRA was perceived by some members of Dáil Éireann to have a mandate to wage war on the Dublin Castle British administration."

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Irish_War_of_Independence)

I revised this paragraph as follows:

"More directly, the war had its origins in the attempt by the British government (which had not received, or even sought, an electoral mandate to govern Ireland) to suppress the Irish government created by the members of the Irish parliament, called Dáil Éireann, formed by the majority Sinn Féin MPs elected in Irish constituencies in the Irish (UK) general election, 1918, who had sought and won an electoral mandate to form an independent government in Ireland. In the general election of 1918 Irish voters showed their disapproval of British policy, and their support for

democratically mandated Irish independence, by giving Sinn Féin 70% (73 seats out of 105) of Irish seats. Sinn Féin promised not to sit in the UK Parliament at Westminster, but rather to set up an Irish Parliament. This parliament, known as the First Dáil, and its ministry, called the Aireacht, declared Irish independence by reaffirming the 1916 declaration. The Irish Volunteers were reconstituted as the 'Irish Republican Army' or IRA. The IRA was perceived by some members of Dáil Éireann to have the right to conduct armed defence of its democratic mandate against the military methods of the Dublin Castle British administration which sought to suppress the elected government."

This revision was cancelled by another reader, who styled himself 'Red King'. He added the following comment:

"rv party political broadcast. Original version is neutral and consistent with international law".

Incidentally, the article on the Irish War of Independence has been developing since mid-2006. From the 'History' of the article (which can be accessed from the site), 'Red King' appears to be involved in its construction for about a year or so, but in a small way and does not appear to have been among the main architects of the article.

In a real sense the readers are the editors of the site, which means that those who are prepared to defend their version of history most tenaciously by constant interventions can determine how a historical event is reported—and that the facts therefore take second place.

V
O
X

British-backed Clerics
Rosary Beads and Mass Cards
Tullylease To Christ Church
Priest Shortage
Guinness
Sports Ban
Proxy Wedding
Lisbon Referendum
Clerical Landlord

P
A
T

British-backed Clerics:

"It has now been established that Britain tried to prevent his [Archbishop William Joseph Walsh] appointment to Dublin and had actually 'sponsored' the translation of Archbishop Patrick Francis Moran from Sydney to Dublin. It was felt that Moran might pursue the apparently pro-British, pro-Castle policy of his uncle, Cardinal Paul Cullen. Sir George Errington was Britain's chosen emissary to organise all possible opposition in Rome to Walsh's appointment. Cardinal Henry Edward Manning of Westminster vigorously counteracted Errington's manoeuvres and intrigues, making it clear to Leo XIII that if Errington represented the British Government he did not represent Ireland.

"The *United Irishman* of May 5, 1885 broke the news that England had tried to prevent Walsh's appointment. It published Errington's note to Granville [British Foreign Secretary] recovered from Errington's blotting paper with sufficient accuracy to defy denial.

"Errington's pressure was already overdone and the painful tension was ended on June 23, 1885. Leo XIII,

doubtless alarmed at the ferment which had spread to the Irish in Great Britain and the United States, had taken the matter out of the hands of [S.C.] Propaganda whose officials were very exposed to British influences.

"I stood out strong against them," he proudly told Dr. Walsh on his arrival in Rome.

"In the summer of 1900, Archbishop Walsh absented himself from Ireland during the visit of Queen Victoria to Dublin.

"The Royal visit was proclaimed to be in connection with the [Boer] War and in such circumstances he regarded it as a sadly mistaken policy... He deemed the visit out of place and took care to have nothing to do with it. Nor would he permit his name to be used in anything that can be construed as approval of what was really a political act." (*Bishops of Ireland, 1870-1987*, Bernard J. Canning, Donegal Democrat, Ballyshannon).

Where are you now, Willie, when we need you?

Rosary Beads and Mass Cards:

Wallace Thompson, an adviser to DUP Enterprise Minister, Nigel Dodds

Report

John Martin submitted the following letter to the *Irish Catholic* on 23rd November 2007

The Irish Times

I would like to compliment Peter Costello on his perspectives on history which appeared in the 8th November edition of *The Irish Catholic*. He is, of course, right to point out that it is nonsensical for a senior politician such as Dick Roche to claim that a digital version of *The Irish Times* going back to 1859 will be an antidote to revisionism.

The Irish Times for most of its history has represented British interests in Ireland. Here is an extract from its first editorial of 29th March 1859:

"Holding ourselves entirely unconnected with all recognised parties, we shall labour to develop in Irish society such a public opinion as may command the respect and sympathy of all that is most intelligent and liberal in England. As Irishman we shall think and speak but it shall be as Irishman loyal to the British connexion, and proud to share in the destinies of the only first rate power in Europe that has known how to combine social order with individual freedom."

It has been consistent right up until 1963 when Douglas Gageby became editor. Gageby, who was its greatest editor, rescued the paper from oblivion and brought it into the mainstream of Irish society. However, it appears that this was not without a struggle.

According to Sir Andrew Gilchrist, a British Ambassador, the chief executive of the newspaper Major Thomas McDowell complained to Downing Street in September 1969 that the newspaper's editor (Gageby) was a "renegade or white nigger" on Northern questions (see the letter from the British State archives, *Sunday Independent*, 26.1.03). This was a short time after the outbreak of war in Northern Ireland.

Gageby retired in 1986 and in my opinion the newspaper has reverted discreetly to its pro-British origins.

The ex British army Major Thomas McDowell is currently honoured with the title of President of *The Irish Times* Group.

Dick Roche should perhaps look elsewhere for antidotes to revisionism.

set the phone lines buzzing on State radio, RTE when he declared that "The Pope is the Anti-Christ".

It all arose after Wallace visited St Patrick's Church of Ireland cathedral in Dublin, to discover a wide range of rosary beads for sale in the cathedral shop. He subsequently wrote to the Dean of St Patrick's, on behalf of the Evangelical Protestant Society, to request that these beads be withdrawn.

The Dean advised Wallace that the beads are sold because the majority of visitors were not Anglicans, and "if these visual aids are of use to them so much the better".

To which Wallace replied: "His attitude is, of course, typical of the ecumenical movement and its leaders who, as the blind leading the blind, are quite content to call darkness light and light darkness."

Meanwhile:

"A prominent distributor of pre-signed Mass cards has refused to reveal details of what, if any, donations are made to missionary priests or even whether a signature by an alleged priest on the cards is authentic. David Murphy, who trades as David Murphy Wholesale Cards and David Murphy Trading also confirmed that he is using the 'Guaranteed Irish' logo, a registered trade mark, on his cards without permission" (*Irish Catholic*-20.3.2008).

The Attorney-General is expected to give his advice to the Government later this Spring on whether or not the sale of pre-signed Mass cards for commercial gain can be out-lawed by the Charities Bill which is currently before the Oireachtas.

Tullylease To Christ Church:

A former priest from Cork has described as 'agonising' his decision to leave the Catholic Church as he battled with issues like compulsory celibacy.

Mallow-born Archdeacon Dermot Dunne was appointed as Church of Ireland Dean of Christ Church Cathedral in Dublin on 25th February 2008.

As Dean, the Venerable Dermot Dunne will be the 35th Dean of Christ Church Cathedral since 1539, when the last Augustinian Prior, Robert Paynswick was made Dean under reforms initiated by King Henry VIII.

Archdeacon Dunne—who is now married—was first ordained in the Catholic faith in his native Mallow in 1984.

"I was ordained in the Church of the Resurrection in my hometown of Mallow, where my mother of 81 is still living to this day," explained the Archdeacon.

"I said my first Mass in St Mary's in the town and not long after that I was posted to the parish of Milford

which also comprises Freemount and Tullylease," he continued.

"I was a curate in Tullylease and I was there for six years before the opportunity came my way to serve in London with the Immigrant Chaplaincy."

He explained his move to the Protestant church in 1998 saying he disagreed with Rome's teaching on issues like artificial birth control, women's ordination and compulsory priestly celibacy.

"The Church of Ireland was nearest to what I had already known, it was not a huge leap but there is a difference of authority, it is a non-hierarchical governance starting from the ground up," Archdeacon Dunne said.

Before he left the Catholic church over 10 years ago, Archdeacon Dunne discussed his concern with Bishop John Magee of Cloyne diocese:

"The difference of opinion we had was over whether there is an intrinsic connection between the vocation to celibacy and the vocation to the ordained Ministry. The official view is that there is an intrinsic link. I would hold that there isn't.

"So that is why I moved outside. My view of celibacy is that it is a sacred vocation which people are called to, not only in the ordained ministry, but in ordinary life," he said. (*Evening Echo*, Cork-26.2.2008)

Archdeacon Dunne is expected to take up his new role on May 30.

Priest Shortage:

"Churhes in Cork are at crisis-point due to a shortage of priests which has prompted a massive parish re-organisation." (*Evening Echo*-1.2.2008)

The re-organisation will mean some Saturday and Sunday Masses will be cut and classes including Communion, Confirmation and marriage preparation will be scattered across the city and county instead of taking place at every church.

The 68 parishes of Cork and Ross diocese will be reorganised into 16 pastoral areas by the end of this summer.

At a meeting on 9th March 2008, called by the Bishop of Cork and Ross, the significant changes—which will see as many as six parishes grouped into one area—for the Catholic church were announced.

For the first time ever representatives of all the 68 parishes of the diocese met together to help resolve urgent issues facing the Catholic church in the diocese.

"In the future we may be seeing one priest covering up to three parishes if we don't start working together," he said.

"At the moment we're looking at how we can divide the current set of parishes up into pastoral centres—larger collections of parishes.

"It's no longer possible to have one set of Masses per parish, or one priest per parish—we don't have the manpower. The workload is becoming too much for our priests.

"In addition, we had three sudden deaths among parish priests in the diocese in the past year. This in itself has been hard to cope with," he said.

The meeting heard that the situation regarding priest shortages will only get more difficult in the coming years as there are just 13 priests in the diocese aged 44 or less.

There are currently 123 priests of the Diocese of Cork and Ross but 19 of these are retired.

Delegates at the March meeting will bring the proposals back to the 68 parishes in the Diocese of Cork and Ross for further discussion, with local area meetings planned for April and May.

Guinness:

On 10th January 1942 the Vatican praised the Irish drinks company, Guinness, but not for the quality of the product, instead a Vatican Radio broadcast praised the brewing company for its family allowance schemes, paying married men with children an extra 5%, while single men over the age of 25 were deducted 1% (*Evening Echo*-10.1.2008).

Sports Ban:

Bishops across Ireland have called for Sunday mornings to be kept sacred and free from sport.

Speaking of the encroaching affect of sports on Sunday services at the Irish Bishops conference which ran in Maynooth on the week of Monday, 10th March 2008, a spokesperson for the Bishops said young people were feeling forced to choose between sport and Mass.

"In the past sporting and leisure activities for young people on Sundays did not begin until early afternoon, enabled families to attend Mass together and to regularly share the Sunday meal as a family unit," said the statement released from the conference.

"Now, however, there seems to be an ever-increasing frequency in the scheduling of underage training sessions for Sunday mornings.

"Dedicated young sports people can be afraid to miss a training session or a game for fear they will lose their place."

Ultimately the Bishops requested that people respected the spiritual needs of children and adolescents and refrain from

organising events that clashed with Mass.

Proxy Wedding:

One of the strangest weddings on record took place in Dublin on 25th April, 1959. Kerry-born Maura Garvey married her fiancé at Harrington Street Church—although he was 5,000 miles away in Venezuela. It was a marriage by proxy. This is rare in the Catholic Church, but Canon Law allows it when restrictions prevent the parties from meeting to marry. Her groom was Declan Gilroy from Dartry, Dublin. He had to leave Ireland four months before the wedding to take up an accountancy position in Venezuela. The unusual ceremony was solemnised by Rev. Father Foley. The marriage was arranged by ecclesiastical authority in Ireland, and Dublin, because under Venezuelan immigration laws it was impossible for an unmarried woman to enter the country (*Foster's Even Odder Irish Oddities*-Alan Foster-New Island-2007).

Lisbon Referendum:

The Catholic Bishops' Conference at Maynooth in March, 2008, announced that they are to issue a statement on the Treaty of Lisbon after the Government announces the date for the referendum on the treaty.

Bishops noted that Pope Benedict XVI recently addressed this subject when in discussion with the Diplomatic Corps accredited to the Holy See on January 7. Specifically referring to the Treaty of Lisbon, Pope Benedict said: "Last September, I made a visit to Austria, partly in order to underline the essential contribution that the Church is able and willing to give to European unification.

"On the subject of Europe, I would like to assure you that I am following attentively the new phase which began with the signing of the Treaty of Lisbon.

"This step gives a boost to the process of building the 'European home,' which will be a good place to live for everyone only if it is built on a solid cultural and moral foundation of common values," said Pope Benedict.

Clerical Landlord:

A priest whose tax affairs were under investigation for income he was getting from at least 11 properties made a statement to the Revenue Commissioners—but failed to disclose a bank account he was using for his rental income.

This emerged in Cork District Court on 19th March 2008, as fines totalling more than €6,000 on 10 charges were imposed on Fr. Tadhg O'Donovan, aged 46, a curate in the Cloyne diocese based at Whitechurch, Blarney, County Cork,

and formerly of Araglen, Kilworth, County Cork.

Fr. O'Donovan paid €213,000 to the Revenue Commissioners for unpaid income tax, penalties and interest.

Fergus Dempsey of the Revenue Commissioners' criminal investigation unit in Dublin testified in the case where Fr. O'Donovan pleaded to five charges of delivering incorrect income tax returns, three counts of delivering incorrect information in rental income statements, one count of submitting an incorrect statement of affairs and one count of failing to keep records.

"Subsequent inquiries were made with the Health Service Executive and the Department of Social and Family Affairs which showed these rental statements were incorrect.

"Not only did he not indicate rent from all the properties he had let, but he also understated the rental income from properties he had disclosed to us," said Mr Dempsey.

At the outset he said: "It is known that he had an interest in at least 13 different properties since 1989.

"At least 11 of these were let out by

him. Information received showed he was in receipt of substantial rental income from them. The majority of the rental income was in the form of rent supplement paid under the HSE rent supplement scheme."

Fr. O'Donovan said yesterday: "I am just happy I have reached settlement with the Revenue.

"I am sorry about the whole situation and that it took so long."

Judge Leo Malone could have imposed penalties up to a maximum of approximately four times the €6,050 that was imposed and/or 12 months in prison.

The judge said: "I am dealing with it in this way because the outstanding taxes and penalties have been paid."

Fr. O'Donovan had no solicitor yesterday and said he was representing himself. The prosecution only consented to the case being dealt with at Cork District Court on a plea of guilty.

Had the case gone to trial at Cork Circuit Criminal Court, maximum penalties of more than €100,000 would have been available to the sentencing judge for each charge on conviction.

Report

Anyone will illusions about the Broadcasting Complaints Commission will have been shocked by the rejection of complaints about the Hidden History programme about the killings at Coolacree during the War of Independence. The Commission rejected seven complaints, including one from local historian Paddy Heaney complaining that the cutting process made him appear to say the opposite of what he actually told interviewer Niamh Sammon. The following report about the BCC appeared in the *Tullamore Tribune* of 20th March 2008

"Coolacree Complaints Rejected By Broadcasting Commission

"Seven separate complaints about the RTÉ documentary 'Hidden History: The Killings at Coolacree' have been rejected by the Broadcasting Complaints Commission (BCC).

All seven complaints were made on the grounds that the programme which examined the Offaly IRA during the War of Independence was unfair, lacked objectivity and contained misleading information.

However, the BCC this week rejected that the show was biased and accepted RTÉ's position that it analysed the event justly.

The show told the story of two Protestant brothers, the Pearsons, who were killed by the IRA shortly before the ceasefire which ended the War of Independence.

It examined two theses. The first of these was that the killings were justified as the two brothers had been assisting

the Crown forces in their war with the IRA. The second thesis was that the motivation behind the killings was sectarian and that there was a desire to obtain the land the Pearson family owned.

Among the accusations lodged to the BCC were claims that the show had 'supressed evidence', 'misrepresented views of contributor's and 'made assertions with no factual basis'.

One of the complainants, Mr. J Martin argued in his submission that that there was a 'flagrant example of bias in this programme'. He quoted Eoghan Harris as saying that the IRA shot the Pearsons '...very deliberately in the genitals, in their sexual parts, in their sexual organs. What it really says is you are the other. You are an outsider. We hate you. Go away and die'.

Mr. Paddy Heaney who contributed to the broadcast claimed that the show

had misrepresented his viewpoint. He said that despite several pre-interview discussions with director Niamh Sammon, he was put in a gruelingly disadvantaged position, and taken utterly by surprise by the hostile tone of interviewing.

However, RTÉ stood firmly back the broadcast which aired on October 23rd last year. In its defence it stated that the programme 'looked at a historic event that took place in County Offaly in 1921 during the War of Independence, over 85 years ago. Therefore, any analysis of those events has to be regarded as part of an understanding of historical events.'

In a statement to the BCC, RTÉ said:

'Indeed there is an argument to be considered that the obligation to be impartial and objective does not apply in the same way to programming on historical topics as it does to programmes on current issues.

'For example, it is possible that two interpretations of an historic event could be argued and both have some validity. Both could be considered impartial and objective, yet the two

interpretations contradictory.

'The Killings at Coolacree was the result of over a year's methodical research on the subject of the Pearson family and the Offaly IRA during the War of Independence.'

An independent producer who examined the complaints for the BCC summarised that 'the programme makers did not suppress vital information', and the BCC agreed.

They said:

'On viewing the broadcast, the Commission was of the opinion that both motives were explored, with each given a fair and equal hearing.

'Experts and locals with varying opinions were interviewed and offered the opportunity to outline what they believed had happened. The programme also had a very human aspect to it, clearly indicating that what happened was tragic and had a huge impact on both the Pearson family and the local community.'

In rejecting all seven complaints, the BCC concluded: 'This broadcast dealt with its subject matter in a fair and balanced manner.'

faire Free Traders living in the ideology of Cobden and Bright, led by Gladstone, and social reformers led by Joseph Chamberlain. Parnell was in alliance with the Tories on the strength of an undertaking that they would set up some kind of representative Irish administration. After the indecisive election of 1885 these Whig, Liberal, Radical, Tory, Conservative elements of the ruling stratum went into a cocoon. What emerged was Liberal/Parnellite alliance on Home Rule, and a split in the Liberal Party on the issue of Home Rule. The Anti-Home Rule Liberals then went into *de facto* alliance with the Tories for a few years before merging with them in the 1890s to form the Unionist Party on a social reform programme, in which the Welfare State was prefigured. This Unionist Party (which had little to do with the Ulster Unionist Alliance) governed from 1895 to 1905. In Ireland it abolished landlord control of Local Government in 1898 and eased the landlords out of the ownership of land in 1903.

If there was anything that would incline one to believe in Plato's eternal Forms, of which things in this world are mere copies, it is English party politics, which are always in change but are always there as reassuring and unchangeable pillars of the political world. For half their life-span they were strictly anti-democratic, but when they became democratic they gave the impression of having always been so. And, in the course of becoming democratic, they warded off the *demos*. "The democracy" has never appeared in English political life as an active presence intent on self-government—and wherever it has so appeared, stable government has never followed.

English party politics pre-empted democracy and subordinated it to the pre-existing party divisions of the aristocracy at every stage of its emergence—or of its construction, because 'emergence' suggests that democracy existed somewhere and made its own way into politics, which in England was not the case. There was no democratic revolution in England. There was an aristocratic revolution in 1688 and 1714, and its political system absorbed every subsequent social development.

The great Chartists demonstrations might have broken the elite, hierarchical system of the state and asserted themselves as 'the democracy' if they had a mind to. Instead of doing that the demonstrators went home peacefully having made their protest, and waited for the regime to take some account of it. The regime did so piecemeal in the course of time. While the grass grows the steed starves, and it is demonstrable

Brendan Clifford

Part Four of a fragmented review of *Rebellions*

[As Part Three was artificially truncated because of space considerations, this instalment begins with a reminder to the reader]

A Journey Around Tom Dunne

[Tom Dunne, a Christian Brothers teacher without a University degree, felt that it was not right to teach history without a history degree, so he went to UCD and got a degree. He subsequently left the Christian Brothers and entered the higher spheres of University history at Cambridge University at a time when Nicholas Mansergh, Maurice Cowling, Herbert Butterfield and Joseph Lee were there. On returning to Ireland as a finished, up-to-date historian, he joined with Edna Longley, an English lecturer at Queen's University (Belfast), and Richard Kearney, "a continental trained philosopher" (based at UCD), and Kevin Barry, an English lecturer at Maynooth, to found a magazine called *The Irish Review* with the object of showing that "those who believed their terrorism was justified by Irish history" were wrong (*Rebellions* p86). He describes coming out of the quietness of an academic discussion and running into a demonstration by Northern Catholic workers in Grafton Street and being angered by it. He experienced it as a nightmare, and thought the academic re-writing of history was the best hope of ending the

nightmare.

The great work that was in hand at Cambridge when he was there was *The Governing Passion* by Alistair Cooke and John Vincent, published in 1974. Dunne did not like its "*high-tory nihilism... its pathological dislike of liberalism, its disdain for "enthusiasm" and its distaste for democracy*" (p73)—things which in my opinion made liberalism a functional system of state in England over three centuries and made it possible for it to function as a democracy, more or less, during the last of these centuries. I thought it was odd that Dunne, who as a revisionist applies English standards to Irish affairs, should have gone to Cambridge to be finished off as a historian, and come back without having seen what made England tick. And now read on:]

The Governing Passion is a very big book (about 500 pages) about a very brief period of English political history (1885-6) when party politics was going through one of its periodical metamorphoses. The Liberal Party was on the verge of splitting between *laissez-*

proof of the moral hegemony of the aristocracy that the steed was willing to starve for the time being—which for large numbers was the only time there was—out of implicit trust that the ruling class would do something for it sometime.

During the past twenty years the British state has been active in precipitating many 'democratic revolutions' in other countries. It has been out of the question to allow the existing systems in those countries to develop over time under the hegemony of an elite, as was the case with Britain itself. It is always an urgent matter of 'Democracy Now'.

The Chartists had to wait until they were dead for democracy.

But that is how it has always been with this British state—effective exhortation to the masses at home to be patient and endure, and exhortation to the populace in enemy territories to endure tyranny no longer—to revolt to be free.

Every influential British philosopher since Burke has been of the opinion that stable constitutional government is not to be got through democratic revolution. But that of course is a reason for encouraging it abroad while making it a priority to prevent it at home.

There was one moment when a kind of democratic revolution was a possibility in Britain—when 'the democracy' might have arrived unabsorbed in the corridors of power. That was in 1918, when the party system was in disarray and the electorate had been tripled by the 1918 Reform Act—an unprecedented measure made necessary by conscription. The mass of the Liberal Party had been manipulated into war enthusiasm by the Liberal Imperialist governing group, but the party fell apart under the stress of managing the war. The Labour Party, which had been very much the third party in the system, suddenly became the second party, and therefore a presumed future government. It was not habituated to playing the game, and if the Opposition did not play the game, then the game could not be played.

The relationship between language and thought is one of those uncertain things that can never be made definite. Language both expresses thought and determines it. Language is a kind of objectified thought, capable of being used effectively by people who have little capacity for thought; and such people make competent routine politicians in the British democracy. On the other hand, thought can arise in defiance of the objectified thought content of customary language, but it doesn't make its way easily.

The situation in 1919 was that a new

party arrived at Westminster which had largely arisen outside Parliament and had developed its own forms of speech for discussing the world. If it had carried its own realistic forms of speech into Parliament, there was nothing Parliament could have done about it, and the continuity of Parliamentary government (as it is inaccurately called) would have been broken in substance if not in form. And realistic discussion of the world in Parliament from a working class viewpoint would have found an immediate response in the most powerful social force in the country at the time—organised labour.

The only way to avert a serious crisis was to get the new party to begin speaking the old language, and the considerable social skills of the old ruling class were brought to bear on the task.

As well as that, bits of the splintered Liberal Party joined the Labour Party to help it cope with success. The most eminent of these was Lord Haldane, the Liberal Minister for War who had prepared the Army for the war on Germany, and who was the first Labour Lord Chancellor.

Not a great deal has been written about this, but one of those high Tories at Cambridge so superficially dismissed by Dunne, Maurice Cowling, has written a book about it. (I have forgotten the title, but it is self-explanatory.)

The Governing Passion is about a moment of high-politics in the Parliamentary bee-hive; high politics being free politics conducted amidst all the levers of the state with the purpose of deciding which ones to pull, and with party structures and alignments having become uncertain. Cooke and Vincent do not show how the decisions actually made were determined, any more than the observer of the goings-on in an actual beehive can determine how decisions are made there.

When *The Governing Passion* was published I was working out the party-political history of the British state in connection with what I was trying to do in Northern Ireland. I had heard of one of the authors, Alistair Cooke, as both an Ulster Unionist and a member of the Tory Party. I read the book but found nothing in it that had any bearing on the Northern Ireland problem, even though one aspect of that problem (and in my view, the most important aspect) began there in 1885-6.

Lord Randolph, who coquetted with Parnell in 1885, declared in 1886 that *Ulster Will Fight And Ulster Will Be Right*. Protestant Ulster had been developing within British party-politics, but the Liberal Party in Protestant Ulster was wrecked when Gladstone brought in the Home Rule Bill. The Ulster Tories

urged the Ulster Liberals to form an alliance with them when Gladstone went for Home Rule. The party-politics of the state came to an end in Protestant Ulster in 1886, having failed in the rest of the country during the preceding generation. The all-party, all-class Ulster Unionist alliance was formed. It was for a while attached to the Unionist Party (i.e., the combination of the social-reform liberals and the Tory Party) but it never functioned as an integral part of that party. That connection was effectively dissolved in 1921 when the mainly Unionist Coalition made a deal with a section of Sinn Fein, and set up a Six County Home Rule system as "*an integral part of the British state*", but cut off from its politics. There was only one substantial connection between the Ulster Unionist party and the Unionist Party. That was Lord Londonderry, who was in the running for a British Cabinet position in 1921, but chose instead to be a member of the Northern Ireland Government, to the bewilderment of his cousin, Winston Churchill. Nobody else followed his example. Northern Ireland became a place apart from Britain—a place without democratic British politics or anything of its own that could be called democratic politics, or even politics.

All of this followed in one way and another from the subject of the big academic event at Cambridge during Tom Dunne's time there. It would have been useful if he or one of his colleagues had followed it up and had introduced something of the reality of British political life into Irish academia so that it might have considered events of the next 35 years [after 1885-6] in Ireland (when Ireland was not only part of the British state, but was at times central to its affairs) with better understanding that it has ever shown.

In the early 1970s I did what I could to dispel resentments which were fed by the belief that the rules of the British Constitution had been broken in 1912-14 in order to prevent the Home Rule Party from benefitting from them. This was a groundless belief arising from the notion that there was some definite and formal thing, with rules, that was called the British Constitution, and that the Unionists broke the rules and got away with it. As a matter of historical fact there was no British Constitution. John Redmond and others believed, or pretended to believe, that there was. The foremost British Constitutional authority of the time, A.V. Dicey, explained that there wasn't. And Dicey supported opposition to the Home Rule Bill to the point of justifying pushing it to the brink of civil war.

The Minister for War, Seely, faced

with indications that a crucial section of the officer corps of the Army, based at the Curragh, would resign their commissions if orders were issued to maintain order in the North in the event of the Home Rule Bill becoming an Act, gave an undertaking to the Army that it would not be given such orders. He did this on his own authority as Minister, allowing the Government as a body to hold formally by a different position. That was the 'Curragh Mutiny'. When the duplicity became evident, Seely resigned, having made the Army safe for the time being. He explained in his Memoirs that his over-riding concern was to prevent anything resembling an Army Mutiny from occurring, because the Army would probably be needed soon for real war. He was a member of the Committee of Imperial Defence and knew of the detailed, but secret, military preparations that had been made for war with Germany in alliance with France. And he did his duty by the only real Constitution there was. The British Constitution is the politics of accomplished facts.

In early August 1914, it was revealed by the Foreign Minister that Party and Parliament had been systematically deceived for years by the inner group in the Government. These took the revelation in good spirit, appreciating they had been deceived for their own good.

The only eminent politician in nationalist Ireland who understood about the British Constitution and Parliament, and who acted on his understanding, and remained in Parliamentary politics, was William O'Brien, leader of the All For Ireland League which took eight Cork seats from the Home Rule Party in 1910. O'Brien was both a gifted agrarian agitator and a realistic politician, and with this combination he secured from the Unionist Government the 1903 Land Act which ended landlordism as the general form of landholding. When Redmond, with the balance of power in Parliament after 1910, made it possible for the Liberals to enact reforms against the Unionist interest and then got the Home Rule Bill as a *quid pro quo*, O'Brien did not believe that actual Home Rule would be gained through nationalist manipulation of the two evenly-balanced British parties.

He had earlier supported a lesser measure of devolution, a Council Bill providing for a representative all-Ireland local government authority, which both the Liberals and the Unionists had proposed but the Home Rule Party had rejected.

Redmond's party described itself as Constitutional, but it was not constitutional in the fairly basic sense that it

refused on principle to take part in governing the state. It was an external body seeking to manipulate the internal party conflict of the state to its own advantage. When this scheme foundered on the rocks of the actual British Constitution, and it was demonstrated that the British Parliament could not be manipulated successfully by an Irish nationalist party holding the balance of power, Redmondism gave way to a Republicanised Sinn Fein. The essential role of force in British constitutional affairs where Ireland was concerned, which had once been crystal clear but had been obscured for a while, became clear once more.

O'Brien had wanted to play the Parliamentary game realistically in order to achieve might be got through it. Redmond became a Constitutional fantasist and in the course of eking out of his fantasy he helped to get 50,000 Irishmen killed in the Great War. When the 'Constitutional' movement was wrecked by being applied to an unrealisable object, O'Brien threw in his lot with Sinn Fein.

This instructive episode has been written out of history by the revisionists. It is much too instructive for their purposes.

The mirage, or deception, of the revisionist doctrine is that Redmond's leadership of the Home rule movement was conciliatory towards Ulster Unionism and that Redmondite conciliation was spoiled by the rise of Sinn Fein, which either made Partition inevitable or made the inevitable Partition a matter of extreme antagonism instead of an amicable parting of the ways. (This rather important difference is deliberately blurred.)

As a matter of mere historical fact (an irrelevance in revisionist doctrine), the extreme antagonism between Unionist Ulster and nationalist Ireland was brought about by Redmond. It was against Redmond's Home Rule Party that the Ulster movement sworn to the Covenant was formed, and it was to resist Redmondite Home Rule that the Ulster Army was raised. It was Redmond's leadership of the Home Rule movement that drove the situation towards Partition, and put Partition on the practical agenda of British politics for the first time. And, if the (British) Unionist Party encouraged Ulster Unionism to extremes for reasons of its own party interests, it was Redmond who placed Home Rule at the centre of the party antagonism that is the normality of the British state, by forming a tight alliance with one of the British parties and enabling it to carry a highly contentious measure within British politics. Redmond's conduct while the Home Rule Bill was going through

Parliament was as if designed to aggravate Ulster Unionist hostility—it was contemptuous and dismissive. He maximised the probability of Partition as an outcome, while always rejecting it as a possible outcome. When driven to taking part in meetings at which it was on the agenda he squirmed and evaded. Even when he undertook to make war on Germany in external alliance with the Ulster Volunteer Force, the message at the Review of his own Volunteers at Easter 1915 was still that the UVF was the enemy. He was never willing to consider more than a temporary exclusion of a part of Ulster—which the Unionists dismissed as a death sentence with a brief stay of execution.

Sinn Fein took over in a situation in which Redmond had made Partition inevitable. The most that can be said of the turning of the electorate to Sinn Fein is that it made Partition more inevitable—which is only gibberish.

If Partition is to be taken as the crucial matter, then the major miscalculation of *realpolitik* was the rejection of the *Council Bill* which both the Liberals and the Unionists proposed. A representative all-Ireland administrative structure without legislative power was a practical possibility. The implementation of such a structure between 1904 and 1910 would have been unlikely to cause a great surge in Republicanism. What caused the Republican surge was the great excitement of the Home Rule conflict of 1912-14, and the very different excitement of Home Rule involvement in war on Germany. The raising and dashing of great expectations by Redmond, and his bleeding of 'moderate' nationalism, were the actual preconditions of 1916. And then nationalist Ireland went for independence on the tacit understanding that Redmondism had made Partition inevitable. And more inevitable than inevitable is not really a matter of practical political concern.

I can see nothing that is more to the point for the production of a critical history of his period than the practical critique of Redmondism by William O'Brien that was part of that history (*An Olive Branch In Ireland*, 1910). O'Brien showed that Redmond was driving the situation towards Partition, and he raised a movement against it which inflicted the first substantial losses on the Home Rule Party.

Tom Dunne himself does not comment on this period, but he recommends somebody who does, Clare O'Halloran, "a colleague, a product also of UCD and Cambridge, and a historian of Modern Ireland".

It so happened that O'Halloran's book

was one of a bunch picked up for me at a local library to occupy my time during a month I spent in hospital. I noticed that "*irredentism*" was mentioned a lot in it, so I read it carefully as I was then going into the irredentism that was central to the First World War. O'Halloran used the word pejoratively, but without saying what it means or relating it to any wider context. And, although it is the central theme of the book (*Partition And The Limits Of Irish Nationalism: An Ideology Under Strain*, Gill & Macmillan, 1987), it is not indexed. I noted its use on pages, xiv, xvii, xviii, 14, 116, 117, 174, 175, 186, 188, 201, 209, and 210.

It means roughly the claim made by a state on the territory of another state on national grounds, whether historical or current, or a mixture of the two. In *Casement, Alsace-Lorraine And The Great Irredentist War* I showed that the French irredentist claim on Alsace was the means by which Britain brought about the Great War, that Italy launched an uncomplicated irredentist war of aggression on Austria (which was welcomed by Home Rule Ireland), and that Greece refused to launch an irredentist war of aggression on Turkey, causing Britain to invade it and set up a puppet government which did declare irredentist war, but which came to grief in 1920 when, at the urging of Britain, it went to occupy the irredenta in Asia Minor.

I cannot see how the Irish nationalist claim to a 32 County state is weaker than the French claim to Alsace, the Italian claim to Alto Adige or the Greek claim to Asia Minor. And if one purports to be a historian, I can see no reasonable grounds for wrenching the Irish claim out of the historical context—especially when the Irish are being urged to celebrate their participation in the Great Irredentist War as a worthy event in their history.

Neither the Home Rule nor the Sinn Fein claim to 32 County government is meaningfully described as irredentist before Partition, and if a 32 County State had been formed, by whatever means, in the first instance, that would not have been irredentist. An irredentist claim is made by one state on the territory of another.

An all-Ireland state with a strongly dissenting national minority would have been neither irredentist or unusual. And, because of the peculiar way Partition was enacted and maintained, and the way the North was excluded from the political life of the state which held it, I think use of the term is unwarranted. I think I introduced it thirty years ago, but I dropped it. Germany and Austria did not invite French and Italian irredentist

demands by excluding Alsace and Alto Adige from German and Austrian political life. Alsations and Italians took part in German and Austrian political affairs. De Gasperi—Prime Minister of Italy after 1945 and a creator of the European Union—had been a representative from the Trentino in the Austrian Parliament before 1914 as a member of the Austrian Christian democracy, when he did not support Italian claims on the region.

Britain governed the Six Counties after 1921 as if its purpose as to keep All-Ireland claims alive and active.

O'Halloran nowhere says what Northern Ireland was. She refers to it in passing as a "*state*" and leaves it at that. Very little investigation is required to establish that it was not a state. It was part of the British state both in its sovereignty and most of its administration. It was separate from the British state only in its politics, but its politics dealt with nothing the British state chose to deal with. Britain chose not to deal with policing, but gave it over to the 6 County majority acting as a Protestant communal collective.

O'Halloran quotes Tim Healey (as Free State Governor General) saying in 1924 that, while in the North Catholics were oppressed,

"in the Free State there is perfect religious and civil freedom... Protestant citizens in the Saorstát are as free to take part in their legitimate avocations as Catholics... Many Protestants are members of the Oireachtas but in no sectarian sense, having joined one or other of the several national parties" (p80).

I have not looked up the statement in which Healey said this, and so I cannot say whether it was accurate by accident or design. But as it stands in the quotation it is accurate. There were no laws against Protestantism in the South, and Protestants were free to take part in the party-politics of the state and they did so. There were laws against Catholicism in the North as part of Britain—though no local ones that I can

recall—and Catholics were excluded from the party-politics of the state. The bias of the state against Catholicism was greatly magnified in the 6 County set up, and the Catholics were denied recourse to the party-political life of the state against it.

It is a tribute to the academic blinkers devised in UCD and Cambridge that O'Halloran should have been able to quote Healey about Protestants taking part in politics through membership of the "*national parties*" (which is the customary way of referring to the parties which take part in governing the state), and not see that this was not the case in the 6 Co. part of the UK state.

Southern politicians, over three generations, are berated by O'Halloran for misunderstanding what the Ulster Protestants were, and for engaging in wishful thinking instead of analysis, but I could not find anywhere in her 240 pages any attempt to analyse what the Ulster Protestants or Northern Ireland were.

Consider the following:

"While it can be argued that the Lemass approach to the north represented an historical psychological compromise, its practical effects were extremely limited. Indeed, with hindsight, it is possible to say that there was a certain air of unreality about this attempted *rapprochement*. The essentials of the problem were

Belfast Historical & Educational Society:

John Martin—
The Irish Times,
Past And Present,
a record of the journal since 1859
€20, £15

Launch
Friday, 18 April, 7.30pm
Liberty Hall, Beresford Place/Eden Quay, Dublin 1

Sir Charles Wogan—
The Rescue Of
Princess Clementina (Stuart)
An Adventure Of The Irish Brigades (1719)
in the original French, with translation by
Cathy Winch, who supplies an Introduction
€15, £11

Launch
Saturday, 19 April, 7.30pm
Teachers' Club, 36 Parnell Square, Dublin

ALL WELCOME

Orders:
athol-st@atholbooks.org
www.atholbooks.org

suppressed rather than confronted. It was stressed in official statements that 'Political and constitutional issues were not discussed'..." (p186).

What the "*essentials of the problem*" were is not mentioned.

It is true that Lemass's initiative had an "*air of unreality*", but so has O'Halloran's book. Both deal with an illusory subject: the Northern Ireland State. Lemass browbeat the 6 County Nationalist Party into undertaking the role of Loyal Opposition in the Stormont Parliament, even though it was an entirely make-believe role. Policy played next to no part in Northern Ireland affairs. Policy was determined in Britain. Stormont elections were essentially referendums. It was a condition of the Partition Act that the Unionists had to win every election in order to keep the Six Counties attached to Britain. Policy matters were decided in the British elections.

"...the Arms Trial can be seen as a product of the friction between the Lemass policy of pragmatism, carried on to some extent by his successor Jack Lynch, and the hardline approach of Charles Haughey and others. Despite Lynch's apparent victory at that time, the forces of traditional irredentism... triumphed ultimately and, under Haughey's leadership, have adopted a more extreme posture than at any time under de Valera" (p188).

If "*pragmatism*" is used to describe a policy that worked even though it did not accord with some existing theory or principle, I do not see how Lemass's Northern policy could be said to have worked. It required the Nationalist Party to act as if Stormont was the Parliament of a state. The 'Northern state' had by then operated for over 40 years with only routine oppression, such as was inevitable in it. It only survived Lemass's 'pragmatism' for 3 years before blowing apart. Lynch's 'pragmatism' consisted of an inflammatory speech delivered at a critical juncture in August 1969, followed by eight months of supplying arms to Northern Catholics and preparing the Free State Army for incursions into the North, followed by a sudden and still unexplained about-face and the bringing of charges of criminal conspiracy against a few of those who had been engaged in implementing Government policy of August 1969-April 1970.

The jury threw out the case in the face of evidence by the chief prosecution witness (the Director of Military Intelligence, Col. Hefferon) that refuted it. The judge aborted the trial at that juncture, probably expecting that the Government would see sense and drop

the charges. But Lynch insisted that the trial start again, on the same charges, but he dropped Col. Hefferon from the list of prosecution witnesses, reducing the affair to absurdity. If Hefferon was not willing to say that Capt. Kelly acted without Ministerial authority, and that Defence Gibbons did not know what was being done, there was no case. The judge in the second trial agreed that Hefferon be a witness (though not called by the Prosecution), and again he refuted the criminal conspiracy charge, saying that all that was done was done on official authority. The jury brought in the only possible verdict: Not Guilty.

Lynch had used the apparatus of state in an attempt to frighten lawyers away from the defendants. When that failed, and the Prosecution foundered, he treated the verdict as perverse, and was assisted in this good work by Garret FitzGerald.

No comprehensive account of the trial was ever published, other than the daily newspaper reports. And the official transcript of the trial—the most important in the history of the state—was conveniently lost, and the tapes mislaid.

Thirty years later enough documents were allowed into the public archive to establish the defence case beyond doubt and to show that the Government prosecution was rigged. But there had never been any reasonable ground for doubt that this was the case.

During the 70s and 80s in Belfast I used to wonder how the notion of Haughey as an "*irredentist*" trouble-maker had got so firmly established. It seemed to me that he was the one who made a point of *not* stirring things up in the North. The active "*irredentists*" in my experience were Lynch in 1969-70, FitzGerald and C.C. O'Brien in 1973-4, and FitzGerald again in 1985. Haughey's "*irredentism*" consisted of nothing more than refusing to reject the ideal of a united Ireland. He engaged in no mischievous 'initiative' in furtherance of that ideal.

He said at some point that Northern Ireland "*was not a viable entity*", which showed that he had looked at it without blinkers. And since it was not viable there was no point in stirring things up within it. I had come to the same conclusion and proposed that it be democratised into the British state. Haughey, as a working politician in the South, could hardly go along with that, but he did not respond to it with frenzy as others did. He did the next best thing, by treating Northern Ireland as something to be dealt with by British and Irish Governments.

I saw the Ulster Protestants restored to something like their 1912 defiance by FitzGerald and O'Brien in 1954. And I

saw them driven almost berserk by FitzGerald in 1985. But I never saw Haughey cause a ripple of disturbance amongst them. He had better things to do.

These things may be insignificant in the view of Cambridge history. But if there is ever to be Irish history it is out of such facts that it will be written.

NIPSA Donates To Palestinian Humanitarian Relief

Union Calls For End To Blockade Of Gaza

The (Northern Ireland) public service union NIPSA is making a donation of £8,000 towards humanitarian relief for the sick, injured and hungry in occupied Palestinian territory. The union's contribution is made through the respected Medical Aid for Palestinians (MAP).

NIPSA has also called for an end to the Israeli blockade of Gaza. NIPSA's Deputy General Secretary Brian Campfield said:-

"The continuing blockade of the Gaza Strip by Israel is causing untold misery to the people of that area but it is having a particular disastrous impact on the sick, the old and the young. We have heard the reports of civilians who have died while queuing at Israeli checkpoints before they could receive medical treatment.

There is no justification for this appalling treatment of the Palestinian people in Gaza and these draconian actions which are in breach of international law must be condemned.

NIPSA feels duty bound to lend its voice to the condemnation of the Israeli Government and recognises that in doing so we have joined a host of Israeli Human Rights organisations which are working to lift the siege of Gaza and which have been campaigning valiantly against the policies of their own Government."

NIPSA fully supports the call for all trade union Congresses in the UK and throughout Europe to call on the European Union to remove the favourable trading status that Israel enjoys with the European Union itself.

Mr. Campfield participated in an Irish Congress of Trade Unions' delegation to Palestine in November 2007.

See NIPSA statement on Gaza at <http://www.nipsa.org.uk/uploads/news/11th%20February%202008.pdf>

11 February 2008

The Second American Revolution and the Sense Problem in the West

The contemporary West is built, not on Auschwitz and Treblinka to which we have said 'No', but on Hiroshima and Nagasaki to which we have said 'Yes'.

The Postwestern Condition: Between Chaos And Civilisation (1999) p79

If we recognise that the Second American Revolution began in 1933, simultaneously with the German Revolution and during the latter phase of the Russian Revolution, many aspects of life in the West today are clarified. In particular, light is thrown on an unintended result of that American revolution: the pervasive contemporary senselessness.

The fact that the transformation of the United States between 1933 and the early 1970s has not generally been called a revolution takes nothing from the fact that it was indeed that. A similar failure of recognition occurred with regard to the long-drawn-out replacement of the republic by one-man rule in ancient Rome. Although it was in fact a revolution, it was not recognised as such, and called that, until Ronald Syme's book *The Roman Revolution*, published in 1939, made the term current. In both instances, the forces that effected the revolution wished to give the impression that the previous constitution had not been overturned, but that the public business continued to be conducted within the inherited framework, only better. In addition, in the American case, liberal-democratic exceptionalism, a secular Puritanism, was operative. It saw revolution as a crude method of political change, rendered unnecessary by liberal democracy and therefore out of the question in liberal-democratic America. And in this case, as previously in the Ancient Roman, the standard histories have been compliant with the revolutionaries—and at fault. (Cf. Ethan Theodore Colton, *Four Patterns of Revolution: Communist U.S.S.R., Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, New Deal America*, Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1970; first published 1935).

In the minds of their idealistic activists and in fact, those three twentieth-century revolutions, Russian, German and American, largely shared a common nature and purpose with previous revolutions in the history of Europe and Europe Overseas. Each of them occupied a nation's central government and by unconstitutional action increased its power. Using that

augmented power, in the following years or decades they imposed a new worldview and new order, while empowering those who were likely—by their nature or in response to their empowerment—to support the new order, and disempowering opponents, domestic or foreign.

In one important aspect, however, these three revolutions differed from those that had preceded them and, indeed, from the Irish and Italian revolutions in the same century. They broke with the tacit common constitution of European nations which prescribed that political, including military, action must respect—or after a transgression reassert—the essential ethical and customary rules of European (*alias* western) civilisation. Occasionally, in the course of previous revolutions, the revolutionary power had contravened that normative framework or for a time proclaimed new rules. But never had it invalidated the framework by enduringly establishing new rules in place of essential rules of European civilisation.

The Russian and American revolutions did this, and it was evident that the German revolution would have done so had it survived. All three declared and implemented new rules of behaviour in place of essential European rules. They thereby launched experimental systems of human living not previously attempted by Europeans at home or overseas.

The German and Russian systems, which for a short and a long period, respectively, operated in much of Europe, have perished. Only that resulting from the Second American Revolution—the system in which we now live in the West—remains. And because its post-western collection of rules to live by is the factor that has caused the current senselessness of western life, the Revolution that produced that collection, the collection itself, and its effect on westerners call for scrutiny.

What a civilisation is, essentially

First, however, it is useful to recall what a civilisation is, and western civilisation in particular. A civilisation

is essentially a grounded hierarchy of values and rules covering all of life and making sense, which a community's rulers and ruled subscribe to over a long period. 'Over a long period' (unless a catastrophe overwhelms it) because the community is motivated to keep reproducing itself by the sense, and therefore goodness, that it finds in its framework for life.

The rules to which it subscribes cover all behaviour from the maintenance of the state and communication with the supernatural to international relations in peace and war and dealings among persons and between men and women. The rules derive hierarchically from the hierarchy of values. This dual hierarchy—representing the greater or lesser importance to the community of the elements so arranged—is 'grounded' in the sense that there are interconnected reasons, understood or intuited by the community, for the presence in it of those values and rules and for their order of ranking. Some of the rules are adjustable or replaceable as the centuries pass and circumstances and mentalities change. The essential rules are those whose continuous acceptance is necessary for the civilisation to remain itself. They form its defining core.

Constructed in western Europe by Latin, Germanic and Celtic Christians, western civilisation had crossed the Atlantic and other seas and had lasted almost a thousand years. Among its essential rules were the following:

The West is a Christian civilisation of Christian nations. Its divinity is the Christian God. Whether on religious grounds or for secular motives, national and international law generally subscribe to the Christian principles of interpersonal and international behaviour. Connection with the West's Roman-Greek-Judaic roots is maintained through the educational system and educated public discourse. An educated man knows Latin. Art is work which has a formal crafted beauty. Frugality and chastity are admirable virtues. Reason takes precedence over feeling and desire. Private property is protected by law. Massacre is grievously wrong and strictly forbidden. Sexual relations are legitimate only in the monogamous betrothal and marriage of man and woman. Homosexual relations are unnatural and abhorrent. Abortion is a heinous crime, pornography a degrading evil that must be denied circulation. Adults do not foist sexual awareness on children. A girl who bears a child without a committed father is a disgrace. Human nudity and bodily intimacies are not for public display, but nudity may be represented decorously in art. Men's work and women's work are different. Men have authority and legal preferment

over women; they accord women social pre-eminence and physical protection. Age has authority over youth.

Western civilisation replaced by new collection of rules

In a process that began at the end of World War II, the West's democratic rulers, led by those of the USA, rejected many of the essential rules of western civilisation and introduced new rules in place of the rejected ones. This process was part of, or derived from, the Second American Revolution, which began in 1933 and continued to the early 1970s. Its agents, in the USA and Western Europe, were democratic rulers working in collaboration with late arrivals on the western scene: the 'new' or fundamentalist liberals.

These utopian idealists (known in Ireland since the 1970s as 'the Dublin liberals') had a prehistory in American 'progressivism'. Under the name 'liberals' they first rose to prominence in the 1930s in the USA. Unlike their classical-liberal predecessors in Europe and the USA (in Ireland, the liberals who took their lead from Daniel O'Connell and who drafted our Constitutions after Independence) these fundamentalists wanted a powerful and active state—a 'Big State' as the slogan went—intervening to shape the lives of people for their good.

The revolution gets under way

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, with the support of the Democratic Party, brought the new liberals to power. Elected in 1932 in the midst of the Great Depression, Roosevelt was convinced that their 'Big State' project was the best means of tackling its dire economic consequences. His New Deal programme, inspired in part by Mussolini's Italy and Stalin's Russia, transferred powers from the states to the Federal Government and extended the range of government action. Its immediate purpose was to liberate millions of citizens from unemployment and poverty, but it impinged on all spheres of American public life, including the arts. Its thrust, in short, in the public domain, was 'totalitarian', in the original and basic meaning of that word.

(Its original meaning, which, like the word itself, emerged in Mussolini's Italy in the 1920s, was a state which—in contradistinction to the previous classical-liberal state—involved itself, authoritatively, in all aspects of the citizens' lives. As the twentieth century progressed, this became a common characteristic of all modern states. But again, as with regard to the Second American Revolution, liberal-democratic exceptionalism was operative: nothing characteristic of non-liberal-democratic

states could be replicated in a liberal-democratic state. So liberal democracies, while engaging in the common practice alluded to, reserved the *t*-word for *oppressive* states which did likewise.)

When eleven New Deal measures were declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, Roosevelt threatened to appoint extra judges who would do his bidding. Eventually, by means of legitimate new appointments, the Court was rendered compliant. Between 1937 and 1946, it reversed thirty-two of its earlier interpretations of the Constitution, extending back over a period of 150 years. In effect, therefore, the Supreme Court presented the revolutionary government with a new Constitution tailored to its needs. In 1940, in disregard of American precedent, Roosevelt was elected President for a third term. (Later, he would seek and win election for a fourth term, and like his German revolutionary counterpart, whose period in power coincided with his, die in office.)

The Big State thus consolidated, and reinforced by emergency powers, made war on and defeated America's two main rivals, Germany and Japan. In respect of power directed outwards, it reached its apogee with the manufacture of the atomic bomb, the use of this weapon against two Japanese cities, and the subsequent official justification of the resulting massacres; in part immediate, but in greater part occurring subsequently as a result of radioactive radiation.

This justification, besides establishing the American state as the first 'superpower', had practical and symbolic side-effects. It licensed the American state, and by extension its British and French allies, to construct thousands of similar, but more powerful weapons of massacre. Symbolically, its effect was dual. On the one hand, by implication, it legitimised retrospectively all the deliberate massacres of civilians by American and British aerial bombing during World War II. On the other hand, it sent a signal to the fundamentalist liberals about the state they had worked to create; namely, that it was likely to approve those elements of their programme which rejected other core rules of western civilisation.

The general aim of their programme—given the backing of a powerful, active state—was to bring about, by pedagogical, legislative, financial and scientific means, a perfect human condition. For that purpose, first, there must be an end to the tacit recognition of the Christian religion as America's 'national' religion, and to the consequent role of Christian morality as a determinant of behavioural rules. Second, categories of citizens who were legally

or otherwise unequal must be raised or lowered to legal equality, so as to bring about a fraternity of individuals, equal in law and in their treatment by their fellows. Third, all citizens must have access to education and health services and be equipped with buying power. And finally, with due regard to the rights of others, the desires of individuals must be recognised as rights and realised as far as possible.

Implicit in that programme were Black civil rights and radical feminism; normalisation of homosexuals and of unmarried mothers and their offspring; political and financial empowerment of young people; maximal facilitation of the physically deficient; invalidation of intrinsic personal authority such as that possessed by clergy, men, parents, teachers and the aged; ample social welfare; unshackling of sex and of pornography of all kinds; legalisation of abortion; and a blank cheque for science. Implicit, too, and duly advocated by the liberals, were a collection of consequent behavioural rules that ran counter to essential European rules, traditional in the USA, which they deemed oppressive or unjust.

The culmination of the revolution

Without invalidation of the West's core rules, some progress had been made during the New Deal years and, even more, during the war years, almost to their end. But the main work remained to be done. In the remaining Truman years, and through the 1950s, while the liberal party continued to preach its fundamentalist doctrines, conservative opposition prevented further practical progress. The breakthrough came, and the revolution entered its culminating phase, when, at the end of the 1950s and in the following decade, the US Government and manufacturing industry needed urgently to increase consumption, with its dual yield of revenue and profit.

The Government, already spending heavily to wage the Cold War, was now faced with manufacturing scores of space satellites and thousands more of long-range missiles and nuclear warheads; putting a man on the moon; and paying the rising costs of war in Vietnam. Industries making consumer goods, having greatly raised their productivity by the use of automation and computers, were producing in excess of market demand. Government and manufacturing industry, jointly, perceived in the unfulfilled parts of the liberal agenda the means of greatly increasing consumption.

From the 1960s the American state began endorsing that agenda selectively through Supreme Court rulings, by legislation, and administratively. The state's totalitarian quality, considerable

in the public sphere, increased greatly as it imposed new norms of virtuous thought and behaviour on private lives, families, educators and employers. Prominent universities played a supporting role.

In the Johnson years, 1963-9, under a liberal President, the revolution celebrated its carnival and launched a rocket against western civilisation into the Nixon 70s, where it exploded on the campuses. The teachers of the new, liberal rules of correct behaviour came to function, collectively, as a sort of secular state church or informal doctrinal 'Party'. Henceforth, regardless of which political party was in government, this collective would retain its pre-eminent teaching status.

Given the ending of tacit recognition of the Christian clergy as the supreme extra-Constitutional body teaching ethical rules to the state and the citizens, this was a logical development: a substitute ethical teaching body was called for. And indeed, its emergence brought the USA into line with the practice in other twentieth-century revolutionary states, such as Russia and Germany, where the Christian clergy had been replaced by a supreme Party that defined good and evil. But in accordance, once again, with the theory of liberal-democratic exceptionalism, the existence of such a secular moral teaching body in the US—even in an informal, non-card-carrying guise—was impossible. So another clash occurred between theory and reality: such an informal body did in fact come into being and wield great influence, and later spawn similar bodies in Western Europe. For convenience of the narrative it must have a name. And since its role had to do with defining correct thought and behaviour, to call it the liberal 'Correctorate' seems appropriate.

As often before in history, the formation of this state-liberal system was a case of political power, and a new ideal vision of the good life, working together towards their distinct objectives: rulers who wish to increase their power and wealth finding substantial common cause with innovative idealists who want to render life as they believe it ought to be; the rulers empowering themselves by selectively supporting the idealists' programme, while the latter celebrate them as enlightened and virtuous rulers; the idealists ending up powerful in a semblance of their envisioned life that has been tailored to suit the rulers' interests. (In this particular instance, the rulers' interests required, both among individuals and among swathes of the citizen body, an inequality of living conditions, education and political influence as extreme as in Communist Russia, along with a similar inequality of financial power.)

The construction of consumerism

The principal preaching space allotted to the new liberals was in the mass media, including films, which they came to dominate pedagogically. (An important secondary podium was the humanities faculties of the universities.) But their pedagogical dominance of the mass media was dependent on, and shared with, business big and small, inasmuch as these same media were the principal public space where business paid to advertise its goods-for-sale.

The advertisers of goods-for-sale were, for business reasons, in substantial agreement with the social and ethical doctrines of the liberal reformers. On this account, and because their advertising, like the liberals' teaching, amounted to telling people how they should act, live and be—much of it, for example, had to do with personal body care—they *de facto* formed part of the state-licensed Correctorate. Thus a conjunction of all the interests involved made up that state-liberal system, with ethical, economic, technological and political dimensions, which we call 'consumerism'. It was a new word employed to designate the system of mass consumption, based on the socio-ethical principles of fundamentalist liberalism, which took shape in the 1960s.

It worked this way. The hybrid Correctorate and its supporting legislation issued rulings and exhortations which encouraged material and sexual consumption, rather than the previously inculcated restraint. Advancing science, and military technology by its offshoots, supplied a never-ending array of new, attractive goods to buy. Buying potential and activity were maximised through payments by the state to the poorer citizens, encouragement of women and teenagers to earn money, incomes constantly rising, goods promotion by television and radio in every home, and the prolongation of active individual life by advances in medicine. Thus mass consumption, material and sexual, became the contemporary equivalent of medieval mass labour in the fields. Together with the instigation, nourishment and exploitation of it under both forms, it constituted the main motor of the economy, society and the state. Powerful as instigation was the Correctorate's promise that by thinking, consuming, and otherwise acting, in accordance with its exhortations, the legally equalised consumers would individually attain enlightenment and righteousness, ability to do more and more things, lives ever more lasting, and the sensual satisfaction that was everyone's due. All in all, it was, and remains, the culminating realisation of

the centuries-old drive by Europeans to increase collective and individual ethical power, in the sense of *ability to do more things and bigger things and be justified*.

Consumerism spreads to Western Europe

"Freedom of speech includes the temporarily unfashionable freedom to express a certain scepticism of liberal shibboleths", wrote Maurice Wiggins in London's *Sunday Times*, 21st October 1962. *"Every little authoritarian these days pays lip-service to liberal ideals..."* wrote Judith Pakenham in the London *Spectator*, 18th January 1963. The liberals they were talking about were clearly not the Liberals of earlier British history. In the 1960s, pressure from the USA via London began the imposition of the new state-liberal system in America's West European satellites.

The aim of the American rulers was to widen the area of maximal money yield and to counter, with a display of mass permissiveness and prosperity, the communist indoctrination of Eastern Europe. In each West European state, successively, elements of the increasingly well-financed mass media adopted and spearheaded the new ethical doctrines until the media as a whole conformed; a national, business-supported correctorate emerged; and the rulers, in varying degrees, gave legal force to its teachings.

From the late 1960s onwards, in North America and Western Europe, the national liberal correctorates functioned much as the national communist parties in the Soviet satellites, except in one respect. Whereas the leading doctrinal role of the communist parties in the 'people's democracies' was constitutionally formalised, that of the liberal correctorates operated, with tacit state approval, extra-constitutionally, as a matter of fact. So while the former functioned as commanding authority in the respective multi-party parliaments and in society generally, the latter secured conformity by manipulating public opinion and institutional decision-making. Through the mass media they allocated public honour, dishonour or effective silencing to significant groups in parliaments and societies, and to significant writings, speeches and individuals.

In Europe the national correctorates also worked in collaboration with the liberal party in the central administration of the European Community. While these bureaucrats worked to ensure that Community Directives and Regulations conformed in relevant matters to liberal principles, the national correctorates lauded these dictates and insisted on their meticulous implementation in the Community's member states.

The net result, in terms of rules to live by, is that a collection of non-European rules, combined with some surviving European rules, has become the reigning and widely accepted system of do's, don'ts and do-as-you-likes of North America and much of Europe, Ireland centrally included.

TO BE CONTINUED

Desmond Fennell's latest book *About Behaving Normally In Abnormal Circumstances* was published by Athol Books last year. He can be contacted at www.desmondfennell.com
<<http://www.desmondfennell.com>>

Report

It is probable that those out to damage Barack Obama's presidential campaign dug up the Sermon given by his Pastor following 9/11. It was called *The Day Of Jerusalem's Fall*, and delivered by Rev. Jeremiah Wright at the United Trinity Church of Christ in Chicago on 16th September 2001. Until his recent retirement Wright was pastor at the church attended by Barack Obama. When selected clips from this sermon were screened on national television in the US, Obama's relationship with Wright was questioned. The full audio version of the speech is available on the Internet. Extracts appear below

A Religious View Of 9/11

Every public service of worship I have heard about so far in the wake of the American tragedy has had in its prayers and in its preachments, sympathy and compassion for those who were killed and for their families, and God's guidance upon the selected presidents and upon our war machine, as they do what they do and what they gotta do—payback. There's a move in Psalm 137 from thoughts of paying tithes to thoughts of paying back—a move, if you will, from worship to war, a move in other words from the worship of the God of creation to war against those whom God created. And I want you to notice very carefully this next move. One of the reasons this Psalm is rarely read in its entirety [is] because it is a move that spotlights the insanity of the cycle of violence and the cycle of hatred.

Look at the verse, look at the verse—look at verse nine: "Happy shall they be who take your little ones and dash them against the rocks." The people of faith are the rivers of Babylon. How shall we sing the Lord's song? If I forget the order... The people of faith, have moved from the hatred of armed enemies—these soldiers who captured the king; those soldiers who slaughtered his son, that put his eyes out; those soldiers who sacked the city, burned, burned the towers, they have moved from the hatred of armed enemies to the hatred of unarmed innocents—the babies, the babies.

Blessed are they who dash your baby's brains against a rock. And that, my beloved, is a dangerous place to be, yet that is where the people of faith are in 551 BC, and that is where far too many people of faith are in 2001 AD. We have moved from the hatred of

armed enemies to the hatred of unarmed innocents. We want revenge, we want paybacks, and we don't care who gets hurt in the process. Now I asked the Lord: "What should our response be in light of such an unthinkable act?" But before I share with you what the Lord showed me, I want to give you one of my little faith footnotes.

Visitors, I often give little faith footnotes, so that our members don't lose sight of the big picture, let me give you a faith footnote. Turn to your neighbour and say, "Faith footnote".

[Voices: "Faith footnote".]

I heard Ambassador Peck on an interview yesterday. Did anybody else see him or hear him? He was on Fox News. This is a white man, and he was upsetting the Fox News commentators to no end. He pointed out—did you see him, John?—a white man, he pointed out, ambassador, that what Malcolm X said when he got silenced by Elijah Muhammad was in fact true, America's chickens are coming home to roost.

We took this country, by terror, away from the Sioux, the Apache, the Arawak, the Comanche, the Arapajo, the Navajo. Terrorism—we took Africans from their country to build our way of ease and kept them enslaved and living in fear. Terrorism. We bombed Grenada and killed innocent civilians—babies, non-military personnel. We bombed the black civilian community of Panama with stealth bombers and killed unarmed teenagers, and toddlers, pregnant mothers and hard working fathers. We bombed Gadafy, his home and killed his child. Blessed be they who bash your children's head against the rocks.

We bombed Iraq, we killed unarmed civilians trying to make a living. We bombed the plant in Sudan to pay back

for the attack on our embassy—killed hundreds of hard-working people—mothers and fathers, who left home to go that day, not knowing they'd never get back home. We bombed Hiroshima, we bombed Nagasaki and we nuked far more than the thousands in New York and the Pentagon, and we never batted an eye. Kids playing in the playground, mothers picking up children after school—civilians, not soldiers. People just trying to make it day by day. We have supported state terrorism against the Palestinians and black South Africans, and now we are indignant? Because the stuff we have done overseas is brought back into our own front yards.

America's chickens are coming home to roost. Violence begets violence. Hatred begets hatred, and terrorism begets terrorism.

A white ambassador said that, y'all, not a black militant. Not a reverend who preaches about racism; an ambassador whose eyes are wide open, and who's trying to get us to wake up, and move away from this dangerous precipice upon which we are now poised. The ambassador said that the people we have wounded don't have the military capability we have, but they do have individuals who are willing to die and take thousands with them, and we need to come to grips with that.

Let me stop my faith footnote right there, and ask you to think about that over the next few weeks if God grants us that many days. Turn back to your neighbour, and say, "Footnote is over."

[Voices: "Footnote is over."]

Now, now. Come on back to my question to the Lord: "What should our response be right now, in light of such an unthinkable act?" I asked the Lord that question Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday. I was stuck in Newark, New Jersey. No flights were leaving La Guardia, JFK or Newark airport. On the day that the FAA opened up the airports to bring into the cities of destination those flights that had been diverted because of the hijacking, a scare in New York closed all three regional airports, and I couldn't even get here for Mr Radford's father's funeral. And I asked God: "What should our response be?"

I saw pictures of the incredible. People jumping from the 110th floor; people jumping from the roof because the stairwells and elevators above the 89th floor were gone—no more. Black people, jumping to a certain death; people holding hands jumping; people on fire jumping. And I asked the Lord: "What should our response be?" I read what the people of faith felt in 551 BC. But this is a different time, this is a different enemy, a different world, this is a different terror. This is a different

reality. "What should our response be?"

And the Lord showed me these things. Let me share them with you quickly and I'm going to leave you alone to think about the faith footnote.

Number one: The Lord showed me that this is a time for self-examination. As I sat 900 miles away from my family and my community of faith, two months after my own father's death, God showed me that this was a time for me to examine my relationship with God. My own relationship with God—my personal relationship with God.

I submit to you that it is the same for you. Folk flocked to the church in New Jersey last week. You know that foxhole-religion syndrome kicked in, that emergency cord religion, you know that little red box you pull in an emergency? It showed up full force. Folk who ain't thought about coming to church in years were in church last week. I heard that mid-week prayer services all over this country which are poorly attended 51 weeks a year were jam packed all over the nation the week of the hijacking, the 52nd week.

But the Lord said, this ain't the time for you to be examining other folks' relationship; this is a time of self-examination. But the Lord said: "How is 'our' relationship doing, Jeremiah? How often do you talked to me personally, how often do you let me talk to you privately? How much time do you spend trying to get right with me, or do you spend all your time trying to get other folk right?"

This is a time for me to examine my own relationship with God. Is it real or is it fake? Is it forever or is it for show? Is it something that you do for the sake of the public or is it something that you do for the sake of eternity? This is a time for me to examine my own, and a time for you to examine your own relationship with God—self-examination.

http://commentisfree.guardian.co.uk/jeremiah_wright/2008/03/the_day_of_jerusalems_fall.html

De Valera's Fine Ghaedheal

The following letter by Dr Brian P Murphy OSB appeared in the *Irish Examiner* of 29th February 2008

Your columnist Diarmaid Ferriter dealt with the origins of Fine Gael (February 21).

Whatever about the Fine Gael party of today, it should be placed on record that Eamon de Valera founded a Fine Ghaedheal party in 1922.

Report

This is Ephraim Sneh (in November 2006, when he was Deputy Defence Minister) saying that Iran could "kill the Zionist dream without pushing a button" if it had nuclear weapons, because "most Israelis would prefer not to live here; most Jews would prefer not to come here with their families; and Israelis who can live abroad will". Although this occurred two years ago, it has recently come to light

Puncturing The Zionist Dream?

Iran filed a complaint Saturday to the UN Security Council over remarks by Deputy Defense Minister Ephraim Sneh that Israel must be ready to prevent Iran's nuclear program "at all costs."

Iran's ambassador to the UN, Javad Zarif, submitted the complaint to UN Secretary General Kofi Annan. It stated that the council must censure Israel over the threat, and called Israel a terror state that must be stopped.

Sneh suggested in comments published Friday that Israel might be forced to launch a military strike against Iran's nuclear program—the clearest statement yet of this possibility from a high-ranking Israeli official.

"I am not advocating an Israeli preemptive military action against Iran and I am aware of its possible repercussions," Sneh, of the Labor Party, told *The Jerusalem Post* daily. "I consider it a last resort. But even the last resort is sometimes the only resort," he said.

Sneh's tough talk is the boldest to date by a high-ranking Israeli official. Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and other leaders frequently discuss the Iranian threat in grave terms, but stop short of discussing military action against Tehran.

This party was formed following a week-long meeting of the World Congress of the Irish Race in Paris from January 20-28, 1922.

The minutes of the congress record that on January 28, "it was unanimously decided that the name of the organisation should be Fine Ghaedheal (Family of the Gael), and the motto should be: 'Beyond all telling is the destiny God has in mind for Ireland the peerless.'

Eamon de Valera was president of the new organisation.

The former Israel Defense Forces brigadier general told the paper that Israel cannot afford "living under a dark cloud of fear from a leader committed to its destruction." Under such a threat, he said, "most Israelis would prefer not to live here; most Jews would prefer not to come here with their families; and Israelis who can live abroad will."

"People are not enthusiastic about being scorched," he said.

Sneh said Israel's greatest possible danger could be Iran's President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's ability "to kill the Zionist dream without pushing a button. That's why we must prevent this regime from obtaining nuclear capability at all costs."

Ahmadinejad has previously called for Israel to be "wiped off the map," and has expressed doubts that the Holocaust, in which six million Jews were murdered, took place.

The deputy minister said that while he hopes that efficient sanctions would be imposed by the international community against Iran, "the chances are not high... My working assumption is that they won't succeed."

Government spokeswoman Miri Eisin said Sneh's comments did not necessarily reflect the view of the government or Prime Minister Ehud Olmert.

Israel crippled Iraq's nuclear program 25 years ago with an airstrike on its unfinished nuclear reactor at Osiraq. Experts say Iran has learned from Iraq's mistakes, scattering its nuclear facilities and building some underground.

<http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/pages/786439.html> 11/11/2006

✱

Iran And Nuclear Weapons

The following letter was submitted to the *Guardian* by David Morrison

Oliver Kamm writes: "Avoiding military action requires that the UN pressure Iran to abide by its international obligations as a signatory to the NPT [Non-Proliferation Treaty]". Which NPT obligations is Iran not obeying? Access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, including uranium enrichment, is Iran's "inalienable right" under the NPT. Other states, for example Japan and Brazil, have uranium-enrichment facilities and it is never suggested that they are in breach of the NPT.

(published 5th December 2007)

Pat Maloney

Thoughts On The 2006 Census

Quo Vadis?

Ireland is a nation of sales staff, builders and care workers, figures show—not quite surpassing Mrs. Thatcher's 'nation of shopkeepers' but consuming our way towards it, speedily!

On 20th September 2007, the Government released the latest batch of figures from last year's Census, focusing on the kinds of jobs undertaken by the country's 2.1 million labour force.

The most common job for men was in the construction industry, while women were the dominant sex in the office and clerical world.

The headcount found a huge rise in the number of men and women employed in the "*personal services and childcare*" sector, which covers restaurants, pubs, hotels, care homes, hair salons and funeral directors.

Since the previous census in 2002, the number of people employed in the sector has risen by 53,885 or 35.6% to 205,197, making the group of occupations Ireland's most popular.

At the bottom of the scale were clergymen and clergywomen, who numbered 3,902 (down 75 or 1.9% on the 2002 census), making the group Ireland's smallest occupational sector.

But the second most popular occupation was in the field of sales jobs and allied trades, which employed 205,102, or around one in 10 of every person in Ireland's workforce.

Among the occupations with the biggest influxes of workers was the construction trade, which employs 183,429, up 46,731, or 34.2% on the 2002 figure.

"The number of road workers almost trebled from 2,980 to 8,802 in four years," said the Central Statistics Office, which compiled the Census.

"The numbers of pipelayers, bricklayers, crane drivers, roofers and plasterers all increased by over 70% over the period."

Expansions were also seen in the computer software industry, which, in four years, has seen worker numbers rise by 7,818, or 20.7%, to 45,588.

In the four years between the two headcounts, the numbers working in the field of law, insurance, accountancy and related fields leapt by 16,410, or 26.2%, to 79,062.

The numbers of people in light industry, including skilled crafts workers, rose 20.8% to 74,714.

Among the occupational groups suffering severe cull of workers was textile, clothing and leather industry, which has seen numbers shrink by 21.2% from 9,409 to 7,416 in the space of four years.

Likewise, the numbers in the Army fell by 5.2% or 407 personnel to 7,442, making the armed force the country's third smallest occupational group.

The workforce in the country's chemical, plastics and printing industries fell by 15.6% to 19,268.

Analysing the figures also reveals a subtle shift in the make-up of Ireland's workforce.

In 2002, the five most common occupation in descending order were in sales, followed by clerical staff, service and childcare workers, builders and then managers. Religious occupations were bottom.

Last year, service and childcare workers topped the list followed by sales staff, builders, clerical workers and then bosses.

The number of people in the labour force—those able to work whether employed or not—came to 2.1 million in the 2006 Census, up 17.1% on the 2002 figure of 1.8m.

The most common

occupation in Leinster was in the clerical, managerial or government sector; in Munster and Connacht it was in the professions; while in the border counties manufacturing was the biggest employer

THAT GREEK worker—if you're Greek and working in Ireland's farming, fishery and forestry sector then you're unique, according to new figures from last year's Census.

For the headcount revealed just one Greek-born national was living in Ireland and working in the sector when the Census took place in April last year.

Of the 87,698 men and women living here who work on farms, in forests or on the seas, 82,071 are Irish-born, while seven are Nigerian, one Slovenian and four Danish.

Of all the countries in Europe or the western world, Luxembourg had the fewest workers in Ireland at 13.

Of these, two worked in manufacturing; a pair were in the clerical, managerial or government sector; one was in communication or transport; and three apiece were in sales and the professions. Two were employed in other jobs.

The biggest number of non-nationals in the Irish labour force were from Britain and the North (totalling 61,366) followed by Poland (55,076).

Elizabeth Bowen:

"Notes From Eire"

Espionage Reports to Winston Churchill, 1940-42

Second, extended edition

with additional material on Irish Neutrality
in the Second World War by Brendan Clifford

€20, £15

LAUNCH:

Teachers' Club

36 Parnell Square, Dublin

ALL WELCOME

Saturday, 19 April, 8.30pm

Forthcoming

Eoin Neeson: *The Battle Of Crossbarry*

€10, £6

Pamphlet Reprint

Canon Sheehan: *A Turbulent Priest*

€7, £4.50

Aubane Historical Society

Aubane, Millstreet, Co. Cork

www.aubane.org

ORDERS: jacklaneaubane@hotmail.com