

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

November 2007

Vol.22, No.11 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.21 No.11 ISSN 954-

Coolacrease

"It was here at Coolacrease that on the 30th June 1921, a band of thirty, perhaps forty armed and masked men descended on the house, torched it, then in the courtyard shot the two eldest sons of the household" (Alan Stanley, *IMet Murder On The Way*, p13).

A third young man, a cousin of the two who was shot, saw the armed group approaching the meadow where they were working and ran away. He was caught the following day by the armed group but was let escape. His name was William Stanley. Alan Stanley, who wrote the book on which the sensationalist, and systematically falsified, account of the incident broadcast by RTE was based, is his son.

The two young men who were shot were the sons of a substantial farmer, William Pearson, who was a Protestant. Alan Stanley suggests that they were shot by land grabbers who were also inspired by a "blood lust" against them because they were Protestant "interlopers". But in conflict with this he reports a local informant (Tom Mitchel of Kinnity) as telling him that:

"The Pearsons were sociable people..., great ramblers, i.e. fond of visiting and receiving friends and neighbours, a widespread practice in Ireland at the time".

The armed group that rounded up the Pearsons, shot two of the sons, and burned the house, was a company of the IRA, which was the Army of the elected Government of the country.

There was also an unelected Government in the country at the time. It was a Department of the Government elected in Britain in 1918. It did not hold a single elected seat in the relevant part of Ireland on 30th June 1921. Such electoral base as it had in Ireland had been separated off from the rest of the country by the Partition Act of 1921. Sinn Fein held every seat in the 26 Counties, barring those in the gift of a handful of Trinity graduates.

The IRA existed because the British Government continued governing Ireland in defiance of the verdicts given by the Irish electorate in the General election of 1918, the Local Government Elections of 1920, and the General Election of 1921.

continued on page 2

Ireland Is In The Imperialist Camp

Dail Eireann re-elected Bertie Ahern as Taoiseach on 14th June 2007 on the basis of a programme agreed with the Greens and the PDs. It contains a section on foreign policy entitled *Ireland in the World*, which begins:

"We want to ensure that Ireland is a constructive member of the international community, prioritising the active promotion of peace and development through the European Union, the United Nations, international agencies and direct action." [1]

"*Making Neutrality Count*" is to be Ireland's slogan for action in foreign policy in the next five years, we are told:

"Neutrality is central to our vision of Ireland as the bridge between the developed and developing world, the intermediary and facilitator in peace processes, the first on the ground in a major humanitarian crisis—the model UN State for the 21st century. Our policy for the next five years is to Make Neutrality Count.

"We believe neutrality enhances our standing internationally. Our goal is to use that standing to build peace and deliver development."

continued on page 4

Boycotting The Cenotaph

It was England bade our Wild Geese go
That small nations might be free.

But their lonely graves are by Suvla's
waves

Or on the fringe of the great North Sea.

Oh had they died by Pearse's side

Or fought with Cahal Bruagha,

Their names we would keep where the
Fenians sleep

'Neath the shroud of the Foggy Dew.

Kevin Myers (11.10.07) berates the Government for never sending its Ambassador to Britain to the Cenotaph celebrations, and celebrations they are, every November 11th. He partly answers himself after a few paragraphs:

"And how can our national pride be nourished on the sullen neglect and a righteous disdain towards those innocents who in 1914 onwards merely did the bidding of their betters?"

They were told by their betters, British and Irish, that their sacrifice would bring Home Rule for all of Ireland. There was no such intent as events and documents

prove. And once the Unionists dominated the British Government in 1916, the Irish leaders also knew this.

They were told by their betters that they were fighting for the freedom of small nations, especially "little Catholic Belgium". Belgium was the most vicious of imperialist nations slaughtering millions in the Congo—a fact exposed by Roger Casement, and for which exposure he received a Knighthood.

They were used in an unprovoked attack on Germany and Turkey, countries which never did any harm to either Ireland or to Britain. They took part in bloody holocaust

continued on page 7

CONTENTS

	Page
Coolacrease. Brendan Clifford	1
Ireland Is In The Imperialist Camp. David Morrison	1
Boycotting The Cenotaph. Conor Lynch	1
Letters To The Editor. Headscarves In Iran, <i>Desmond Fennell</i> ; Casement 'Black Diaries', <i>Roger Sawyer</i> ; Instant Revolution? <i>Ivor Kenna</i>	3,18
Poor Little Belgium? Jack Lane (report)	7
Conquestpolitik. Machiavelli	7
Sean O'Casey's Songs Against Sommetry. Manus O'Riordan	8
Shorts from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (<i>Irish Times</i> : Self Parody; English Language; The Law; The State Broadcaster; New 'Creative Age'; New Allies? 'Nuff Said)	11
Old Irish And The Market. John Minahane (part three)	12
End Of History? Hamid Dabashi (report)	14
The Killings At Coolacrease. Pat Muldowney (report)	15
Editorial Digest (Dana; Bus Tours; Martin Meehan; MI5; UDA; 1641; Seagate; RUC Resignations)	16
Sean O'Hegarty. P. Beresford Ellis (review, report)	16
Hands Off Venezuela	
Coolacrease And The Pearsons. Daithi O hAilbhe (report)	16
Philosophy Of Nationalism? Brendan Clifford (review of D. Clarke)	16
High Court Ruling Against <i>Irish Times</i> Deserves Support. (report of IPR Group press statement, Daithi O hAilbhe)	18
Kevin Myers' Niche. Seán McGouran	19
Hezbollah Denied Entry To Ireland. David Morrison	20

Labour Comment, edited by **Pat Maloney**:
Corporatism And Trade Unionism back page

Alan Stanley invariably refers to the unelected Government as "*the authorities*" and to the elected Government as "*the rebels*".

Assuming that his father and the Pearsons of Coolacrease House also regarded the unelected Government as the legitimate governing authority and gave allegiance to it, and regarded the elected Government and its agents as rebels, and therefore criminals, there is nothing improbable in the allegation that they gave information to the British administration about criminal activity that came to their notice, or that they took action to prevent such activity when they were in a position to do so.

The Pearsons were murdered by criminals because they gave information about criminal activity to the legitimate authorities and resisted it, OR they were executed because they gave allegiance to a usurping power and assisted it against the democratically elected, and therefore legitimate, authority. That is what it comes down to.

What they did to resist the rebels and whether they did actually give information about the activity of the elected Government to the unelected Government is a secondary matter. The evidence is that they did. But the primary question is whether the elected or the unelected Government was legitimate.

Miscarriages of justice do not invalidate the system of justice under which they happen, and I have never seen the execution

of somebody subsequently found to have been innocent described as murder and a murder charge brought against the hangman.

The primary matter at issue with regard to Alan Stanley's book, and the RTE programme based on it, is whether the ground of legitimate government in Ireland in 1921 was Democratic or Imperial.

Alan Stanley, without giving any reasons, takes Imperial authority to have been legitimate authority in June 1921, even though neither the British Government nor its Opposition held a single seat in the 26 Counties outside Trinity College. He dismisses democracy without a thought. But his book is essentially a family chronicle. It is a kind of act of family revenge against what he sees as an alien Government, even though it was elected by his neighbours, possibly, but certainly by those who were his father's neighbours—and against the Persons Unknown who did the shooting, whose names he was unable to discover. And it was published privately by himself.

Left to itself Alan Stanley's book would have been a private act of retaliation against the Irish disturbance of Imperial authority in a bygone generation. Although he says that his purpose was "*to propagate the seeds of unease*" and to disturb "*the collective conscience*" (p13), his range of fire would have been narrow and local, if the book had not been taken up, and added to, by the national broadcasting authority.

Having taken part in the RTE programme based on his book, he must now put up with the consequences of success.

It seems probable that the Reform Group (which is dedicated to de-legitimising the democratic sources of Irish sovereignty in the elections of 1918, 1919 and 1921) played a part in getting the RTE programme made, if not the book itself. But it is the programme of the book, and the book therefore cannot be let rest as a private act of retaliation against a neighbourhood. It has become a national event.

The book was given national publicity in the first instance by Eoghan Harris in his paper, *The Sunday Independent*. And it is obvious that Harris was also a loose collaborator with Niamh Sammon in the making of the television programme.

What Harris added to Stanley's book was the allegation of sexual mutilation. He said repeatedly that the Person brothers were shot in "*the genitals*".

The doctor who examined the Pearsons, both before and after they died, said that they had wounds in various parts of the body, including "*the groin*" in the case of one of them.

A shot in the genitals may be more embarrassing and humiliating than a shot in the groin, but it is likely to be less deadly. Castration was widely practised throughout the ages without fatal consequences. The groin is the point of junction between the blood vessels of the body and the legs. No doctor, least of all a military one, is likely to confuse the groin with the genitals.

The reports published in the papers at the time, and the report of the British military Court of Inquiry released much later, refer to wounds in the groin. They make no mention of genitals. That is Senator Harris's invention.

Eoghan Harris was a fanatical anti-Unionist and a fanatical opponent of the Provisional IRA on the only occasion that I ever encountered him in debate. It would not be right to say I met him. He would not be met by me. His purpose was to denounce me. He did so in characteristic manner. I did not know at the time that it was his characteristic manner. I knew nothing about him at the time, except that he was denouncing me on behalf of the Official IRA. I later saw him on television denouncing others in similar manner but for opposite reasons. My offence was that in 1969, after doing a small bit to help defend West Belfast against Unionist assault, I published an article urging nationalist Ireland to negotiate with the Unionists as a distinct nationality, and insisting that they were not a brittle feudal remnant that would crumble under pressure.

Harris saw that as national treason and

denounced me as a national traitor. He did not argue the factual detail of the matter with me. I have noticed that it is a thing he never does. I described his method of dispute at the time as "*poisoning the wells*", which was a term used by Cardinal Newman in his argument with Rev. Charles Kingsley. I rather surprised myself in doing so as I have never been religious, but the term described Harris's method as aptly as it did Kingsley's. (I will go into that in a later instalment.)

After that I forgot about Harris for many years, during which he was a dogmatic Leninist and an admirer of Sir Nicolai Ceaucescu. Then, after the fall of Sir Nicolai, I noticed that Harris was denouncing others for holding the opinions that he asserted against me, and denounced me for not holding, in that debate in Limerick under the auspices of Jim Kemmy's Labour group.

The war that the 'Official Republicans' fought in the early seventies has been all but removed from the record by means of the influence that the 'Officials' (or Stickies) in their later metamorphosis came to hold in RTE and the Dublin media. But I cannot forget it because it came close to me. A friend of mine, Noel Jenkinson, a Dublin Protestant, was drawn into the fringes of it, with its mixture of Marxist fantasy and wild nationalism. He was found to have played a very minor part in a bombing in England, sentenced, I think to 20 years, and he did away with himself in prison.

The Official Republican war, waged in rivalry with the Provo war, was in my opinion an exercise in lunacy. But it passed muster for a while in the atmosphere of those times when a large bubble of Left ideology parted company with social reality. The consequences when the bubble burst are to be seen on all sides in the form of personnel of the Dublin media who are doing well for themselves. In their groundless idealist phase they had developed propaganda skills that were of great advantage to them in their careerist phase.

I did not support the Provo war, but neither did I consider it lunatic. I opposed it for twenty years while living in West Belfast. The only threats made against me from the nationalist side were made by the Officials.

Some years ago Harris half acknowledged that he had not been entirely right in the 1970s, but excused himself by saying that nobody told him he was wrong. Well, I told him so so in our debate in Limerick. And he gave every appearance then of being a fully grown man with a head.

This matter peeped up briefly on the Joe Duffy Show (RTE Radio 1) on 6th November when Tom Carew began to counter Jack Lane with a weary comment

Headscarves In Iran

Just a small correction and agreement arising out of Conor Lynch's latest contribution on his Iran visit (*IPR* October). He refers to me, in my own earlier *IPR* article on Iran, as 'describing the women on his plane donning the hijab as it began its descent into Tehran airport'. Actually I wrote that they donned their headscarves, and I agree with Mr Lynch that this means 'putting on any old scarf at all'.

I make a point of calling a Muslim woman's headscarf a headscarf; the normal name for that headgear when in fairly recent times it was widely worn in Ireland and when we see it today in various Christian parts of Europe. I would not dream of calling it, when a Muslim woman wears it, a hijab or any other strange name. To do so would be to participate in that continuous effort of the western media to make Muslim women seem odd or weird and removed from our 'normal' world.

The worst practice of all in this respect—partly because it is illiterate—is calling this headgear of a Muslim woman a 'veil'. In Italy I noticed that this ignorant, ideological usage is also in vogue in the mass media there. **Desmond Fennell**

The Casement 'Black Diaries' An Overlong Controversy In Outline (Part 3)

Recently, in your columns, my time as someone who was inclined to believe, even hope, that Casement's Black diaries were forged was described as 'uneventful'. I should like to reply to that.

Obviously a historian can never write in support of a theory—however much he hopes it is valid—unless he has found evidence to support it. When I started my research in the early sixties my main source of help was Alfred Noyes's widow, whose late husband had written *The Accusing Ghost or Justice for Casement*. Not only did I have unlimited access to all the poet's correspondence on the matter, but there was a treasure trove of allied MSS, notably from Roger McHugh and Herbert Mackey—whom I later interviewed in Dun Laoghaire. All three were strong supporters of the forgery theory.

Unfortunately Noyes had never examined the documents (*The Accusing Ghost*, pp26-7). I followed up all the leads I could in the Noyes-McHugh-Mackey archive, but the more I did so the more I found that the textual evidence undermined all the arguments: the diaries were genuine. I even looked into a rather far-fetched lead which suggested that Sir Basil Thomson had personally doctored the diaries and that contemporary examples of his handwriting would reveal this. A PRO official bent the rules for me (I ways up against the 100-yea rule) and I was able to examine a number of documents handwritten by Thomson during the relevant years. The lead led nowhere.

Naturally I went into the notorious 'Normand' theory, which was always ludicrous, and I checked up on Mackey's Millar/Bulmer confusion. By the time I had found a publisher willing to commission me to write *Casement with Hindsight* all the evidence was stacked up on the other side.

(Incidentally, I remember one day looking idly through jottings in my own diaries and concluding that the forgery theorists would definitely conclude that MI5 had had a hand in them). **Roger Sawyer**

Editorial Note

At the Casement Symposium of 27th October Paul Cullen presented important new evidence about interference with Roger Casement's Diaries. It seems that he several times visited San Ramon in South America, which the forger turned into 'Saw Ramon'. In conjunction with this, a reference to grand new buildings conveyed a different sense to Casement's words, "*Splendid Erections*". It is to be hoped that the Casement Foundation will publish this evidence.

about all that old BICO stuff being rehashed. Duffy intervened to say No, we can't do that; BICO was a legitimate party. That incident almost seemed to have been rehearsed. BICO was referred to, but then the reference was not pursued, and listeners were left to gather that BICO

was an ominous body which could not be dealt with for some technical reason.

BICO was never a party and never pretended to be one. And the reason it would not have been prudent for Joe Duffy

Imperialist Camp

continued

From this, you could be forgiven for thinking that Ireland has an independent stance in world affairs, or is setting out to develop such a stance.

The reality is that Ireland is now firmly in the imperialist camp in world affairs alongside the US-UK. In four crucial areas of foreign policy—Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran and Palestine—Ireland is fully behind the US-UK in their aggressive behaviour towards the Muslim world. You will search in vain in the Programme for Government for any mention of actual policy—past, present or future—on Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran and Palestine. But it is a racing certainty that, despite the presence of the Green Party, the new Government will continue to support

- (a) the US-UK wars in Afghanistan and Iraq;
- (b) their punishment of Iran for enriching uranium, which is Iran's right as a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT); and
- (c) their starving of Palestinians under Israeli occupation.

SHANNON

From the outset, Ireland has supported the US-UK war effort in Afghanistan and Iraq by allowing Shannon to be used to ferry US troops and military equipment to the battlefields. The *Irish Times* reported on 17th October 2007 that a million US troops have passed through Shannon since the invasion of Iraq:

"Up to the end of September this year, 1,059,382 US military personnel, on 8,698 flights, had used the midwest airport since the start of 'Operation Iraqi Freedom' four and a half years ago.

"Figures released by the Shannon Airport Authority have confirmed that since March 20th 2003 an average of 640 troops on five flights every day have stopped off at Shannon on their way to Iraq and to other US military bases in the Arabian Gulf." [2]

Ireland hasn't formally joined the US-led "*coalition of the willing*" in Iraq and sent troops to the battlefield. However, by allowing the US to use Shannon, it has provided far more assistance to the war effort than most of the 30 or so members of the "*coalition of the willing*" with troops in Iraq, whose contribution is useful to the US politically but of little or no military value. The US State Department's Weekly Status Report for 31st October 2007 [3] (see page 26) lists 27 countries, including the UK, with troops supporting the US mission in Iraq, but the overall number is less than a tenth of the number of US troops in Iraq, which now stands at around 165,000.

AFGHANISTAN

Ireland isn't formally a member of the "*coalition of the willing*" in Iraq, but it is a member of the "*coalition of the willing*" in Afghanistan. Ireland has had 7 military personnel serving with the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan since 5th July 2002. Today, it is one of 38 states contributing troops to ISAF, which now has over 41,000 troops, of which the US provides around 15,000 and the UK nearly 8,000 (see [4]).

ISAF was established, initially for 6 months, by Security Council resolution 1386, passed on 20th December 2001, shortly after the US-UK military intervention in Afghanistan that led to the overthrow of the Taliban. Resolution 1386 authorised ISAF

"to assist the Afghan Interim Authority in the maintenance of security in Kabul and its surrounding areas, so that the Afghan Interim Authority as well as the personnel of the United Nations can operate in a secure environment" [5]

The Afghan Interim Authority, headed by Hamid Karzai, had just been put together by the US at a conference in Bonn.

When ISAF was established, it could be said to have a peacekeeping role. At the same time, much larger forces under separate US command were engaged in offensive military operations in southern Afghanistan under Operation Enduring Freedom. Then, ISAF was not engaged in offensive military operations. However, in the intervening 6 years, ISAF's role, and area of operation, has been greatly extended by the Security Council (see my article [6]). In 2003, it came under NATO command and in 2006 it took over the offensive role in southern Afghanistan that had previously been the business of US forces under separate US command in Operation Enduring Freedom. Most of these US forces have been transferred to ISAF.

The Irish Government justifies its participation in ISAF on the grounds that it was established by and continues to operate under UN Security Council resolutions. This is true: all military action taken by ISAF in Afghanistan is authorised by the UN. Every Afghan killed or injured by ISAF has been killed or injured under a UN mandate, duly established by Security Council resolutions. Likewise, every Afghan village flattened by ISAF has been flattened under a proper UN mandate.

However, Ireland is under no compulsion to join in this doomed imperialist enterprise that has killed thousands of Afghan civilians. No Security Council resolution obliges Ireland to send troops to Afghanistan (or to allow Shannon to be

used to ferry US troops to Afghanistan). Ireland has made the choice to do so. *More than 150 states in this world have chosen not to do so.*

IRAQ

The Irish Government justifies allowing the US the use of Shannon by saying that military action by the US-led occupation forces in Iraq is authorised by the UN Security Council. Again that is true today, but it wasn't true at the time of the invasion in March 2003, when Ireland was permitting the US to use Shannon. However, seven months later, on 16th October 2003, the Security Council passed resolution 1511, which authorised the occupation forces in Iraq to take military action to suppress resistance to the occupation (see Annex A). Since then, every Iraqi killed or injured by the occupation forces has been killed or injured under a UN mandate, duly established by Security Council resolutions.

What is more, paragraph 14 of resolution 1511 "*urges Member States to contribute assistance under this United Nations mandate, including military forces, to the [US-led] multinational force*" in Iraq. The Irish Government can say that it is responding to the UN request in resolution 1511 in allowing the US to use Shannon.

Of course, Ireland is under no compulsion to lend assistance to the US in this matter. No Security Council resolution obliges Ireland to allow the US to use Shannon to transport its troops and equipment to Iraq. Ireland has made the choice to do so. *More than 150 states in this world have chosen not to assist the US-UK in Iraq.*

GREEN PARTY BREAKS COMMITMENT

Prior to the elections in May 2007, the Irish Anti-War Movement (IAWM) attempted to get candidates to pledge that, if elected, they wouldn't enter a government that continued to allow the US to use Shannon for military purposes. No Fianna Fail, Fine Gael or PD candidates signed the pledge, but every Sinn Fein candidate did, as did 3 outgoing Labour TDs (Joe Costello, Tommy Broughan, Michael D Higgins) and others on the left.

Six Green Party candidates signed the pledge. More fundamentally, Section 13 of the Green Party manifesto committed all its candidates unequivocally to

"end the use of Shannon Airport by US military forces involved in the war in Iraq" [7]

The Programme for Government that the Green Party agreed with Fianna Fail [1] doesn't mention the use of Shannon by US military forces, let alone commit the Government to end its use. The Green Party has simply reneged on this manifesto commitment.

EU COMMON POLICY

In each of two other areas—Iran and Palestine—Ireland has given its assent to a common EU foreign policy under the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) mechanism.

The CFSP mechanism was initially established by the Maastricht Treaty, which came into force on 1st November 1993. Under this mechanism, member states seek to arrive at common foreign policy positions. In theory, each state has a veto, but in practice the large states, and especially the UK, get their way. These days, it can be guaranteed that, if the EU adopts a common policy on an issue, it will be the UK's policy, otherwise there won't be a common policy on the issue. In the latter event, each member state is free to pursue its own foreign policy.

Where there is a common policy, the EU speaks and votes as a bloc in international organisations, for example, in the UN Security Council, the UN General Assembly and the Board of the International Atomic Energy Authority (IAEA).

In the Amsterdam Treaty, which came into force on 1st May 1999, provision was made for the appointment of an EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy, with the task of representing the EU abroad where there is a common policy. The former Secretary-General of NATO, Javier Solana, has been the sole holder of this post.

A BETTER WORLD?

In December 2003, the EU adopted a "security strategy" drawn up by Solana, entitled *A Secure Europe in a Better World* [8]. It is an imperialist document, dedicated to remoulding the world beyond the boundaries of the EU. It could have been written in Washington. Ireland signed up to this document.

"Spreading good governance, supporting social and political reform, dealing with corruption and abuse of power, establishing the rule of law and protecting human rights" are declared to be key objectives of EU foreign policy (page 16).

These objectives are to be achieved primarily by the exercise of the EU's economic muscle but the document looks forward to the strengthening of its military muscle as well. The document says:

"Trade and development policies can be powerful tools for promoting reform. As the world's largest provider of official assistance and its largest trading entity, the European Union and its Member States are well placed to pursue these goals.

"Contributing to better governance through assistance programmes, conditionality and targeted trade measures remains an important feature in our policy that we should further reinforce."

It continues:

"A number of countries have placed themselves outside the bounds of international society. Some have sought isolation; others persistently violate international norms. It is desirable that such countries should rejoin the international community, and the EU should be ready to provide assistance. Those who are unwilling to do so should understand that there is a price to be paid, including in their relationship with the European Union."

On developing the EU's military muscle, the document says:

"We need to develop a strategic culture that fosters early, rapid, and when necessary, robust intervention.

"As a Union of 25 members, spending more than 160 billion Euros on defence, we should be able to sustain several operations simultaneously. We could add particular value by developing operations involving both military and civilian capabilities." (page 11)

This EU "security strategy", to which Ireland assented in December 2003, is the backdrop to the EU policies on Iran and Palestine.

IRAN

On Iran, the EU has a common policy (and a common policy with the US) of seeking to prevent Iran from engaging in uranium enrichment. Ireland has assented to this policy.

Access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes is central to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). By signing up to the NPT, as Iran did in 1968 when the Shah was in power, states without nuclear weapons forfeited their right to acquire nuclear weapons, but as a quid pro quo they were supposed to be guaranteed access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. This is enshrined in Article IV(1) of the NPT, which states:

"Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with Articles I and II of this Treaty." [9]

The International Atomic Energy Authority (IAEA) hasn't found any evidence that Iran's nuclear programme is for other than peaceful purposes.

So, Iran has not breached the NPT by developing uranium enrichment facilities, and neither has Brazil or Japan by doing likewise. Nevertheless, the EU with Ireland's assent has been to the fore in persuading the Security Council to apply economic sanctions to Iran to pressure it into halting uranium enrichment. By contrast, Brazil and Japan are allowed to engage in uranium enrichment without let or hindrance.

You can see what the EU means when it states in *A Secure Europe in a Better World* (page 14) that "a rule-based international order is our objective".

PALESTINE

On Palestine, the EU is yoked together with the US and Russia (and the UN Secretary-General) in the so-called Quartet, which is the self-appointed arbiter of right and wrong in Palestine. Alvaro de Soto was the UN Secretary-General's Middle East envoy for two years until his retirement in May 2007. In his 'End of Mission' report to the UN Secretary-General (which was leaked to *The Guardian*), he wrote of the Quartet:

"Whatever the Quartet was at the inception, let us be frank with ourselves: today, as a practical matter, the Quartet is pretty much a group of friends of the US—and the US doesn't feel the need to consult closely with the Quartet except when it suits it." [10] (paragraph 63)

As a member of the Quartet, the EU with Ireland's assent refused to accept the result of the January 2006 elections to the Palestinian Legislative Council, which Hamas won with 44.5% of the "national list" vote and 74 seats out of the 132 seats (Fatah won 45 seats). It refused to deal with either of the Hamas-led governments formed as a result of the election in accordance with the Palestinian constitution. What is more, the EU joined the US in collectively punishing Palestinians by withdrawing economic aid, because 44.5% of them had dared to vote in a manner of which the EU (and the US) disapproved.

In June 2007, the EU went further and supported the overthrow of the democratically-endorsed National Unity Government in Palestine and its replacement by an entity led by Salam Fayyad with no democratic validity whatsoever (see Annex B). Ireland is a party to this as well.

David Morrison

www.david-morrison.org.uk

References:

- [1] www.taoiseach.gov.ie/attached_files/Pdf%20files/NewProgrammeForGovernmentJune2007.pdf
- [2] www.ireland.com/newspaper/ireland/2007/1017/1192565608472.html
- [3] www.state.gov/documents/organization/94601.pdf
- [4] www.nato.int/ISAF/docu/epub/pdf/isaf_placemat.pdf
- [5] www.david-morrison.org.uk/scrs/2001-1386.pdf
- [6] www.david-morrison.org.uk/afghanistan/ireland-isaf.htm
- [7] www.greenparty.ie/en/election_07/manifesto_2007/manifesto
- [8] www.iss-eu.org/solana/solanae.pdf
- [9] www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Infcirc/Others/infcirc140.pdf
- [10] image.guardian.co.uk/sys-files/Guardian/documents/2007/06/12/DeSotoReport.pdf

Annex A

Since the Security Council passed resolution 1511 on 16th October 2003, all military action by the US-led occupation forces in Iraq has been carried out under a UN mandate, duly established by Security Council resolutions.

On 16th October 2003, the Security Council passed resolution 1511 authorising the US-led occupying forces in Iraq to use force to put down resistance to their occupation. In March 2003, the US-UK failed to get specific Security Council authorisation for the invasion of Iraq. But, in October 2003, the Security Council authorised them to use force to maintain their occupation.

Resolution 1511 was passed unanimously. In March 2003, France, Russia and China refused to vote for the US-led invasion of Iraq, but seven months later they voted for the maintenance of the occupation of Iraq by military force. From that time on, each and every military action taken by the occupying forces, including the flattening of Fallujah, has been carried out with the authority of the UN.

Paragraph 13 of the resolution contains the authorisation for the US-led occupying forces to take military action:

"[The Security Council] *Determines* that the provision of security and stability is essential to the successful completion of the political process as outlined in paragraph 7 above and to the ability of the United Nations to contribute effectively to that process and the implementation of resolution 1483 (2003), and **authorizes a multinational force under unified command to take all necessary measures** [my emphasis] to contribute to the maintenance of security and stability in Iraq" [1]

"All necessary measures" is the phrase customarily used in Security Council resolutions to mean military action. It is derived from Article 42 of Chapter VII of the UN Charter, which states that the Security Council "may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security".

Paragraph 14 of resolution 1511 urges states to "contribute assistance" to the "multinational force":

"[The Security Council] *Urges* Member States to contribute assistance under this United Nations mandate, including military forces, to the multinational force referred to in paragraph 13 above;"

Lest there be any doubt that the entity referred to as "a multinational force under unified command" is, in fact, the occupying forces commanded by the US, paragraph 25 says:

"[The Security Council] *Requests* that the United States, on behalf of the multinational force as outlined in paragraph 13 above, report to the Security Council on the efforts and progress of this force as appropriate and not less than every six months;"

And here is what US Ambassador, John Negroponte, said after the vote:

"... the resolution establishes a United Nations authorized multinational force under unified United States command" [2]

The ostensible reason given in paragraph 13 for authorising the occupation forces to use force is so that security and stability can be restored and the UN can function in Iraq. It has become impossible for the UN to play any role, separate from the occupying powers, since UN employees on the ground are going to be killed without their protection. That is the inevitable result of the fact that, after the event, the UN has endorsed the US-UK invasion. The chief opponents of the invasion—France, Germany and Russia—have not yet gone so far as to supply occupation forces, but they have sanctioned the occupation in successive Security Council resolutions.

This began with resolution 1483, passed on 22nd May 2003, which mandated the CPA to govern Iraq and sell its oil for the foreseeable future [3]. 1511 goes very much further.

War On Terror

Resolution 1511 also goes along with George Bush's portrayal of the invasion as part of his "war on terror". It has numerous references to "terrorism" in Iraq, and the need to combat "terrorism" in accordance with resolution 1373, passed after the events of 11th September 2001 [4]. George Bush was, therefore, able to welcome the resolution in the following terms on 28th October 2003:

"Our coalition against terror has been strengthened in recent days by UN Security Council Resolution 1511. This endorses a multinational force in Iraq under US command, encourages other nations to come to the aid of the Iraqi people." [5]

With popular support for his Iraqi adventure falling rapidly, not least because of the absence of "weapons of mass destruction", every time Bush speaks about Iraq these days, he yokes it together with Afghanistan, and by implication therefore with 9/11. His message to the American people is that the war in Iraq is an essential part of preventing a repeat of 9/11. As he told an audience in Alabama on 3rd November 2003:

"... a free and peaceful Iraq are important for the national security of America. A free and peaceful Iraq will make it more likely that our children and grandchildren will be able to grow up without the horrors of September the 11th. We'll defeat the terrorists there so we don't have to face them on our own streets." [6]

The Security Council has given credence to this baloney in resolution 1511.

Annex B

The present Fayyad-led Palestinian 'government' is not a legitimate government under the Palestinian constitution (the Basic Law). It is not legitimate because it has not been endorsed by the Palestinian Legislative Council (PLC).

Article 79(4) of the Basic Law [1] states:

"The Prime Minister and any of the Ministers shall not assume the duties of their positions until they obtain the confidence of the PLC."

Article 67(3) of the Basic Law states that

"Confidence shall be granted to the government, if it obtains the absolute majority of the PLC Members."

In other words, the Palestinian constitution forbids a new set of Palestinian ministers from assuming "the duties of their positions until they obtain" the endorsement of "the absolute majority of the PLC Members", that is, 67 members since the PLC has 132 members in all.

Hamas won 74 seats and Fatah 45 in the January 2006 PLC elections. Both of the Hamas-led governments formed since these elections did receive proper PLC endorsement and were therefore legitimate governments under the Basic Law. The present Fayyad-led entity has not received proper PLC endorsement and is therefore not a legitimate government under the Basic Law.

* * * * *

On 14th June 2007, President Abbas declared a state of emergency and dismissed the second Hamas-led government (the National Unity Government). He is entitled to do this under Article 45 of the Basic Law. He then appointed Salam Fayyad, the Finance Minister in the previous government, as Prime Minister and invited him to form a government.

Salam Fayyad is an elected member of the PLC and the leader of the 2-member Third Way party, which got 2.4% of the "national list" vote in the elections in January 2006. By contrast, Hamas got 44.5% of the "national list" vote and won 74 seats overall.

Salam Fayyad nominated a set of ministers as requested by the President, with himself as Foreign Minister and Finance Minister as well as Prime Minister. However, he has not made any attempt to obtain the confidence of the PLC for himself and his ministers, so the Basic Law bars them from assuming "the duties of their positions". In fact, the PLC has never met. So, the Fayyad-led entity is not a legitimate government under the Basic Law.

* * * * *

President Abbas has attempted to give the Fayyad-led entity legitimacy by describing it as an emergency government, which, it is implied, does not require the normal constitutional procedure, in particular endorsement by the PLC, to be followed. It is true that Abbas was entitled to declare a state of emergency under Article 110(1) of the Basic Law, which states:

"The President of the National Authority may declare a state of emergency by a decree when there is a threat to national security caused by war, invasion, armed insurrection, or at a time of natural disaster for a period not to exceed thirty (30) days."

Since the Palestinian territories are under occupation (and have been for 40 years) it would seem that a state of emergency could lawfully be declared at any time. But, the

President cannot maintain it for more than 30 days without the support of two thirds of the members of the PLC, since Article 110(2) says:

"The emergency state may be extended for another period of thirty (30) days after the approval of two thirds of the Legislative Council Members."

That would appear to mean two thirds of the 132 PLC members, that is, 88.

President Abbas declared a state of emergency on 14th June 2007. It hasn't been renewed by the PLC under Article 110(2), so it came to an end on or about 14 July 2007.

More fundamentally, the Basic Law provisions with regard to a state of emergency (Articles 110 to 115) don't allow the President to amend the Basic Law itself to do away with the Article 79(4) requirement that

"The Prime Minister and any of the Ministers shall not assume the duties of their positions until they obtain the confidence of the PLC."

The Basic Law is unambiguous on the question of its own amendment, Article 120 stating:

"The provisions of this Basic Law shall not be amended except with two thirds majority of the Members of the Legislative Council."

So, with or without a state of emergency, the Fayyad-led entity is not a legitimate government under the Basic Law.

* * * * *

This conclusion is confirmed by Anis al-Qasem, who led the drafting of the Palestinian constitution. Questioned by Reuters on 8th July 2007 [2], he said:

"It is clear from (Basic Law) Article 45 that the president has the power to dismiss the prime minister. However, under Article 78(3), the dismissed government continues to run the affairs of government temporarily as a caretaker government until the formation of the new government in the manner provided by the Basic Law.

"Under Article 79(4) of Chapter 5 (on executive authority), neither the prime minister nor any minister shall assume his office except after a vote of confidence from the Legislative Council (parliament) ...

"Conclusion: The president has the power to dismiss the prime minister and to start the process of the formation of a new government. The basic ingredients of this process that give legitimacy to the new government are a vote of confidence by the Legislative Council and the oath of office.

"Until the formation of the new government in accordance with the procedure laid down in Chapter 5 of the Basic Law, the dismissed government continues to act as a caretaker government. The Basic Law contains no special provisions for what is sometimes called 'emergency government'.

"As to the powers of the president in

a state of emergency, the only power specifically given to him is to declare the state of emergency in the manner provided in Article 110. He cannot issue decrees suspending any provisions of the Basic Law.

"The Legislative Council continues to function (Article 113), and none of the other provisions of the Basic Law may be touched except as provided in Article 111, which deals only with restrictions that may be imposed on basic rights and freedoms, and even these may only be affected to the extent necessary to fulfil the objective of the emergency as stated in the emergency decree.

"It is worth remembering that the whole Basic Law has been amended to reduce, rather than increase, the powers of the president as a result of the power struggle between Mr Abbas when he was Prime Minister and the late President Arafat.

"Of course we anticipated that, in a system where both the president and the legislature come to power through popular elections, there is the likelihood that the president may belong to one political party while the majority in the legislature may belong to another, with the possibility of divergence of policies, as it has happened frequently in democracies like the United States and France.

"In a situation like this, compromises through dialogue are struck and neither the president nor the legislature would attempt to thwart the will of the people. If a deadlock is reached, the president may exercise the power given to him by the Basic Law and dismiss the government and appoint a new government that would, ultimately, receive the approval of the Legislative Council. Through this requirement of approval the elected representatives will determine the propriety or otherwise of the action of the president and the will of the electorate will not be thwarted. That was the expectation."

[1] www.usaid.gov/wbg/misc/Amended_Basic_Law.pdf

[2] www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/L0880166.htm

Cenotaph

continued

for the greater glory of British expansionism and for the victory of raw laissez faire capitalism over the Christian Social market system that was developing in Germany

Having had its bacon saved by America, Britain restructured Europe and the Middle East in ways that gave rise to Fascism and Nazism and an even more brutal War, and to the cauldron that is the Middle East today.

But "their betters" ceased to be "their betters" following the Uprising of 1916 by the overwhelming will of the majority in Ireland in 1918. Both the Redmondites

and the British were rejected and the latter forced two wars on the Irish people for their temerity.

The Cenotaph celebrates not just the dead of 1914-18, or even of 1939-46. It explicitly commemorates all British military dead since 1914 and all the battles in which they fell. It includes the Black and Tans and the Auxies in Ireland. Those who performed unspeakable acts in Malaya, in Kenya, in Aden and on the streets of Derry on Bloody Sunday. It commemorates the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan.

And the British plan more of the same. At last year's event, as the BBC cameras focused on the children present, David Dimbleby declared that this was important for them as they too would one day be asked to risk their lives. The monument recently unveiled in Britain to the 16,000 who have been killed since 1945 allows for a further 10,000 names.

For slavery fled, oh our glorious dead
When you fell in the Foggy Dew.

Conor Lynch

(Letter Submitted to

Irish Independent, 8th November)

Poor Little Belgium?

The following letter appeared in
the *Irish Examiner*

Anne Cahill's report on the possible breakup of Belgium into its two, if not three, constituent parts, (that of the Flemings, Walloons and Brussels) made for very interesting and disturbing reading (29th September 2007).

Up to 50,000 Irish people died for the sake of 'poor little Belgium' and therefore we have something of a vested interest in this issue.

These victims are commemorated very volubly these days by many people including our President and Taoiseach. I think they owe us an explanation as to which Belgium these brave people actually died for.

It is rather disconcerting to have loved ones who may have died for a country that might soon not exist! **Jack Lane**

Conquestpolitik

"Conquered states that have been accustomed to liberty and the government of their own laws can be held by the conqueror in three different ways.

The first is to ruin them; the second, for the conqueror to go and reside there in person; and the third is to allow them to continue to live under their own laws, subject to a regular tribute, and to create in them a government of a few, who will keep the country friendly to the conqueror"

Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*

Seán O'Casey's Songs Against Sommetry

INTRODUCTION BY MANUS O'RIORDAN:

Not for a moment could anyone take issue with families commemorating the loss of loved ones in War. But this November, as we approach yet another Royal British Legion Remembrance Sunday, we can see that what the occasion is primarily now being used for is an unashamed celebration of Britain's Imperialist War of 1914-1918.

Genuine commemoration need not take any such British jingoistic form. Three years ago the poet and war casualty Francis Ledwidge was commemorated by the unveiling of three panels in the Navan, Co. Meath branch office of SIPTU. It was indeed appropriate to do so, in the light of Ledwidge's role as Secretary of the Meath Labour Union, whose members subsequently joined the ITGWU. The panels were respectively entitled *The Labourer/Activist*, *The Poet*, and *The Soldier*. I provided the following wording for that third panel:

"Francis Ledwidge was a dedicated Irish Volunteer but enlisted in the Inniskilling Fusiliers—the regiment of his patron, Lord Dunsany—in October, 1914. Eight weeks before his death in 1917, he recalled that he had 'joined the British Army' because he felt 'she stood between Ireland and an enemy common to our civilisation'. But, in the wake of the 1916 Rising and the execution of Pearse and McDonagh, 'two of my best friends, shot by England', it was painful 'to be called a British soldier' while Ireland had 'but the place of Cinderella among the nations'. In May 1916 he had told his brother Joe, 'If I heard the Germans were coming in over our back wall, I wouldn't go out now to stop them. They could come!' Ledwidge was killed in Belgium on 31 July, 1917, when hit by a stray shell while mending a road during the third Battle of Ypres. He is buried in the nearby Artillery Wood Cemetery".

There was, indeed, hardly any Irish family left untouched by that War. As I wrote in *The Corkman* on 7th November 2002:

"There are no Republican martyrs in my family tree. Those of my Cork relatives (from Ballingearry on my father's side and Clonakilty on my mother's), who fought for Irish freedom in the IRA, all survived the War of Independence. The only war casualty in the family had fought in quite a different cause—Britain's Imperialist War against Germany—John Sheehy of Barryroe, Clonakilty. There was, of course, considerable family mourning and sorrow at his death. But what was mourned no less was the fact that he had died in a British army uniform."

Three weeks later, in an *Irish Times* letter on 28th November, I further remarked:

"Two years after the murderous Battle of the Somme it was still a front being fought over. It was there that a first cousin of my maternal grandfather was killed on February 15, 1918. There was indeed much heartbreak and sorrow among his family, not least because he had died as British cannon-fodder."

In the October issue of *Irish Political Review* Jack Lane reproduced the First World War satirical song *We're fighting for Christianity*. Published over the pseudonym of "*Sliabh Rua*" ["red mountain"], Jack speculates that this might in fact have been Seán O'Casey. I'm not absolutely certain that it was, but it was certainly completely in character with a number of other anti-Imperialist War songs from O'Casey. But who now would ever guess that these even existed? How come that all those pundits, who wax lyrical about O'Casey's critique of Connolly and the 1916 Rising, stay dead silent on his anti-British verse?

Feather's from the Green Crow: Seán O'Casey 1905-1925 was a volume edited by an American academic Robert Hogan and published in 1963—but it has long since been out of print. Yet among the invaluable services performed by Hogan was his rescue of such marvellous O'Casey ballads from the archives. Most of them had been published by O'Casey himself in his 1918 collection entitled *Songs of the Wren*, and they represented a powerful propagandist contribution from him to the anti-Conscription campaign. As Hogan observed:

"The satiric songs frequently comment upon World War One, for O'Casey regarded Britain's part in it and Britain's attempt to recruit in Ireland with a cold and satiric eye".

O'Casey mocked both Redmond's foolish belief in Britain's Home Rule promise and the anti-German war hysteria to which Redmondism itself had so passionately subscribed. And in *The Bonnie Bunch of Roses O!* O'Casey also went on to pay tribute to his executed sparring partner, James Connolly. For, notwithstanding the frequent clashes between them, it was Connolly himself who in January 1916 had published the best of O'Casey's songs—*The Grand Oul' Dame Britannia*—over the latter's pseudonym of "*An Gall Fada*" ["the long foreigner"]. When O'Casey himself republished it himself, in his 1934 collection *Windfalls*, he wrote in his Preface:

"Finally came the crash of the guns

in the Great War, and England's hurried and agitated recruiting campaign in Ireland calling on Irishmen of goodwill to go out and fight for little Catholic Belgium. *The Grand Oul' Dame Britannia* was written, printed as a 'nix job' by friendly printers, and circulated among the various National Societies."

SEÁN O'CASEY'S SONGS

The Grand Oul' Dame Britannia

Air—"The Bonnie Bunch of Roses, O!"

Och! Ireland, sure I'm proud of you—
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia,
To poor little Belgium tried and true,
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.
Ye've closed your ear to the Sinn Féin
lies,
For you know each Gael that for England
dies
Will enjoy Home Rule in the clear blue
skies,
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.

Ah! Casement! Damn that Irish Pig,
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia,
We'll make him dance an English jig,
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.
But Redmond's here—the good and
great—

A Pillar of the English State—
Who fears to speak of "Ninety-eight"—
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.

The Castle's now an altered place,
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia,
It's the Drawin' Room of the Irish Race,
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.
John Redmond to the Throne is bowed
'Mid a frantic cheerin' Irish crowd—
Sure it's like the days of Shane the
Proud,
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.

For Redmond now Home Rule has won,
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia,
An' he's finish'd what Wolfe Tone begun,
Ses Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.
Yet rebels thro' the country stalk,
Shoutin' "67" and "Batchelor's Walk"

—
Did ye ever hear such foolish talk?
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.

Ye want a pound or two from me!
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia,
For your oul' Hibernian Academy!
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.
Don't ye know we've got the Huns to
quell,
And we want the cash for shot and shell;
Your Artists—Let them go to Hell!
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.

Ah! Scholars, Hurlers, Saints an' Bards!
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia,
Come along an' list in the Irish Guards,
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.

Each man that treads on a German's feet
'Ill be given a parcel—tied up neat—
Of a Tombstone Cross an' a Windin'
sheet,
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.

Be jabbers! Redmond, you're the Bhoy!
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia,
Shure you're Ireland's pride and
England's joy,
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.
Like a true born Gael he faced the Hun,
Then he jumped around an' fired a gun—
Faix, you should have seen the Germans
run!
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.

Sure I spoke to-day with Inspector
Quinn,
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia,
An' he told me straight we were bound
to win!
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.
What mean these deafenin' newsboys'
yells—
What tale is this the Paper tells—
A British retreat from the Dardanelles!
Ses the Grand Oul' Dame Britannia.

The Worker's Republic, January 16, 1916

If the Germans Came to Ireland in the Mornin'

Air—"I'm Off to Philadelphia in the Mornin'"

There are men in this 'ere Nation without
any education—
An asylum ward they ought to be
adornin'—
For they tell us—Holy Moses—life ud
be a bed o' roses
If the Germans came to Ireland in the
mornin'!

To capture, sure, they're eager, each
United Irish Leaguer,
In Home Rule Sauce to give them all a
cornin';
An' the men that serve King Billy, they'
be fed on Popish skilly,
If the Germans came to Ireland in the
mornin'!

Now, the noble men that lade yez, they'd
imprison in bird cages,
An' make them whistle *God Save
Ireland*, out o' scomin'—
Oh! the Germans are such damn rogues,
they'd destroy our harps an'
shamrogues,
If they came and landed here now in the
mornin'!

In our noble secret service the peelers
now are nervous,
For they'd kill these gentle creatures
without warnin'—
Every peeler on his beat, sir, they'd cut
off his little feet, sir,

An' make submarines of his boots, then,
in the mornin'!

Sure as God made little apples, they'd
demolish all our chapels,
An' our grand homes in the slums that
we were born in —

With their big guns firin' shrapnel,
well—God help poor Charlie
Chaplin —

If the Germans came to Ireland in the
mornin'!

Now take heed to what I'm sayin', they'd
destroy potato sprayin' —
Sure with indignation sore my heart is
burnin' —

An' what would happen, pray, sir, to the
Sinn Féin rainbow-chaser,
If the Germans came to Ireland in the
mornin'!

We've Captured the Cave of Machpelah

Air—"The Ould Orange Flute"

"The British arms have scored a great
victory by the capture of Hebron, which
contains the Cave of Machpelah, the
tomb of Abraham."—*The Daily Mail*

In the fight for Poor Freedom against
the Huns,
We've lost thousands and thousands
and thousands of guns;
But still in the struggle we're givin'
them tons.
An' we've captur'd the Cave of
Machpelah!

Chorus:

Hurrah! For John Bull and for Uncle
Sam—
We're losin' the war, but we don't care a
damn,
For we've take the tomb of poor
Abraham,
An' we've captur'd the Cave of
Machpelah!

To triumph they'll carry the Union
Jack—
Our warriors bold, brown, red and black
The Germans hit us, but we're hittin'
them back—
An' we've captur'd the Cave of
Machpelah!

With Joy an' with Pride, now, our
bosoms thrill!
Tho' we're losin' each dale an' we're
losin' each hill,
But we're givin' the bloodthirsty
Germans their fill,
For we've captur'd the Cave of
Machpelah!

Wirrastrue, Wirrastrue, we have lost
Trieste,

An' the Germans are reignin' in
Bucharest—
But these losses are now but a mighty
jest,
Since we've captur'd the Cave of
Machpelah!

We're proud, aye, we're proud of our
British pluck,
That fought against Hope an' the hardest
of luck,
We've won all we want an' we've settled
Von Kluck,
For we've captur'd the Cave of
Machpelah!

Mackensen may brag and the Kaiser
may blow
About Russia's and Italy's overthrow,
But they'll soon change their tune when
they get to know,
We've captur'd the Cave of Machpelah!

We Welcome the Aid of Japan

Air—"Twenty-Four Strings to my Bow"

"Japan is the last hope of the Allies."—
The Daily Mail

At first, for the sake of small nations,
We ran an' we took down our gun,
For our heart was in wild palpitations
When we thought on the strength of the
Hun.
For Religion and Truth, sure, we fought,
too,
An' the Rights an' the Freedom of Man—
To a frazzle we're bet—but we'll carry
on yet
With the help and the aid of Japan!

Chorus:

With the help and the aid of Japan,
We'll accomplish the freedom of man:
An' we'll still rule the waves, while the
workers are slaves,
With the help and the aid of Japan!

Poor Belgium, like a little goose, sir,
Answered quickly fair Honour's loud
call,
But Germany's strength was let loose,
sir,
And, faith, she soon ended them all;
And now our poor Belgium is numbered
With horses that then also ran—
Sure, that's just as well—let her now go
to hell,
For we've captured the aid of Japan!

On Russia for years we depended,
But their tidy and trim apple-car
The merciless Huns soon upended,
And, now, we've no use for the Czar!
And the Bolsheviks fierce had
destroyed, too,
Our nicely developing plan—
But now we don't care for the great

Russian bear,
For we've collared the aid of Japan!

Roumania, all caution and cunning,
Came out on the side of the Right,
But, faith, sure, I hear they are running—
They never had stomachs for fight.
And these gilded chocolate soldiers
Finished up well before they began;
But we've got to, now, keep our hands to
the plough,
So we welcome the aid of Japan!

Now, Ireland is blighted with Sinn
Féin—
Tho' we thought that she'd give us her
aid—
For they're all thinkin' now of their own
gain
By diggin' up plots with a spade.
But if ever we get a good chance, boys,
Her obstinate hide we will tan,
For she didn't act fair—Ah! But still
we'll get there,
With the much welcome aid of Japan!

Tho' Providence helped us before, boys,
In the great days of Nelson and Drake,
I'm afraid that she'll help us no more,
boys,
For she thinks that we're out on the
make!
But now we can do well without her,
And we laugh at her pitiful ban—
For we don't care a damn, now, for
Bible or psalm,
For we've captured the aid of Japan!

The Japanese may be a haythen—
A bloody and villainous tyke—
But when we're at war we're not playin',
And that's just the thing that we like!
For Civilisation needs, now, boys,
The help, sure, of every man,
And the Savage, we find, is a help to
Mankind—
So we welcome the aid of Japan!

The Divil's Recruitin' Campaign

Air—"Sergeant Willy Bailly"

I suppose you've often heard, now, of
the place that lies below—
Too all tooral, ooral, ooral, ooo!
A public meeting there was held not
very long ago,
Too all tooral, ooral, ooral, ooo!
'Twas the Divil that presided, and soon
it was decided
That the only way to see the matter
through,
An' to keep the British Nation at its
present elevation,
Was to hasten on Conscription, tooral
ooo!

Ses the Divil, "Things in Ireland, now,
they will not do at all!"

An' he spoke in tones of thunder, tooral
ooo!
'All the men that's left in Ireland, now,
will have to hear the call
To get out and to get under, tooral ooo!"
Ses his Secretary, "Look, sir, Home
Rule's on the Statute Book, sir;
And we've only just another thing to do:
The Duke of Connaught swear in as the
great High King of Éireann,
And we'll get recruits in thousands,
tooral ooo!"

Ses the Divil, "In our Empire things
have reached a pretty pass,
Tooral, ooral, ooral, ooral ooo!
With their air raids, submarines an' all
their latest poisoned gas,
Tooral, ooral, ooral, ooral ooo!
But I wouldn't still be caring if it wasn't
now for Erin,
And the doings of the silly Sinn Féin
crew;
I'm beginnin' to feel queer, oh! with this
cursed De Valera—
Tooral, ooral, ooral, ooral, ooo!"

An' the Divil sent his agents out to
gather in recruits,
Tooral, ooral, ooral, ooral ooo!
To preserve the Saints in England an'
destroy the German Brutes,
Tooral, ooral, ooral, ooral ooo!
"You'll get a welcome hearty from the
gallant Irish Party—
Tell them to spread an' preach what isn't
true—
'Twas written by St. Kevin that no Gael
could enter Heaven,
Unless he dyed the green, red, white
and blue."

After years an' years of work his agents
all came back,
Tooral, ooral, ooral, ooral ooo!
They carried an old man nicely tied up
in a sack,
Tooral, ooral, ooral, ooral ooo!
"We could only get just one, sir, to put
the Khaki on, sir —
Tho' we search'd an' search'd the country
through and through;
He'll join the British Awmy, but the
doctors say he's bawmy —
Tooral, ooral, ooral, ooral ooo!"

The Bonnie Bunch of Roses, O!

Dear England, now we'll take a walk,
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
An' we'll have a quiet little talk,
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
An' I'll show you places in the land
Where the stroke of your soft, gentle
hand,
Ruled—for our good—you understand?
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.

The Church that stands here in this
place,

Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
Looked down on Emmet's noble face,
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
Just here his sacred blood was shed—
I hear now what the hangman said:
"Behold the shameless traitor's head"—
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.

Now, isn't this a lovely scene?
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
With its trees an' grass an' rath serene,
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
This place links up our country's past—
No wonder, now, you stand aghast—
For there's blood on the slopes of
Mullaghmast,
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.

The Jail of Newgate once stood here,
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
Why do you shake like that with fear?
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
Before me visions sadly float;
'Twas here poor Éire's heart you smote,
When you cut poor helpless Wolfe
Tone's throat,
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.

We're walkin' now, along the Quays,
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
I hope, dear friend, my words will
please—
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
When Mitchel answered Ireland's call
He passed in chains down this North
Wall—
We've forgot all this? Oh, not at all—
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.

This place we're in is Limerick Town,
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
Ah, England, dear, why do you frown?
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
For here your word was overthrown,
When Sarsfield left the land alone —
Ah, a teacher great is the Treaty Stone!
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.

Strong Labour here his vigil keeps,
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
O'er the place where Connolly calmly
sleeps,
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
His teachings true in Ireland soon
Shall flourish like the flowers in June—
I'm afraid they'll hasten on your ruin—
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.

Conscript the Gael is now your cry,
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
Ah! Listen to our calm reply,
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.
Tho' the country be with soldiers
crammed,
Tho' every street with guns be jammed—
Conscription, ay! an' you be damned!
Says the Bonnie Bunch of Roses O.

—Seán O'Casey,
Songs of the Wren, 1918

Shorts

from
the Long Fellow

SELF PARODY IN THE IRISH TIMES

The Irish Times has descended into self-parody. Following the failure of the Irish rugby team to advance beyond the group stages of the competition, the editorial of 2nd October described the performance of the team as "shameful".

"Shameful"?! Certainly, the team performed below expectations. But "shameful"? There was no evidence of cheating or dirty play. As far as the Long Fellow could see the team tried its best, but just wasn't good enough. It had also the misfortune to be in the "group of death" with France and Argentina.

The editorial concluded with a sentiment, which it would normally reserve for Fianna Fail leaders:

"The Rugby paying public will expect to see accountability—on and off the pitch"

But it was good to see a reader get into the spirit of the thing in the following day's letters' page. A Robert Sloane from Cork opined:

"The rugby World Cup campaign has brought shame and despair to the entire nation. Eddie O'Sullivan must resign and so must his successor."

Sarcasm may be the lowest form of wit, but how else can one respond to the rubbish that *The Irish Times* emits?

THE IRISH TIMES AND THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PART 1

For some time the Long Fellow has been concerned at the increasing levels of illiteracy in *The Irish Times*. Well, that's a lie. The truth is that the poor command of the English language provides some light relief from the magisterial tone which the newspaper attempts to affect.

The editorial of 5th October on the Irish entrepreneur Tony Ryan stated:

"Dr Ryan met triumph and disaster with equal equanimity"

Could there be some types of equanimity that are more equal than others?!

THE IRISH TIMES AND THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PART 2

The Irish Times uses the first person plural in an interesting way. Normally when the pronoun "we" is used with a verb the speaker is referring to a group that he or she belongs to. But in *The Irish Times* usage it has a completely different meaning. In most cases the newspaper uses it to refer to the frailties of the Irish people. In its recent attempt to overthrow the

Taoiseach of the country it included the following paragraph:

"We wanted to believe his initial public responses to the payments story. It was Bertie Ahern versus Enda Kenny back in May and, as a people, we went for no change in our personal circumstances, stability, confidence in the crew that was experienced in government because the Celtic Tiger years could be fading" (28.9.07).

But *The Irish Times* never wanted to believe Ahern's "initial public responses". It always wanted to believe the worst about the Taoiseach. And, when it could find no evidence, it indulged in endless column inches of speculation.

It was only the Irish people which was prepared to give Ahern the benefit of the doubt. And the opinion polls show that the people have not changed their view of either Fianna Fail or Ahern since the general election. No new evidence of substance has been produced to prove wrongdoing on the part of Ahern. But that hasn't stopped *The Irish Times*.

The editorial concludes:

"Mr Ahern has left a trail of confusion, deliberate obfuscation and incredulity in his wake. He is damaged. Most people believe that he has breached the trust they placed in him last May. The ever-changing explanations are close to exceeding the ability of many people to look the other way."

THE IRISH TIMES AND THE LAW

The Irish Times likes to sit in judgement on all and sundry in Irish society, but—as the *Irish Political Review* discovered—it does not like to be the subject of judgement by others. The High Court described the newspaper's decision to destroy documents after it had received a summons to produce these to the Tribunal as an "astounding and flagrant disregard of the rule of law".

Following the judgement the propaganda campaign began. The following day's editorial stated that the judgement was bad for journalism. A Martyn Turner cartoon suggested that the newspaper should follow Ahern's example regarding forgetting details. An article by Marie McGonagle, a "media lawyer", followed the paper's line by concluding that "memory can be a very delicate thing".

But Ahern was uncertain about details which occurred 13 years ago at a time when he had other matters on his mind (he thought he was about to be Taoiseach). And he had no idea that his actions would be the subject of an inquiry more than a decade later. *The Irish Times*, on the other hand, will be asked to recall details of only a year ago and concerning matters that it knew full well would be the subject of a court appearance.

Needless to say *The Irish Times* could find no legal expert to support the High Court judgement.

THE STATE BROADCASTING SERVICE

RTE is not much better than *The Irish Times*. And in some ways it is worse. At least *The Irish Times* is true to its origins.

Sean Lemass thought that the national broadcasting service should be an arm of the state. But RTE was largely left to its own devices and has become the plaything of individuals with an anti-national agenda. The Hidden History documentary on the killings at Coolcrease demonstrates that RTE cannot be relied upon to affirm the republican values upon which this State was founded.

As a result we are left with the bizarre situation that this magazine, some private citizens and local historians are put in a position of having to defend the national revolution against attack by the state broadcasting service.

If the State has any self-respect left, it will have to exercise control over RTE along the lines envisaged by Lemass.

A NEW "CREATIVE AGE"?

The Long Fellow believes that all predictions by economists and sociologists are suspect. He remembers 20 years ago that a social commentator called Charles Handy predicted the "end of work". And therefore we would have to "redefine work" so as to keep people occupied. In subsequent years Ireland's economy took off. Full employment was reached. Greater female participation in the labour force was not enough to satisfy the demand for work and we had to rely on immigration.

Recently, an American sociology guru has indicated that we are now on the cusp of a new age in which "creativity" rather than manufacturing or services would be the driving force of the economy.

And yet recently world prices in such commodities as grain and milk have doubled. All the evidence suggests that agriculture and manufacturing will, if anything, become more important as driving forces in the economy.

NEW ALLIES?

And the most dynamic economies are no longer in "old Europe" or even "old America". China, India, Russia and Latin America are likely to be the driving forces of the world economy.

This magazine has been an enthusiastic supporter of the European Union up until the Nice Treaty. The European Union reached its high water mark in the era of Mitterrand, Kohl and Delors, but since then it has become a loose collection of capitalist states with expansionist aims. The election of Nicholas Sarkozy in France has strengthened the Anglo-American axis. The social Europe envisaged by a previous generation of leaders has been abandoned.

It is not easy for a small state to pursue an independent foreign policy. Europe gave us some cover. It would be foolish to

Old Irish And The Market

Part Three

Not long ago, when I mentioned that I was editing and translating 17th century Irish poetry, I was asked: *How does that connect with us? How does it affect our lives now?* Those are hard questions.

In the first of the books that C.V. Wedgwood wrote about the 1640s in England, she remarks: when these events have ceased to matter it won't be worth the bother of writing their history, but they do matter still. She doesn't offer any kind of proof or argument as to why they matter. Seemingly she takes it for granted that her readers will grasp why.

The Irish, and their poets not least, were involved in the same complex of events, and the outcome here was more decisive than in England. In Ulster, as everyone knows, 1641 matters. And in Munster, Ulster, Leinster or Connacht 1649 matters to all historically conscious people (true, there are people who say that it's best to have no historical consciousness if you're Irish).

Some of the written materials in which Ireland's 1640s can be seen working themselves through are in the Irish language. These Irish materials are mainly poetry, and what remains today is certainly only a small fraction of what once existed. Printed pamphlets had the means of surviving, whereas manuscript poems tended to get lost or destroyed. But in my opinion, those poems are an essential part of the story. Until they have all been edited and published—because most of them are unedited and unpublished to this day—and properly set in context, no one will be able to write about Ireland's 1640s the way C.V. Wedgwood did about England's.

Are Ireland's official scholars hard at work on this? A foolish question!—no, of course they aren't. The most ambitious of them are complacent commentators on an existing body of edited work which they assume to be complete, or complete enough to make no difference—or complete enough, anyhow, to serve their present purposes. These people don't feel at ease with Irish particularities, but th

Long Fellow continued

abandon Europe, but it might be time to seek new allies elsewhere.

'NUFF SAID

The Long Fellow was bemused to see the 'paper of record' publishing the wrong Lottery results: see *Irish Times*, 29th September.

ey themselves contribute towards making Ireland a very peculiar place indeed: we're the strange country that has so much literature and history, we prefer to throw lots of it away.

Take the following verse from a poem by Diarmaid Ó Dálaigh, one of the O'Daly poets of Desmond. I believe he composed it in late 1641 or early 1642, just before the outbreak of the Rebellion in Munster, which this poem is intended to incite. Among other things he refers to the land-grabbing of the Percevals, who were among the spectacular successes of the restored Munster Plantation after 1600. Using the magic weapon of mortgage, Philip Perceval had ruined various Barrys and MacCarthys and picked up huge landholdings in the North Cork area. This robust and wrathful poem was a favourite of Geoffrey O' Donoghue, the Kerry poet whose work I've been editing, which is how I came across it myself.

In the following verse Diarmaid Ó Dálaigh expresses what the Gall, i.e. the New English Planter, has been doing to the Gael within planted Munster, and what the choices are:

*Ach táid fraoch Goill go faoileach dá
geisil-mheilt,
ag treis-ingeilt ar shaoir-chloinn an
Ghaoidhil gheis-oirbhirt;
as rogha gliadh nó as fógra fras-
aimhnirt,
assignment ar gach fiadh d'Fódla
eisoidhire.*

But the furious Gall mills them merrily like cornstack-layers, force-grazing upon the free race of the pledged-to-giving Gael; the choice is war, or look out for a hailstorm that saps us, **assignment** on each territory of an ignoble Ireland!

I think I can safely assume that my readers don't know this poem. I am 95% sure that it has never been published. But supposing there had been a major rebellion, I won't say in Slovakia or Lithuania, but in Poland, France, or England, which a poet had advocated with a verse like this . . . is it likely his verse would be unknown in that particular national culture? It's inconceivable!

But I don't want to shove anything, least of all Irish poetry, down anyone's throat. For some friends of mine Irish is an irritating dead language that was pushed down their throats in school and is still being shoved down the throats of their

children and grand-children. I can't say they didn't have reason to hate it: they know how they feel, or how they felt. Being employed in that way brought no benefits to Irish. It was going against the grain . . . of the language, as well as the forced-learners.

Five, six, seven centuries ago the Irish language made conquests among a strange population by its charm. No one pushed it down the throats of the Normans; to all appearances it went down as smoothly and pleurably as alcohol. A great many of them too, and they were won by attraction, not compulsion. On the other hand, the 20th century Irish Revival, where it became mainly coercive, was a complete failure.

Experience proves that English is a much better language for shoving down people's throats. English has a historical track record and can show impressive success. Not long ago I came across Edward Walsh's description of how people changed from Irish to English, in his preface to *Irish Popular Songs* (1847). This is how it happened:

"The popular songs and ballads of Ireland are as completely unknown to the great mass of Irish readers, as if they were sung in the wilds of Lapland, instead of the green valleys of their own native land. These strains of the Irish muse are to be found in the tongue of the people only; and while for past centuries, every means had been used to lead the classes which had partaken, even in the slightest degree, of an English education, into a total disuse of the mother tongue; when the middle and upper ranks, aping the manners of the English settlers located among them, adopted a most un-natural dislike to the language of their fathers; when even in the courts of law the sole use of the vernacular was a stumbling-block in the way of him who sought for justice within their precincts, and the youth who may have acquired a smattering of education found it necessary, upon emerging from his native glen into the world, to hide, as closely as possible, all knowledge of the tongue he had learned at his mother's breast; it is no wonder the peasantry should, at length, quit this last vestige of nationality, and assist the efforts of the hedge school-master in its repression. The village teacher had long been endeavouring to check the circulation of the native tongue among the people, by establishing a complete system of espionage in these rustic seminaries, in which the youth of each hamlet were made to testify against those among them who uttered an Irish phrase... The poor peasant, seeing that education could be obtained through the use of English only, and that the employment of the native tongue was a strong bar to the acquirement of the favoured one, prohibited to his children the use of the despised language. This transition was,

and is still, productive of serious inconvenience to the young and the old of the same household in their mutual intercourse of sentiments. The writer of these remarks has often been painfully amused at witnessing the embarrassment of a family circle, where the parents, scarcely understanding a word of English, strove to converse with their children, who awed by paternal command, and the dread of summary punishment at the hand of the pedagogue, were driven to essay a language of which the parents could scarcely comprehend a single word, and of which the poor children had too scant a stock to furnish forth a tithe of their exuberant thought."

That is how communities change language voluntarily. The parents voluntarily see to it that the new language is pushed down their children's throats, with the help of the schoolmaster's stick and his spying system, and not just at school times but at all times. This grim experiment had been carried through in hundreds of thousands of families by Walsh's time, and it would be carried through in hundreds of thousands more—including, I believe, the family of my maternal grandmother. (One day, when I was eight or nine, I discovered that she spoke fairly fluent Irish. I didn't understand how that could be, since Irish was a school subject and this old woman hadn't been near a school for decades.)

What Walsh describes is the key modern language experience of Ireland. It is what shapes the modern language-life of the great majority. As for Irish—I think of Irish as a force in the underground, with a little of it left above ground still. Mainly it is distanced from us and our immediate lives, though the deeper down one goes the more one finds that it has soaked the entire land. I don't know that this force can be tapped. Whatever it is, it seems contemptuous of methodical modern purposes. But now and then it will gush up unpredictably and unexpectedly and have little or large effects.

Around 1880 it seemed that there wouldn't be any more gushing. The tendency towards universal and exclusive use of English was obvious. This much was evident even to foreigners, and certain foreigners found the development inspiring. For example, Hungarian nationalists who were concerned with the problem of how non-Magyar languages and the sense of non-Magyar nationality could be killed off within the vast territory of Great Hungary, where the Hungarian speakers were still a minority.

Magyarosodás és magyaosítás by Beksics Gusztáv (Budapest 1883) addressed this issue. The title can loosely be translated as 'Magyarisation and Magyar-assimilation', or 'Compulsory and

Voluntary Magyarisation'. Beksics was against trying to Magyarise by force. Better to do it the **voluntary** way, the English way! If the Magyars got a stranglehold on the towns and a monopoly of modern culture, then sooner or later it would dawn on the Slavic masses that neither they nor their sons would ever get anywhere, the cards would be stacked against them in the law and in all social relationships, until they gave up their useless languages and adopted Magyar. That might take a long time, but it was a sure conclusion and one could afford to be patient.

In support of this he gave the Irish example. His view of Ireland was intelligent and crystal-clear, and the only strange thing about it is that it turned out to be wrong.

"The language of the town will swallow up the language of the countryside without any compulsion or national martyrdom. It swallowed it in antiquity, in the Middle Ages and likewise in the modern age. In Ireland the towns, which became English, liquidated the Celtic language. The English language conquered first the towns and afterwards the countryside. By now the language of Ossian is spoken only in corners of the Kerry mountains. O'Connell attacked the English in the English language. He borrowed from Shakespeare those lightning-bolts with which he blasted perfidious Albion. The Irish nation no longer lives in its language, but only in its history and creed. All that keeps it on the alert is hatred of the English, otherwise it would already be fusing completely with the Anglo-Saxon race. If after the religious question the agrarian question is solved also, Ireland will no longer rebel. It will be as soundly English as Wales, which also was originally dominated by Celts." (p56 in a dual-language Hungarian/Slovak edition, published in Bratislava in 2000).

A decade after Beksics wrote, the Gaelic League was founded by someone who seemed to belong to a type well-known in England: a bookish, reactionary country gentleman who hated progress and modern life and wanted to turn back the clock. And in the two decades that followed (during which the agrarian question was solved, quite according to the prescription of Doctor Beksics) the most gifted and capable young people in Ireland joined this reactionary gentleman's movement. They included most of the key personnel in 1916 and in the subsequent War of Independence. They led the Irish rebellion which had logically ceased to be possible.

It's often been said, and I think the truth of the statement is clear: there couldn't have been any independent Ireland without the Gaelic League. The same suitable conditions might still have arisen, but the leadership wouldn't have been formed. The Gaelic League was a school of revolution. To all appearances the Irish

language gave these people intellectual independence and self-respect—which they were able to assert in the progressive Ireland that spoke English! But surely that shouldn't have been possible?

I don't think any modern sociological explanation can make much of all that. When Roy Foster writes about 1916 and after in his *History of Modern Ireland*, he seems haunted by the feeling of some obscure force of evil.

Thus unexpectedly from underground, the mighty Irish language presented its claim not to be forgotten so easily! But what was one to do with it now that it couldn't be forgotten? Revive it?

The idea was a natural one. When people whose heads have been turned pretty well inside out have a period of renewed strength and a feeling of power, it wouldn't be strange if they set about trying to put their heads back the right way in. But the operation isn't easy. In the Irish case there was a lot of passive resistance. And one reason for this is that the original language change was so horrible that the community would need to be under some bleak compulsion to submit to another. Community language change is a horrible business.

People whose recent forbears had been through this mill were in no hurry to put their own families through it in reverse. Anyhow, they were reaping some of the gain from that earlier pain. The law was accessible now. Dickens, Scott, Cervantes, any amount of English literature, original and translated, was turning up in Irish rural homes. The world was in better focus than it had been. Why risk blurring it?

This was one reason why the Revival ran aground. But beyond that there was the question of utility. It was clear that the community was deeply involved in usefulness and destined to be more so, and it needed a utilitarian language. Could Irish be that language? Or could it have been that language, given certain initiatives taken at a certain historical juncture?

I am not concerned with these questions here. I don't see that the worth of Irish depends upon how one answers them. Certainly I am not in favour of conceding the small place that Irish still has in Irish life and schooling to whatever the priests of utility would put in its place. I see no reason why compulsory Irish in schools in its present-day form should be thought oppressive. I am in favour of maintaining it, since it offers the child some small chance of connecting with what's in Ireland's depths. Beyond that, I am in favour of all cheerful experiments with Irish that can still be made. The *Gaelscoileanna* seem to be cheerful places. (That's another thing sociology wouldn't have predicted!)

But for me the greatest value of the Irish language is historic, in its extraordinary literature. With an unbelievably resolute pride, Irish in the 16th, 17th, 18th centuries keeps its integrity, refuses all compromise, scorns even to consider getting into the trend of thinking and living which England is pioneering.

The power of this extraordinary testimony is unappreciated. To paraphrase Edward Walsh: the great poems of Fear Flatha Ó Gnímh are as completely unknown to the mass of Irish readers as if they had been composed in the wilds of Lapland. And this is what I find so unforgivable in the Institute of Advanced Studies, whose latest stale idea (Michelle O' Riordan, *Irish Bardic Poetry and Rhetorical Reality*, Cork 2007) is to reduce the *filidh* of Ireland to the level of troubadours. After James Carney's mind-opening speculative work, the way was clear for a fruitful contact with those great uncompromising poets of the time of Elizabeth and James. I think that this could be valuable not only for Irish culture but even for the culture of the world.

In Elizabeth's time the great English mind was Francis Bacon, and he's now the great mind of the world, whether acknowledged or not. His glittering eyes are in every shopping mall. ("We have...! We have...! We have...!") But, leaving aside all those places like Slovakia which — merely because they're landlocked! — still do not have sea-surfing facilities with real salt water. . . even Dubai, with its indoor ski slope in the midst of a desert, isn't yet quite the New Atlantis. More is possible, more is needed. . . Francis Bacon is always with us and always still ahead of us.

The society of constant experiment and improvement, where everything, thought included, is demeaned (but Bacon says something like 'equalised' or 'levelled') and poetry is contemptuously pushed to the margins, was never pursued through the medium of Irish. There was a search for alternative paths in history, in association with Spain or the Stuart kings, where Gaelic Ireland could have kept true to itself. The 20th century Revival (under difficult conditions—so difficult, in fact, that the remarkable thing is not that the project fell into coercion and absurdity, but how much it did that was positive) also involved a quest for an alternative.

Now, of course, we're assured by Professor Fukuyama (who with breath-taking cheek, on the very stroke of 1989, tried to buy out European philosophy from the bargain basement—see *The End of History and the Last Man*) that there's no alternative anywhere. Certainly, looking at contemporary Ireland, it's hard to see one. And if it wasn't for all that poetry forever soaking our road-lacerated land, it would be hard to imagine there could ever again be surprises.

In the meantime, I think it wouldn't kill anyone to know the poems of Fear Flatha Ó Gnímh. I hope to collect them sometime in the near future. They've been taken by modern academics as poems of pure despair. A great poet will be understood in many ways, but if he was really a prophet of despair it's strange that his best translator should have been Patrick Pearse. I don't now have Pearse's translation ready to hand, so I must offer my own of the verse following, from *Mo thruaighe mar táid Gaoidhil* (My sorrow, how the Gaels are!):

*Má thug an Deónughadh dhi,
Saxa nua dan hainm Éire,
bheith re a linn-se i láimh bhíodhbhadh,
don innse is cóir ceileabhradh.*

If Providence has willed
a new England called Ireland,
to be all its days in enemies' hands,
to this island we must say farewell!

John Minahane

End Of History?

"How is it possible to tell the story of any nation, write any history at all, after "the end of history" has been proclaimed? This proclamation (to my mind a peculiarly North American intellectual banality) is really the end of moral imagination, commensurate with the rise of a self-congratulatory and triumphalist anti-historiography, of intentional amnesia, a refusal even to acknowledge, let alone relate to, any people's history. The telling of the history of Iran, or anywhere else, is a way morally and imaginatively to resist the presumptuous imperial hubris of a "superpower" that has convinced itself of its triumphant Christian finality, so it can confidently proclaim that history has come to an end. But history has ended nowhere except in the minds of bureaucratic strategists and imperial tacticians. For Hegel, history began with the Greeks and Romans and came to its height in Germany. For Fukuyama, history ended in the U.S. Department of State. The world begs to differ. Not having been permitted entry into history by Hegel, we are now told by Fukuyama, "Sorry, folks! History has ended." We, the people, subalterns rejecting all grand narratives, object."

"I write this book from a vantage point somewhere between the country I come from, where people are afflicted with too much history, and the country I now call home, where people are stricken with historical amnesia—where they are told history has ended. It is not only those like Fukuyama and Huntingdon who must be held accountable for such dangerous delusions; this amnesia, combined with ignorance (an almost deliberate blindness), is widespread, and part of the U.S. ideological machinery. I recently started reading a book edited by Thomas Cushman, *A Matter of Principle: Humanitarian Arguments for War in Iraq* (2005), in which a number of otherwise seemingly decent people attempt to make a "moral" case, as they say, for the U.S. invasion of Iraq. What is astounding about this book is not its shameless defense of an immoral, unjust, and illegal war, a war responsible for the death and destruction, torture, and

rape of an entire people, but the phenomenal ignorance of history displayed in it. I do not mean ancient, medieval, or even modern history—just a history as old as the two or three U.S. administrations that came before George W. Bush's presidency, a history that amounts to nothing more than the active memory of people still alive and in full control of their mental faculties. I cannot tell whether this bizarre historical ignorance is a product of deliberate ideological charlatanism intended to fool people and persuade them to support an immoral war, an innocent manifestation of a cultural leit-motif, or even worse, a sinister combination of both. But the result is the same and coterminous with Fukuyama's notion of "the end of history". Writing history is resisting power, particularly when eradicating history and cultivating a deliberate amnesia, in theory and practice, is the single most abiding manner of projecting the open-ended power of this empire and discrediting the necessary modes of contesting and resisting it. Iranians are still not over the fact that in 1953 the CIA topped the democratically-elected government of Muhammad Mosaddeq and installed a deposed monarch to serve the illegitimate interests of the United States more obediently, and now the United States is yet again up in arms against Iran. Someone ought to connect these dots, and a number of other dots, and put forward a historical account that will enable people, young people in particular, to speak truth to predatory warmongers."

(Hamid Dabashi: *Iran, A People Interrupted*, The New Press 2007, pp4,8)

Tokyo 1945

"I suppose if I had lost the war, I would have been tried as a war criminal. Fortunately, we were on the winning side."
US General Curtis LeMay, commander of the 1945 Tokyo fire bombing operation.

Editorial Digest

DANA was Eamon Dunphy's Radio Eireann guest on 3rd November. He asked her about Fintan O'Toole's "sneering article" when she stood for President saying his "set" didn't think there could be any more to mere singers and football players. She replied "he didn't even know me... These liberals are only liberal with those who share their views". She said she served on the stem cell research Committee of the European Parliament and saw that there were plenty of stem cells available from the placenta and the umbilical cord without having to use the foetus. Speaking about the "events", as many call them, of Bloody Sunday, Dunphy referred to the "murders" of that day. So his statement to Edna O'Brien a few weeks ago that he was no longer a revisionist looks correct.

BUS TOURS, according to the Belfast Telegraph (2nd Nov), have been stopped going along the Falls Road after stones and bottles were thrown at one of them. Hardly surprising as a few days earlier bottles were thrown at the IRA war memorial from the top of a tour bus by young men wearing Rangers shirts. What was the tour company thinking of when they took that lot up the Falls? Still, the real tourists will have something to talk about—they visited a real danger area! These tours do also have a touch of the zoo about them.

MARTIN MEEHAN, former IRA leader, has died. Meehan once described his interrogation by the RUC Special Branch at the time of internment. They stuck a knitting needle into his calf until it touched the bone and then scraped the bone. They were nothing if not inventive, the RUC.

MI5 have already begun moving in to their new purpose-built Barracks in Holywood, Co. Down, according to the *Belfast Telegraph*, October 11th. The handover of "national security" from the PSNI is expected to be completed by the end of the year. "The PSNI will be kept informed of all MI1 anti-terror operations... and will continue to run the 'great majority' of informers, and should be given access to all relevant information", said the paper. Mind you MI5 will decide what is relevant! Dolores Kelly, SDLP member of the

Policing Board, said that the proposed role for MI5 was incompatible with the British Government declaration in 1990 that Britain has "no selfish, strategic or economic interest" in Northern Ireland.

THE EAST ANTRIM UDA Has said that it has decommissioned—all 14 guns. But SDLP Stormont Minister Margaret Ritchie continues to refuse to channel development funds via the UDA until all its sections have decommissioned. One UDA leader reasonably objected that they had no idea where many of the weapons were. Another objection was that Stormont shouldn't be responsible for what amounts to UDA pensions. Inquiry after inquiry has demonstrated that UDA operations were instigated, facilitated—or even organized and led by—RUC Special Branch and Military Intelligence. Its members therefore should be entitled to police or army pensions!

The above item puts one in mind of a story many years ago when a UDA commander in North Belfast had the clever idea of burying his gun under next door's dog kennel. Of course the dog, probably expecting a juicy bone, immediately dug it up, and the police were called. Unfortunately for the gun owner he had wrapped it in a newspaper which had his name on the front to help the delivery boy. More than that, the man had half completed the prize crossword, but had already filled in his name and address. He was about to have plenty of time for doing crosswords.

1641 REBELLION RECORDS which were plucked away in Trinity College are to be digitized and made available to the public over the next three years according to the *Irish News* of October 18th. These comprise 3,400 accounts supporting the view that between 4,000 and 12,000 Protestants were killed by the rebels. What described as "rebellion" was an attempt by people in Ulster to regain lands taken from them 30 years earlier and settled by soldiers and civilians from Britain, mostly in the Western part of the Province.

THE SEAGATE FACTORY in Limavady, which makes blank CDs, has announced that it will close in one year with the loss of over 900 jobs. The reason given is the 'sudden' discovery that Irish wages cannot compete with wages in the Far East or North Africa. As though there was no differential when the plant was set up nearly ten years ago with the help of a lot of taxpayers' money,

or during the intervening years. The company received another £4m in State aid over the last six years. OUP Mayor of Limavady, Edwin Stevenson, said that the total amount of taxpayers' money paid to the company is between £30m and £40m. Seagate, a US multi-national, also employs 1,400 people in Derry. The company refuses to recognize Trade Unions.

45 RUC/PSNI OFFICERS have been allowed to resign while under investigation for serious offences since March 2006 (*Irish News* Oct 3rd). The crimes include downloading child-pornography, assault, theft, and fraud. This means that they have avoided disciplinary processes and keep their pension entitlements.

Seán O'Hegarty

REPORT: The following review by Peter Beresford Ellis of the biography of Kevin Girvin's Seán O'Hegarty appeared in the Irish Democrat:

I MIGHT be accused of becoming the Cork historical correspondent but, in recent times, there has been some excellent books produced about the war of independence in Cork. And now, just out, comes another that should not be missed.

Seán O'Hegarty was one of the most effective military commanders in the Cork area but his significance has long been overshadowed by other great Cork names, not the least Tom Barry.

Kevin Girvin of University College, Cork, has produced the first, and long overdue, biographical study of O'Hegarty, brother of the more famous P.S. O'Hegarty who earned an entry in the Cadogan and Falvey *Biographical Dictionary of Cork* while Seán, sadly, did not rate a mention.

No one trying to understanding the struggle in Cork during the period 1916-1923 can afford not to have a copy of this book and it is certainly a corrective to the trash being peddled as history by the likes of Hart and his fellow revisionists who have tried to paint the war of independence in Cork as a sectarian conflict with the Catholic fanatics (IRA) wiping out the southern Protestants (Unionists). Such claims are pretty bizarre and certainly, if notoriety was what Hart was after, by his appalling *The IRA and its Enemies*, he has gained that.

Thankfully, Kevin Girvin, has presented a thoroughly researched and fascinating work which has an addition of 114 pages of appendices, notes, bibliography and index.

What is essential to an understanding

of the Treaty debate and descent into civil war, is the fascinating inclusion of the record of O'Hegarty's contribution to the Treaty debate in the Dáil in 1922 when he was allowed to address the Dáil as leader of a delegation of army officers.

Fascinating, too, is how the British intelligence saw O'Hegarty. Kevin Girvin has been able to access O'Hegarty's British military intelligence file, which is part of the appendices.

Another fascinating appendix is the inclusion of the text of Father Dominic O'Connor's letter to Cork No 1. Brigade giving the counter arguments to the Bishop of Cork's decree, threatening excommunication to the Irish Volunteers.

Father Dominic was brigade chaplain and believed the Bishop had no right in Canon Law to make this threat, giving a closely reasoned argument. But he added, in the circumstances, there was no need for anyone in Confession to even mention they were a member of the Irish Volunteers.

This is an essential book because, while it deals with the microcosm of Cork, it also deals with the macrocosm of the entire country not just in 1916-23 but it is a reminder that there is an attempt by certain so-called historians to denigrate and re-shape these essential years of Irish history.

It is a fragment of truth in the sea of neo-colonial propaganda now being peddled in Ireland.

<http://www.irishdemocrat.co.uk/book-reviews/hunger-strike-reflections/>

REPORT

Venezuela

Subject: Report meeting in support of Venezuelan Revolution in Ireland (October 2007)

The five "engines" for Socialism: meetings in support of the Venezuelan Revolution in Ireland

P. Bowman (Dublin)

Hands off Venezuela, in co-operation with the Venezuela Support Group and the James Connolly Debating society in Belfast, organised two meetings in support of the Venezuelan Revolution in Dublin (8th October) and Belfast (10th October). The idea was also to continue with the campaign Hands off Venezuela – Ireland, already constituted after a first round of meetings held last April in two Irish Universities.

More than 35 people attended the meeting in Dublin (including activists from SIPTU and other unions, from the Connolly Youth Movement, éirígí, the Labour Youth, the CPI and others). The meeting in Belfast was hosted by the James Connolly Debating

Society and had an enthusiastic audience of about 60 people from many different backgrounds.

The meetings intended to explain "the five engines for socialism"; the programme that the Venezuelan government will try to implement in the next future. 63 per cent of the population of Venezuela voted for that programme in the election held last December.

Carlos Fiorillo, member of the Unified Socialist Party of Venezuela (PSUV) and Hands off Venezuela – Ireland, presented for the first time in English translation some sections of three speeches about the "5 engines" that President Hugo Chavez made between the 8th and the 17th of January 2007. Carlos said:

"The 5 Engines is the name of the procedure that is taking place in Venezuela in order to make the transition from a capitalist state to a new socialist state on behalf of the Venezuelan people, and to nationalize the resources for the well-being of the whole country; as president Chavez promised when he won the last presidential elections on December 2006."

The first engine, Carlos went on, is the enabling law. With that law the Venezuelan government will be able to nationalize all that was privatized; the second engine is a constitutional change to allow the people of Venezuela to go towards socialism. President Hugo Chavez, according to Carlos, said that, "Venezuelans [in the election last December] voted for socialism ... [Socialism] is what people want ... [Socialism] is what the country needs... Venezuela is free, we are not colony of anybody."

The third engine is national education on socialist values and solidarity, and access to education for all at all levels: "study is the debate of ideas in a permanent way." The fourth engine is a new "geometry" of power, based on popular power, in order to eliminate the differences between classes and the obscene privileges of the bureaucrats and the ruling class. The fifth engine, Carlos concluded, was the "explosion" of popular, revolutionary, socialist and democratic power through the creation of communal councils and federations of communal councils.

Jorge Martin, international secretary of Hands Off Venezuela Campaign, analysed the current situation in Venezuela. The political process unfolding in Venezuela, he said, has a socialist character and is fully democratic. It is not the first time that Hugo Chavez wins an election, but this time he got 63 per cent of the votes, he said.

The problem, Jorge argued, is that the imperialist powers don't agree with the

nationalisation of the basic means of production in order to satisfied the needs of the people of Venezuela; it goes against their profits. This is so even when any nationalisation and expropriation has been carried out according to law and with payment of compensation.

So, Jorge continued, the imperialists will try anything they can to get rid of Chavez and put back into power the old corrupt oligarchy. They already tried with the US-backed military coup and the bosses lock out in 2002. This shows the hypocrisy of the US and European governments when they accuse Chavez of being undemocratic.

In the meeting in Belfast some people in the audience asked what people could do in Ireland to support the people of Venezuela and to stop the imperialist intervention. In Dublin, some also expressed the need to actively support the Bolivarian movement. Jorge Martin made clear, first, that the broadest possible movement in solidarity with Venezuela should be organised in Ireland. He made an appeal to all those who agree with three basic principles, full support for the Bolivarian revolution, against imperialist intervention and counteracting the lies of the media, should join Hands Off Venezuela.

The first thing to do, he said, was to tell the youth and the workers in our communities what is really happening in Venezuela. That is the only way to counteract the lies spread in the mass media, owned by a few large corporations, about the Venezuelan government.

This could be done by organising talks and projecting documentaries in colleges and in meetings with trade unionists, by passing resolutions in trade union congresses, by getting youth organisations and trade unions to link up with our solidarity groups, etc. He underlined several times the importance of getting the support of the working class in our communities through their trade unions.

Jorge Martin suggested raising funds and getting trade unions to sponsor delegations trips of Irish workers and students to Venezuela in order to witness what is really happening in Venezuela, and reporting back in their communities, trade unions, and study places.

We would like to thank all those who made these meetings possible.

Contact Hands Off Venezuela Ireland (hov.ireland@yahoo.com <<mailto:hov.ireland@yahoo.com>>) or visit our yahoo group (http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Hands_off_Venezuela_Ireland <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Hands_off_Venezuela_Ireland>).

Coolacrease

continued

to pursue it was that pursuit would have brought the attention of the listeners to the awful truth that in the main the people who were exposing the misrepresentation of historical fact by RTE about the Coolacrease incident were not a disgruntled sub-group of Republicans left behind by events, but were the people who had put themselves out of court with prevailing nationalist opinion around 1970 by presenting a case in defence of the Ulster Protestants, and that Senator Harris had denounced them as national traitors for doing so.

And where would that have left the Taoiseach's unelected nominee to the Senate?

Harris was engaged in a campaign to de-legitimise the democratic sources of Irish sovereignty long before the Taoiseach made him a Legislator and made him a gift of something in the region of half million Euros. It is what he has been about since the early 1990s. His Coolacrease programme, which the RTE authorities stand over, presents the Imperial authority as the legitimate authority in 1921, and the Republicans as land-grabbers and bigots. Free invention was applied in a reconstruction of the incident. Imagination was freed from the burden of documentary evidence.

The documentary evidence will be listed next month and compared with the RTE programme. I will end here with a paragraph from the British Military Court of Enquiry held on 7th July 1921, a week after the incident. Alan Stanley wrote his book without reference to this document produced by his own side which contradicts his account of the incident. It was given to the programme makers to take account of, but they decided to ignore it:

"It is said by the C.I. [County Inspector] Queen's County [Offaly] that the two Pearson boys a few days previously had seen two men felling a tree on their land adjoining the road. Had told the men concerned to go away, and when they refused had fetched two guns and wounded two Sinn Feiners, one of whom is believed dead."

Brendan Clifford

Check out the *Athol Books*
website:
www.atholbooks.org

The Killings at Coolacrease

The following appeared in *Village* magazine of 25th October

The "Hidden History" documentary, inspired in part by Eoghan Harris, is a distortion of what actually happened at Coolacrease, when two young Protestants were murdered [word in blurb written by the Editor of *Village*]. By Pat Muldowney

There is a great big hole in the middle of the RTÉ Hidden History programme aired on 23 October 2007 about the 1921 IRA execution of the two Pearson brothers in Co Offaly. There was an even bigger one in the Tubridy Show (RTÉ Radio One) coverage of the issue on 21 October.

The Hidden History programme originated in the 2005 book I met murder on the way by Alan Stanley and in Eoghan Harris' Sunday Independent article (9 Oct 2005). The latter provided the tone and political content of the programme; "To attack a family like that calls to high heaven for atonement". It also provided the programme's working title—Atonement—during production.

So it is not surprising that the programme challenged the validity of the Irish Court Martial ruling, held in June 1921, which found the Pearsons guilty of staging an armed attack on an IRA unit engaged in road block activity in resistance to the Black and Tan terror aimed at suppressing the democratically elected Irish government; for which the Court passed the death sentence.

But this was not the only Court that met to adjudicate on the fate of the Pearsons. This Hidden History programme supposedly set out to examine forensically what happened on 30 June 1921, the day of the executions. So how did it happen that the programme never mentioned – not once – the other Court, which met on 2 July 1921 to do exactly the same thing?

It is not that Hidden History did not know about the British Military Court of Enquiry, which met on that day in Crinkle Military Barracks, Birr.

The problem for the Hidden History/Eoghan Harris line was that the British Military Court of Enquiry, operating completely independently, found exactly the same as the Irish Court Martial. The Chief Inspector of the Queen's County RIC testified to the Court that "the two Pearson boys a few days previously had seen two men felling a tree on their land adjoining the road, had told the men concerned to go away, and when they refused, had fetched two guns and fired and wounded two Sinn Feiners, one of whom it is believed died".

In numerous recitals of the propaganda, and in the dramatized re-construction shown by Hidden History, the women of

the Pearson family are placed in the yard where the executions took place and forced to watch the two men being shot. At the Court of Enquiry, the women themselves testified that they were taken, not to the yard, but to a grove of trees a safe distance from the house. In the grove it was physically impossible to see inside the enclosed yard where the two men were taken.

Eoghan Harris salaciously described the gunshot wounds that the two men received: He said they were shot "very deliberately, in the genitals, in their sexual parts, in their sexual organs". Other versions, again inspired by Hidden History/Eoghan Harris, are practically pornographic and I will not repeat them here. But what the medical evidence given to the Court describes is a range of injuries from the legs to the shoulders, all of them superficial, and none to the genitals. According to the evidence, none of the wounds were fatal, and the men died from shock and blood loss. If they had received timely and adequate medical attention it seems their lives could have been saved.

There is much more that can be gleaned from the Court of Enquiry. Along with the Irish Court Martial Report, this is where a real investigation of the Pearson case should have started.

Which brings us to the historians used by Hidden History. To their credit, historians Paddy Heaney and Philip McConway detected that there was something amiss with the programme and distanced themselves from it, as reported in the Offaly Independent newspaper of 6 October. Philip McConway's findings on the subject are expected to be available on the website of the Offaly Historical & Archaeological Society <http://www.offalyhistory.com> and in print. Much of the relevant information is already available at <http://www.indymedia.ie/article/84547> <<http://www.indymedia.ie/article/84547>>

Like thousands of others caught up in the war caused by imperial aggression against the democratically elected government, the Pearsons suffered a terrible tragedy, which everyone must feel. But as the Courts found, they worked for the terror forces that sought to destroy Irish democracy by brutal methods. In his statement to the British Government's Grants Committee, William Pearson formally declared that he was a collaborator ("I assisted the Crown Forces on every occasion").

By endlessly posing the question of whether the Pearsons were spies and informers, and whether documented evidence can now be found for this, Hidden History uses misdirection to divert attention away from the real and more serious reason for the executions, as determined by both the Irish and British Courts.

Coolacrease And The Pearsons

The following letter appeared in the *Irish Times* on 2nd November 2007

Digging up atrocity stories from Ireland's past for the purpose of discrediting nationalism is an underhand method of making a political point, all the more so when done through the medium of an seemingly objective television programme. RTE's Hidden History programme on the Pearson tragedy at Coolacrease, Co Offaly (shown on October 23rd) was carefully worked atrocity propaganda masquerading as history. It reflects badly on the national broadcaster and the professionals involved in making it.

A member of the Pearson family stated during the programme that all the family now wanted was for the truth to be told. Instead the programme intermixed their story with subtle hints about ethnic cleansing, sectarianism, land grabbing and a barbarous form of execution, all of which are at variance with the known facts or the documentary evidence.

One of the shots from the firing squad hit one of the brothers in the right groin. During the programme this fact was transformed by Eoghan Harris into a claim that the firing squad deliberately shot the brothers in the genitals. Actually the right groin is a different part of the body to the genitals. Harris's distortion of that point is a straightforward example of hyped up atrocity propaganda. It might have been more revealing if the programme had probed whether either of the brothers would have survived had they received more competent or timely medical attention.

The political context against which the incident took place was also distorted. Professor English from Queens University Belfast gave the British view asserting that the Pearsons had the right to shoot terrorists attempting to fell trees on their land.

No mainstream nationalist historian was interviewed to counter that assertion. The significance of the landslide election victory achieved by Sinn Fein in 1918 was played down as was the military repression used by the Crown to flout the election result.

The necessary context that the IRA was acting under a democratically elected civil authority was absent.

The Pearsons were sentenced to execution by a republican court-martial because they shot an IRA volunteer on active duty, not because they were Protestants.

The idea that the attack was motivated by land hunger was mentioned in the programme but no supporting evidence was provided.

The facts are that in the few parts of the country where land grabbing was attempted, it was blocked by the IRA, a policy for which they were later criticised for being too protective of bourgeois property rights.

A two part Hidden History programme

on Irish nazis broadcast earlier this year has also been criticised for misusing history in pursuit of a political agenda. Following this latest offering, it is reasonable to ask, has the national broadcaster come under the influence of an anti-national agenda?

Daithi O hAilbhe

Book Review

Philosophy Of Nationalism?

When *The Rights Of Nations: Nations And Nationalism In A Changing World* (a collection of articles by eminent academics, edited and introduced by Desmond Clarke, Professor of Philosophy a Cork University) was published by Cork University Press in 1999, I missed it. Now that it has been brought to my attention I must try to see what I missed.

NATIONS?

Clarke says in his Introduction that they—

"are concerned... not primarily with historical questions about the rise of nationalism, with distinctions between ethnicity, race or nation, or with analysing detailed political structures that might satisfy the aspirations of different nationalisms, but with the alleged right of nations to self-rule within a particular territory" (p1).

If history and politics are set aside, the project becomes one of devising a philosophical understanding of the nation as a subject of rights. In view of the part played by history and politics in creating the world of nations from the 1840s to the 1920s I would not have thought that this was a project likely to produce much enlightenment—and in this book it hasn't.

The creation of a world of nations began as a British Imperial project with the purpose of disrupting enemy Empires—Spanish nationalism against Napoleonic France around 1810, Italian nationalism against Austria from the 1840s, Alsatian/French nationalism against Germany in 1914; 'Czechoslovak' and 'Yugoslav' nationalism when it was decided to destroy the Austro-Hungarian Empire; and jihadic/Muslim/Arab nationalism in 1916 in order to gain an ally against Turkey. And, along with this, the vigorous suppression of national development within Britain's own Empire—pitch-capping in Ireland in 1898, followed by imprisonment in 1848 and 1867, slaughter by the hundred thousand in the case of the 'Indian Mutiny' etc. etc.

Nationalism was boosted into a general principle by the USA when it joined Britain in the war against Germany and Austria in 1917. But, when the moment for general

delivery on the basis of general principle came in 1919, Britain wouldn't have it. The right of national self-determination was for application to enemy states Ireland got the Black and Tans and the Indians got the Amritsar Massacre. The American Congress refused to play this British game, and refused to sign the Versailles Treaty or join the 'League of Nations', which was part of the Treaty.

It is not by abstracting it from the history and politics of its creation that one can reach an understanding of this creature.

LOCKE AND MILL!

Clarke then says that the project is to relate the nation to the principles of liberalism—which, however, "is not to assume that we all agree on what is meant by 'liberalism'" (p2).

The meaning he takes is that "Individuals have rights... against each other, against concentrations of private power, and against the collective power of the state" (p2).

The idea that the rights of the individual are prior to the rights of the state is traced back to John Locke (who was the ideologist or philosopher of William of Orange's Revolution of 1688). Locke is quoted:

"that the Aggressor who puts himself into the state of War with another, and unjustly invades another man's right, can, by such an unjust war, never come to have a right over the conquered, will be easily agreed by all men, who will not think, that robbers and pyrates have a right of empire over whomsoever they have force enough to master."

Clark then comments:

Locke goes on to argue that successive generations remain in the same unjust relation as their ancestors. Those who acquired political power by force cannot pass it on, justly, to their successors. And those who have been conquered never lose their right of rebellion" (p5).

Then, having set out Locke's argument as if it had something to do with national rights, Clarke rejects it. "Unfortunately, the history of conquest and colonialism is much more complex than Locke's analogy of pirates and robbers might suggest".

But if possession, however acquired, becomes a basis of right, why this quotation from Locke?

Locke's heirs in Ireland for close on two centuries—those who swore by the 1688 Revolution, i.e. the Anglo-Irish—accused those whom they had conquered of refusing to accept the legal and moral legitimacy of the conquest, and of plotting rebellion for the purpose of undoing the conquest. Were they hypocrites in that they used Locke as their source of moral authority and yet denounced those whom they had conquered for aspiring to get their own back? Not at all. They acted entirely in the spirit of Locke. He proclaimed grand principles for the purpose of justifying the rebellion in which he took part, but he never intended that those principles should be availed of as constituting a right of rebellion by those whom he had helped to conquer and exploit. His principles were for the Protestant English alone. They were formulated in such a way that they justified the conquest and expropriation of the peoples of North America by English colonists. He based the right of property on labour and, since the English colonists applied labour to land more intensively than some Indian peoples did, they were entitled to take the lands of the Indians.

And, while Locke condemned slavery in words, he practised it in deeds. He not only invested in the Slave Trade, but drafted slave constitutions for American colonies.

The thing about English liberalism—and England is the home of what is called liberalism—is that it proclaims grand libertarian principles and has the knack of using them for the great authoritarian project that was frankly called *Imperialism* a century ago but now prefers other names.

In the internal life of Britain a kind of liberty was associated with the rule of the aristocracy after 1688. The aristocracy/gentry curbed the national powers of state connected with monarchy in order to be free themselves and a kind of wild freedom of individual action prevailed throughout the 18th century and into the 19th. The liberal theorising of J.S. Mill in the late 19th century (cited by Clarke) was an element in the construction of the state to which all classes were subject and which was democratised in the early 20th century. Clarke describes Mills' position as being that "*the individual should be allowed as much personal freedom as possible on condition that others in society enjoy the same freedoms, and that their exercise of freedom does not cause harm to others*". But then he quotes Mill explaining that this doctrine is not—

"one of selfish indifference, which pretends that human beings have no business with each other's conduct in

life, and that they should not concerned themselves about the well-doing, or well-being of one another, unless their own interest is involved".

And he concludes that the bias of Mills' libertarianism is such that "*our moral life becomes unbearably burdensome*".

LIBERAL ?

There is hardly anything that one person does that others cannot take to be their concern if they are of an interfering disposition. And the Puritan lower middle classes who displaced the gentry in forming the ethos of the British state are of a very interfering disposition. Their religion is dead so they are tolerant of religious difference—at least within broad Christian/atheist parameters—as a thing of no consequence. But the interfering disposition which they acquired when they saw themselves as agents of God remains alive and well. Mill, for example, was a eugenicist. God was discarded so it could not be left to him to sort things out in the end. Biology replaced theology and Mills' concern for the species here and now led him to urge restrictions on marriage for the purpose of culling.

The Irish resisted Puritanism for centuries but are now succumbing to it. Micheal Martin might easily have made arrangements for people who liked to have a smoke in sociable circumstances to continue doing so without impinging on others in any tangible way, but he chose not to do so.

Though full of Puritan zeal for making people behave right, he found it expedient to allow smoking to continue in the home. But if Smoking Kills, that means you are allowed to kill people at home. And that can hardly stand in the long run.

It seems that in many respects the difference between liberalism and authoritarianism does not depend on "*the doctrine of liberalism*" but on who is being liberal.

IRISH NATIONALISM

Regarding Irish nationalism, Clarke quotes a verse of *A Nation Once Again*, and comments that it expresses confusion:

"If the Irish people had been a nation for centuries, they could hardly have lost that status by being conquered. On the other hand if they lost their status as an independent state, rather than their distinctiveness as a people or nation, then the author has confused being a nation and being a state."

The nation—which is not defined—is here taken to be an eternal entity beyond the reach of the conquest and oppression practised by the British state. And it must be remembered that 'nation' was used loosely in earlier eras to describe a distinct body politic. Davis wrote the song a century and a half after the Williamite conquest and the establishment of the

Penal Laws. Looking back to that time Pearse described the populace as a mob trying to realise itself as a nation. I have not seen an accurate description. Irish social life had been deliberately wrecked by English rule, but the pieces had not been incorporated into the political life of the English state, and were not likely to be. The Irish fragments were forged into a national political development by Cox, O'Connell and Davis—so *A Nation Once Again*.

NORTHERN IRELAND

The main article on Irish politics is *The Ethical Status Of Nationality* by David Archard of the University of St. Andrews. It purports to deal with the conflict of Unionism and Nationalism in Northern Ireland, but is no more than a pretentious assault on Aunt Sallies.

Davis is said to have confused state and nation, but here the state is "*set aside*" and the conflict of Unionism and Nationalism mulled over in abstraction from political context, and the issue is said to be one of "*territorial boundaries*" (p146). The "*political status of Northern Ireland*" is mentioned on page 149, but it is not said what that political status is.

We are told on page 150 that—

"Northern Ireland is a society within whose undisputed boundaries co-exist two distinct, well-defined groups. Its problem is no different in kind from any other modern society in which are to be found a plurality of groups... who demand different things in its law, education, public administration, and so on."

For over 30 years I have been on the lookout for another region that is governed as Northern Ireland is—excluded from the political life of the state which holds it, which is exceptionally competent at over-riding religious and communal divisions—and organised for half a century into a largely informal communal dominance of 60% over 40%.

I have seen it compared to Cyprus and Lebanon, but those territories are not part of large states with effective political arrangements from which they are excluded.

Differences on law, education etc. are not what conflict in the North is about. Such differences cut across the community difference, but they are merely contemplative in exclusion from the party politics of the state.

Northern Ireland is dealt with by Archard as if it was a state. But at one point a doubt seems to strike him and he inserts a footnote:

"Whether it is appropriate to term the regional government of Northern Ireland a 'state', however extensive its devolved powers when it remains within the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom,

is a matter which may be set to one side" (p147).

That was the point at which Clarke should have sent Archard back to the drawing board to start again.

Brendan Clifford

High Court Ruling against Irish Times Deserves Support

The following press statement was submitted to all the media on 25th October. It was only published on the *Village* website, belatedly, on 1st November, when it was 'old news', and after a protest at its non-appearance had been submitted

The recent High Court ruling against the *Irish Times* because of its refusal to comply with instructions from the Mahon Tribunal represents a commendable defence of democratic principle and deserves public support.

By destroying documents requested by the Tribunal, the *Irish Times* engaged in what the authors of the Judgement rightly call "an astounding and flagrant disregard of the rule of law". According to the Judgement, the journalists "*cast themselves as the adjudicators of the proper balance to be struck between the rights and interests of all concerned. This is a role reserved by the Constitution and the law exclusively to the courts.*"

The arrogance underlying its dealings with the Tribunal, highlighted in this ruling, is also evident in some of the paper's publishing activity. Thus on the *Irish Times* website, a section entitled, "Message from the Editor" under a heading, "About Us", states:

"Most important of all, *The Irish Times* occupies a special position as a pacemaker for change in the society which it serves. We aim to lead and shape public opinion to a greater degree than any of our competitors because we have both the natural authority and the means, through our interested and receptive readership, to do so."

Unfortunately many other Irish media organizations have seen fit to defer to this self-appointed leading role of the *Irish Times*, thereby creating an unhealthy 'media consensus' across many topics.

When, during the High Court proceedings in July, counsel for the *Irish Times* referred to this role the paper claims for itself, of educating public opinion, the President of the High Court, Mr. Justice Johnson, made an apposite comment. He suggested that 'educating public opinion' amounted to "*slanting*" opinion in such a

Instant Revolution?

I have known and read Brendan Clifford for 42 years. I have generally liked what I read, particularly as I believe that he does not care a damn whether he is liked or not, as long as he believes he is telling the truth.

Forty one years ago some of us proved that the people of Britain had all been bought off from revolution by the fruits of imperialism. There were quite a number of instant revolutionaries around at the time with a subjective need for revolution. One such was the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) with its slogan "Russia 1917. China 1949. Britain Next".

In the eyes of the instant revolutionaries, Ireland was even more revolutionary than Britain. Then along came Brendan with the Two Nations' Theory.

As I remember it, the existence of the nation in the North had quite a materialistic explanation. All that heavy industry and shipbuilding in Belfast made sense in the context of the British Empire. In terms of Ireland on its own, it was like an elephant in the living room.

Anyway, the Two Nations' theorists pointed out incessantly to all and sundry that there were one million paid-up reactionary Protestants in the North. This was a blow against the instant revolutionaries. Many of them took a closer look at their own non-existent revolutionary situations.

Years have rolled by since that happened. Today, there is little to distinguish Protestants from Catholics, settlers from natives, apart from a few customs and, to use one of Brendan's memorable phrases, "the subjective consciousness of virtue".

A DUP/Sinn Fein coalition now exists in Northern Ireland. It has the support of the great majority of the people of Northern Ireland and of the great majority of the working class. It is in a strong position to demand any level of independence from England that it wants, short of leaving the United Kingdom. Leaving the United Kingdom will have to wait for a while.

The republicans have not gone away. They are in a position to exert extra-parliamentary pressure if England drags its heels.

There is arguably a better basis for serious politics in Northern Ireland than the right to send a few Tory, Labour or Lib Dem yesmen to Westminster. **Ivor Kenna** (London)

direction as to coincide with the editorial direction of the paper.

The following extract from an *Irish Times* editorial provides a further example of the journalistic mentality that, in the words of the High Court ruling, poses "*an affront to the democratic order*":

"The removal of a Taoiseach from office can be a long and painful process, as both Charles Haughey and Albert Reynolds found to their cost" (from *An error of judgement* Sep 28th 2006).

Fortunately, following the General Election, the paper's power to remove Taoisigh turned out to be weaker than imagined.

Notwithstanding the paper's claims to champion democracy and openness, it is surprisingly reticent about its own internal affairs. Incredibly in this day and age, the Directors and Editor of the *Irish Times* are required to make an annual oath not to divulge information about the paper. Similarly there has never been a satisfactory explanation provided about documentary evidence concerning its former Managing Director, Major Thomas McDowell's connections with the British Government.

All things considered, the High Court ruling represented a good day's work for Irish democracy that will hopefully be

endorsed by the Supreme Court and, if relevant, the European Court of Human Rights.

NOTE IN VILLAGE:

Village apologises for the late publication of this post, sent by Daithi O hAilbhe of The Irish Political Review Group. *Village's* remiss in that regard prompted the following message from Daithi:

A necessary test of the Irish media's commitment to the value of free expression, is the extent to which it allows criticism of itself to be published. On behalf of the Irish Political Review Group I submitted a press statement supporting the High Court's judgement against the *Irish Times* last week. It was not published or broadcast in any media outlet. Specifically it has not been published in the *Village* blog section.

Village magazine advertises itself as publication in which critiques of the media can be found and it does regularly publish such critiques. Its blog section also deserves credit and support as a space in which minority views are published. It cannot be underestimated how the creation of such a haven of free speech provides a precious asset to Irish public life. It effectively makes the society bigger.

By not publishing the IPR Group statement, the editors of *Village* are showing that they are not above using the power of their position as a conduit of minority opinion to suppress views of which they disapprove.

Of course readers may suspect that our statement was too irrational or too insignificant to be published. In that case they can judge for themselves by reading the statement in the November Irish Political Review which can be got through http://www.atholbooks.org/magazines/iprgroup/press_1.php.

Daithí Ó hAilbhe

Kevin Myers' Niche

Readers may be pleased to learn that Kevin Myers has found his niche. He has a regular column in Sir Anthony O'Reilly's *Irish Independent* and *Belfast Telegraph*. Sir Anthony acquired the lucrative *Bellylaugh* group because his *Independent* (sic) papers in Ireland and Britain supported the Governments' version of the Peace Process. Mr. Myer's item (Belfast Telegraph 27.07.07) has a long headline in large type *The truth About A Liar And Fantasist Who Sullied The Good Name Of A Heroic Policeman*. There is at the foot of his half-page column: "I believe in the rule of law and peaceful change. I believe in the likes of John Regan, who in 1920 was faced with appalling and murderous violence, and responded in a lawful, measured and professional way—as did most RIC men." (That 'most' is a bit of a cop-out, surely?)

There is an image of cover of *The Memoirs Of John M. Regan* subtitled *A Catholic Officer In The RIC And RUC 1909-48*. Why is his religion noted? The rank and file of the RIC was 90+% Catholic. The RUC was largely made up of former members of the UVF. The book is edited by Joost Augusteijn, a revisionist historian (mentored by Professor David Fitzpatrick of TCD), and published by Four Courts.

Myers claims *"There's no point in asking what Irish history would have consisted of without the 1916 Rising"*. We then get the smart-alecky: *"That is the way of history. No one could have imagined that the Nazi invasion of Poland would have led to Australia going to war with France in Syria in 1941, or the Brazilians fighting Austrians in the Italian Apennines in 1844"*. Presumably the last date should read '1944', and 'Apennines' is the usual spelling. Australia did not have conscription during the Great War (1914-18) because the people, spearheaded by Daniel Mannix (RC Archbishop of Melbourne who, for unobscure reasons, never got a Red Hat) opposed its imposition. But there was no question

that Australia and New Zealand were dutiful daughters of Empire. When England declared war on distant Germany in 1939, they followed suit, as did South Africa's Government (which led to an uprising). Canada fell into line in its own time. In India Congress was outraged that India was deemed to be at war simply because England was. ('Éire' remained neutral, though De Valera suggested to the 'British Representative' Mahaffy, that England was, momentarily, in a morally superior position.)

Australia, despite bitterness about the Dardanelles campaign, was patently going to do what 'the mother country' asked. It was involved in Syria because France was deemed an enemy, and was in possession of Syria. Though the 'Vichy' authorities had no intention of allowing armed Axis personnel to use Syria to attack England's oil empire in Iraq and Iran. Brazil's involvement was due to Vargas, the pseudo-fascist dictator, playing New Deal America off against National Socialist Germany. The Yankees blinked first and built him a steel foundry. He sent two army Divisions and parts of the Air Force to Europe—thereby further compromising the US: his armed forces being the only ones in Latin America with real experience of modern warfare. (Practically every other state in Latin America declared war on the enemies of the USA in 1941—Uncle Sam insisted.)

"We know that 1916 unleashed a tidal wave of violence which has pursued us down the decades". This is a nonsensical statement, and patently inaccurate. Apart from some amateurish gunplay in the '40s, and Operation Harvest of 1956/57, which barely got off the ground, Ulster's Croppies lay down (or at least kept their heads down) until the mid-1960s. Then they started asking for British norms. The 'Ulster is British' Unionists beat them off the streets. The war in the North arose strictly out of the conditions imposed on everybody in the place by Westminster in 1922. If the IRA in 1969 had been run by the traditionalists, the Provisional IRA might have taken a Leftist path from the beginning. As it was the PIRA was able to contain former members of the Peoples Democracy and current members of the Society of Saint Pius X, in the same organisation.

Mr. Myers writes, *"...in the war between the IRA and the RIC/DMP, I side with the police"*. By his standards this is almost subtle. The RIC in 1918-22 were following orders from Westminster via Dublin Castle, and were not, as implied here, a separate agency. After December 1918 there was a situation of 'dual power' in Ireland, Dáil Éireann was elected by the mass of the people, and Westminster chose to ignore it. (There was, of course, a situation of 'treble' power, in that the Ulster

Unionists were determined to run their little 'Carsonia' as the IRA's GHQ staff called the 'wee North'. Myers will never refer to this as it would involve mentioning the UVF, the B- (as well as the A- and C-) Specials, and sectarian violence. The Taigs of Lisburn, for example, did not wish 'evacuation' from the town on themselves). The unarmed DMP (Dublin Metropolitan Police) was not involved in the War against Dáil Éireann, and was almost bodily incorporated into the Gárda Síochána.

There follows the sentences quoted above, which Myers, or his sub-editors, chose to emphasise. By early 1920 the Dáil had been further legitimised by the Local Government elections (on the results of which Dublin Castle had set great store): every city in Ireland apart from Belfast, pledged loyalty to the Dáil. So also did most other Local Government bodies including some well inside 'Carsonia'. In such a situation no RIC member could have been under any illusion that they were still members of a legitimate policing organisation. Dublin Castle treated them as just another arm of the military. The most remarkable aspect of the War of Independence and its aftermath is that former RIC personnel were unharmed, including those who remained in England's pay to the end. Many men were in a difficult position in that pensions and other benefits would have been lost, to their families as much as to themselves, if they had resigned. But surely even an ordinary Peeler has to have some sense of honour?

Myers in this article (covertly) blackguards the men who took part in the Listowel Mutiny of 1920 (after the Local Government elections, in which the RIC had played a part in intimidating the electorate). The history of the RIC has been *"contaminated by republican lies, perjury and falsehood"*—the use of the word 'perjury' is nowhere justified in this article. It is (in case Myers's idiosyncratic way with the English language has confused the reader) lying under oath. The IRA's oath to the independent Republic declared by Dáil Éireann on the 20th January 1919 simply disappears in this sort of writing.

"None is more spectacular than the calumnies of Jeremiah Mee..." an RIC recruit *"who invented... [a] speech by Lieut Col Gerard Smyth..."* who issued a shoot to kill order at Listowel Barracks. Myers goes on to denounce *"wretched Judas Mee"*, but does not acknowledge that this incident was popularly described as a 'Mutiny' and led to many resignations from the RIC. (In fact Jeremiah Mee's account of Smyth's speech was supported by other RIC men who heard it, was publicised widely at the time and was taken up by the American Congress.)

But Myers tells us "... any journalist will agree that you forget the spoken word within seconds...". But he goes on the quote a written Order of Smyth's, the "Divisional Police Commissioner for Munster". Smyth was, needless to say, "an extremely efficient and decent officer, an honourable Irishman who was passionately attached to the rule of law". (Why, then, did he take up arms against the democratically legitimate government of Ireland?) Myers quotes Smyth as saying: "A policeman is perfectly justified in shooting any man who is seen with arms and who does not immediately throw up his arms when ordered" and comments: "In 1920? Amen to that, I say."

Mee "was a liar and a fantasist", whose report the "termagant" Napoli McKenna, Editor of the *Irish Bulletin* published. (The *Irish Bulletin* was issued by Dáil Éireann as an information sheet, it had a very wide circulation, and few of its allegations about misconduct by the RIC and the rest of the Imperial armed—occupying—forces were disputed.) Smyth was "a hero who had lost his arm in 1915... wounded six times in... Great War... four times mentioned in dispatches... DSO and Bar...", in other words a chap who loved the 'death or glory' life he led 1914 to '18. Precisely the sort of man who ought not to have been put in charge of any sort of policing operation. He was a military commander in charge of a military machine—the Listowel 'Mutiny' was clearly revulsion by men who wanted to stick to civic policing and did not want to take up arms against their fellow-country women and men. (Smyth clearly had a blind spot where women were concerned, and Myers can only describe an assiduous servant of Dáil Éireann as a 'termagant').

Dan Breen killed Gerard Smyth's brother George, who was also "a gallant soldier who had won the DCO and Military Cross". The latter information is there presumably to demonstrate what a frightful *oik* Breen was. Myers last sentence is: "Killing Irishmen has always seemed to me to be a strangely ineffective way of making other Irishmen like you." Nobody would disagree with that. But why is he shy of mentioning the 1912 UVF? By 1914 it was 100,000 strong with many weapons of all kinds and much ammunition. There was a 20,000 strong Ulster Women's Corps (which inspired the formation of Cumann na mBan), to do admin., nursing, deliver dispatches and other chores. The Irish Volunteers, like Cumann na mBan, was a consequence of the foundation of the Ulster Volunteer Force.

In 1912 the UVF was quite prepared to kill Irishmen in their thousands to impose the Ulster Unionist Council's will. Kevin Myers rarely refers to the UVF, or to the defiance of Westminster by the Ulster

Unionist Council (which was prepared to turn itself into a Provisional Government of Ulster). The UVF's successors, especially the B-Specials, were allowed to engage in (admittedly, mostly low-level) hassle of Taigs—though a favourite sport was allowing vehicles to pass check-points, then firing shots through the back windows. On Myers' view the Provisional IRA spontaneously generated itself for no good reason. In fact it was the result of fifty years of Unionist dominance in 'John Bull's political slum'. If Myers wrote about such things he might be tolerable—but he would not get high approval ratings in the Letters column of the *Belfast Telegraph*.

Seán McGouran

Hezbollah denied entry to Ireland

Ibrahim Mousawi of Hezbollah was granted a visa to visit Ireland in October 2006. He is the editor of Hezbollah's weekly newspaper, having formerly been Chief Editor of Foreign News on Al-Manar, Hezbollah's TV station. During his visit last year, he addressed a number of anti-war meetings in Northern Ireland and the Republic. In addition, he was invited into the Department of Foreign Affairs to talk to an official about Lebanon and the Middle East in general.

In September 2007, Ibrahim Mousawi sought a visa to revisit Ireland. He was due to address a number of anti-war meetings again this year. But this year he was denied a visa. Yes, believe it or believe it not, a person who was invited into the Department of Foreign Affairs last year was refused an entry visa this year.

Did Ireland succumb to pressure from the US? It looks like it.

The *Sunday Independent* mounted a campaign to have Ibrahim Mousawi denied entry into Ireland. An article by Jim Cusack on 23rd September 2007 contained the following:

"The United States has called on the Government to refuse entry to representatives of the Lebanese terror group, Hezbollah, and Iraqi insurgents, who have been invited to take part in a conference in Dublin, sharing a platform with members of the Green Party as well as Labour's Michael D Higgins. ...

"The fact that Fianna Fail's partners in government are participating in the event could lead to diplomatic problems with the US whose companies based here employed more than 100,000 people.

"Hezbollah and its TV station are included in the list of organisations banned from the United States as terrorism sponsors. A spokesman for the US State Department said on Friday:

'We take it very seriously when we decide to designate an organisation like Al-Manar as a terrorist entity and put them on a list of banned groups from the United States. We would hope that our allies and friends around the world would take similar action.'

It appears that the US's Irish ally and friend has done as requested.

Cusack's report also contained an outpouring of anti-Hezbollah vitriol from Jewish Fine Gael TD, Alan Shatter, which stated amongst other things that Al-Manar "openly supports Hezbollah violence not just against Israelis but its fellow Lebanese citizens". That is simply a lie.

Cusack's article contained a number of other serious misrepresentations. For example, he wrote that Hezbollah was "the group responsible for last year's rocket attacks on Israel which prompted the bombardment of Lebanon" by Israel. That is a misrepresentation of what occurred: Israel's bombardment of Lebanon was in response to the capture of two Israeli soldiers by Hezbollah. Hezbollah responded to Israel's bombardment of Lebanon by firing rockets into Israel.

Cusack also wrote that "Hezbollah ... is believed to have participated in the attacks on Lebanese political leaders, including the murder of former President Rafiq Hariri". There is no evidence for that assertion. Rafik Hariri was assassinated in February 2005. The UN established a Commission to investigate his assassination and the Commission was later given the responsibility for investigating other political assassinations. The Commission has yet to complete its work and it hasn't charged anybody in connection with the assassinations. However, the Commission has produced several reports for the Security Council and in none of these will you find any suggestion that Hezbollah was responsible for any of the assassinations.

(Rafik Hariri was not a former President of Lebanon, as Cusack wrote. He was a Sunni Muslim and only Maronite Christians can be President. He was a former Prime Minister—and only Sunni Muslims can be Prime Minister. Shiite Muslims are banned from both posts, even though they are largest of the three groups.)

The following letter by me in response to Cusack's article was published in the *Sunday Independent* on 30th September 2007:

"Jim Cusack ('US calls on Irish to ban terror group', September 23) follows the US State Department in branding Hezbollah "a Lebanese terror group". It is true that Hezbollah is on the current US "List of Designated Terrorist Organisations". But it is not on the equivalent EU list, nor is it a banned

CORPORATISM continued

"Even if widespread agreement had been secured there was no strong Catholic social movement to bring it into effect. Furthermore, the Catholic bishops, as stated earlier, did not wish to reform a system that served them so well" (*Vocationalism and Social Catholicism in Twentieth Century Ireland*, p35).

FIANNA FAIL

"The priority given to party political interests indicates that De Valera had little regard for **vocationalism**" (*Vocationalism and Social Catholicism in Twentieth Century Ireland*, p184).

"The government was in no mood to appease the vocationalists. When Bishop John Dignan's term as chairman of the National Health Insurance Society came to an end in August 1945 it was not renewed. Sean MacEntee, despite his condemnation of bureaucratic centralism, replaced the bishop with a civil servant. Furthermore, it seems that *The Irish Press*... became the instrument of the government's public criticism of the report. On 11 August, Frank Pakenham's scathing analysis was published in the national newspaper" (ibid, p144).

"James Ryan, however, seemed determined to deflate the last remnants of vocationalist aspirations. When, as Minister for Agriculture, he presided at the opening of the Catholic Social Week on 30 October, 1944 the overall thrust of his speech had been defensive and conciliatory. Thirteen months later, this time addressing the Fianna Fail faithful in the Mansion House, Dublin, he was far more dismissive of the commissioner's recommendations. In his speech of 20 November, 1945, (this was one of a number of lectures which had been organised by the National Executive of Fianna Fail), Ryan declared:

"I am not objecting to the merits of the Commission's scheme of organisation but I think it is impracticable and could only, if at all, be achieved by gigantic efforts. The position aimed at is not so substantially different from the *status quo* as to warrant the vast amount of organisation and work

that will be required."

"He assured his audience that the dangers to society, which were present in the 1930s, were now no more. The capitalists could no longer exploit the community at will. Unbridled capitalism was in sharp decline and squalid living conditions were being eliminated. His remarks implied that *Quadragesimo Anno* and **vocationalism** were obsolete" (*Vocationalism and Social Catholicism in Twentieth Century Ireland*, p148).

"The confrontation between the vocationalists and the government was at its most intense in March, 1945. Sean MacEntee engaged in a bitter public debate with Bishop John Dignan while Lemass and [Bishop] Browne publicised their grievances. Lemass and MacEntee were not overawed by the invocation of the papal encyclicals to bolster vocationalist contentions and they maintained a hard-line attitude towards the vocationalist lobby. In the editorial of the *Irish Times* (10 March, 1945) it was argued that the perception of southern Ireland as a state ruled by the Catholic bishops was now difficult to sustain. The notion, expressed particularly in Northern Ireland, of Eire as a 'priest-ridden community', could be refuted with greater confidence because two government ministers were clearly rejecting proposals advocated by two Catholic bishops" (ibid, p135).

SOCIAL PARTNERSHIP: THE FUTURE?

"The new **neo-corporatism** has been based on economic planning and is not preoccupied with justice. Trade unions and employers are manipulated for the purpose of stability. In Ireland it has consisted of rationalising the pressure group process rather than reforming the socio-economic order" (*Vocationalism and Social Catholicism in Twentieth Century Ireland*, p182).

At the Killarney conference mentioned in our introduction, Jack O'Connor told the conference—

"he was not there to defend partnership, 'not because I don't believe in it, but because what we have had for

the past 15 years is not true partnership. There has been a disproportionate benefit to business and the positive outcome for workers had not nearly been as great as those for employers" (Irish Independent, 24.5.2003).

Through sheer pragmatism and working class common sense, the Irish Trade Union movement avoided the ideological pitfalls of British labour. The Irish movement had some instinctive sense of a productive conception of socialism while British labour floundered amidst a conception of socialism which was based on little more than restrictive practice—"We won't rule ourselves, but neither will anyone else".

The challenge now for the Trade Union movement is to conceive a position whereby workers gain a participatory role in the output of production. Mere pragmatism won't ensure this! It will require a political will. We cannot stand still—for already, the Colm McCarthys of this world have decided that the role of organised labour is no longer essential in the most globalised economy in Europe.

We can continue to examine Corporatism; the Bullock Report is essential reading, the more so, since it was ultimately sabotaged by the nascent Blairites in the 1970s but above all it is surely time to revisit the writings of James Connolly, particularly *The Workers' Republic* in the period 1915 right up to Easter 1916 which is packed with material on Germany and productive socialism and its interweaving with private industry.

LABOUR KNOWS BEST?

"The trend seems to be towards outsourcing where possible within government and private industry," said Mr Spring. "It is a matter of efficiencies. Not every small business needs its own processing unit. This can be done more efficiently by outsourcing, allowing companies to concentrate on their core elements of their business, the things they are best at" (Dick Spring, former Labour Party leader; Executive Vice-Chairman of FEXCO, Irish Examiner, 5.10.2007).

organisation in Ireland—so there are no grounds for refusing a Hezbollah representative entry into Ireland.

"Hezbollah is a Shiite political organisation which currently has 14 MPs in the Lebanese Parliament (and would have considerably more if the Shiite community were represented fairly within the Lebanese political system). Until last November it had two Ministers in the Lebanese Government under Prime Minister

Siniora, the programme of which recognised the contribution of Hezbollah's military wing in combating Israeli aggression.

"In a report published on 25 July, the UK House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee described Hezbollah as "undeniably an important element in Lebanon's politics" and recommended that the British Government reverse its policy of refusing to talk to it. In arguing for this reversal, the report said:

"... we asked a range of Lebanese politicians whether the British Government should engage directly with the group. No one, including bitter opponents of Hezbollah, told us that the current [British] Government approach was the correct one".

When Hezbollah's Lebanese opponents are arguing for engagement with it, should we in Ireland be adopting a policy of boycott? I think not."

David Morrison
www.david-morrison.org.uk

CORPORATISM continued

Social Catholicism in Twentieth Century Ireland, Don O'Leary, Irish Academic Press, 2000).

It was a task that was taken deadly serious.

The Chairman was Dr. Michael Browne (Bishop of Galway); other members included Professor Alfred O'Rahilly, U.C.C. and Professor Michael Tierney, UCD.

The Labour members were: Louie Bennett, General Secretary of the Irish Women Workers' Union; Senator Sean Campbell, Treasurer of the Dublin Typographical Society; Senator Thomas Foran, President of the ITGWU who in 1939 was replaced by Luke Duffy, Secretary of the Labour Party and Jim Larkin, Senior, General President of the Workers' Union of Ireland.

The Commission consisted of 25 members.

The Commission made a critical investigation of continental **Corporatism**. The home of **Corporatism** was Italy. But they were of the opinion that **Corporatism** in Italy was more an ideology than an actual form of social life. The Italian state was too powerful to allow the **Corporatist** system to develop properly. (Many members of the Commission would not have disapproved of the power of the Fascist state in Italy. By and large, they approved of Mussolini as a necessary dictator, but argued that political necessity prevented **Corporatism** from developing its full potential.)

Corporatism or **Vocationalism**, was the organising of society into autonomous corporations, or vocational bodies. Each trade or profession would be a corporate body and as such it would be a constituent segment of both the economy and the body politic. Each corporation would supply society with something which was necessary to its existence and well-being. It would be internally uniform—workers and employers in the building trade, for example, both being in the Builders' Corporation. And each corporation would be autonomous to a very considerable extent.

The corporate organisation of society would erode the basis of class conflict. The system of class-based political parties engaged in perpetual conflict—whether, in a parliamentary system, for the control of government or, when the parliamentary system broke down, as it was bound to do, for dictatorial state power—was an intolerable disruption of the orderly life of society. The corporate system, by establishing a basic harmony in the component parts of society would

minimise the functions of the state. Representatives of the various corporations would meet to co-ordinate their activities. With class conflict and party conflict eliminated, the adversarial routine of Parliament would wither away, and the representatives of the corporations would easily make sensible arrangements for common affairs.

And, of course, the requirements of the individual would be seen to by his corporation, and not by the state.

THE RELIGIOUS MEDIUM

Such was the ideal of the Corporate state, which was the social ideal of a substantial section of the new Irish state from the 1930s until the early 1960s. It had echoes of Guild Socialism, and of Syndicalism. But there is a further element, which was lacking from Guild Socialism and Syndicalism: the ideological cement of a universally operating Church. The corporations would exist in the medium of a uniform and authoritative religion. The Catholic Church would be universally active in the life of the Corporate state, as it was in the life of Europe in the 13th century.

Since the Catholic Church in Ireland steadily increased its influence after Independence, a democratic transition to the Corporate state was conceivable. It was not attempted because the Corporatist development of Europe was largely destroyed by the victory of the Allies in 1945. The Report of the Vocational Commission was published towards the end of the war. It was not implemented because Ireland did not have the moral courage to embark on a Corporatist development at a moment when Corporatism was in disgrace in Europe.

The Corporatist ideal was passively retained until the early 1960s. Then it collapsed, when the Vatican, which had succeeded in dominating social life nowhere but in Ireland, made an accommodation with the liberal state and its individualist social welfare arrangements.

"You may have been worried of much talk of changes to come. Allow me to reassure you. No change will worry the tranquility of your Christian lives." (Dr. John Charles McQuaid, Archbishop of Dublin, preaching in Dublin on his return from the Second Vatican Council, 10.12.1965).

However, within the state, there were clear divisions both political and religious regarding the proposed new Corporatist social order. Led by Archbishop John Charles McQuaid, a substantial body of

Church leaders couldn't understand the necessity for this new social order in a state where a near Catholic 'utopia' prevailed—whatever about the teachings of Papal Encyclicals or otherwise.

At the political level, De Valera did indeed set up the Commission on Vocational Organisation but in the end that body foundered when it failed to generate Fianna Fail support. The concept of a new social order found little appeal from a party whom a decade prior, had fought a revolution and a civil war, then clawed its way to power in the new state. Fianna Fail, like the parish priests were none too enthusiastic to hand over their new found power.

"Archbishop John Charles McQuaid had successfully frustrated attempts in the 1930s to form a council of education on a vocational basis. His lack of enthusiasm for **Vocationalism** is further indicated by the exclusion of Muintir na Tire from the archdiocese of Dublin from 1940 (the year he became Archbishop). Muintir na Tire was not prepared to go where it was not welcomed. A disappointed Canon Hayes may have had McQuaid in mind when he quipped 'It is bad enough to be kicked by the Devil, but it is the devil and all to be kicked by angels and archangels'" (*Vocationalism and Social Catholicism in Twentieth Century Ireland*, p165).

"The Republic of Ireland was over 90% Catholic and there were few exponents of communism, liberalism or democratic socialism. A movement, which was motivated by Catholic social principles, should have met with little resistance—especially when the vocationalist principle was expressed in the 1937 constitution. Yet the resistance was overwhelming. The majority of Irish Catholic bishops and priests either opposed or failed to support the vocationalist cause. Fr. John Hayes, founder of Muintir na Tire, did more than any other vocationalist to translate theory into practice. His efforts to give practical effect to Catholic social teaching met with '...stone walls of clerical opposition... There was a resistance to Catholic social work in Ireland by the older priests only to be compared with the resistance to Russian communism.' A minority of young priests regarded the guilds of Muintir na Tire as mere forums for discussion. Others believed 'the movement was fraught with dangers: the laity getting too much control... interference in church affairs and, worst of all, the mingling of Catholics and Protestants.' ...Conservative bishops and priests were quite capable of suppressing vocationalist inspired schemes without any assistance from politicians and civil servants: (ibid, p165).

continued on page 23

CORPORATISM continued

systems for dealing with industrial relations problems. In an interview in early 2001, Haughey recalled being particularly impressed by the German Chancellor and SPD leader Helmut Schmidt, whom he questioned at length about the German model of industrial relations." (*Saving the Future, How Social Partnership Shaped Ireland's Economic Success*, Hastings, Sheehan and Yeates, Blackhall Publishing, 20007, Twenty Euros).

So at the end of the day, Social Partnership "is a **Corporatist** system for dealing with industrial relations problem"?

Charles Haughey went out into the highways and byways in an endeavour to find a formula that would get the economy off its knees and up and running. If it worked, its ideological connotations mattered not a whit!

As Jack O'Connor, General President of SIPTU put it, the Programme for National Recovery, 1988 "...would not have occurred without Haughey. Full Stop. He and Bertie Ahern understood the subtlety of Irish politics" (*The Irish Times*, 6.10.2007).

"When the PNR was debated in the Dail in 1987, the main opposition parties were hostile to the agreement negotiated by Charles Haughey's minority Fianna Fail administration. This hostility was not confined to criticism of the nuts and bolts of the agreement. It was also attacked on the grounds of being either 'just a pay deal' or on the alleged basis that it was some form of 'capitulation' to interest groups" (*"Saving the Future"*, p54-55).

"Such attacks on any major initiative by the government of the day are not unusual. What was evident in 1987, however, and again to a more limited extent in regard to the PESP in 1990, was the fact that the agreements were seen by some to be a threat to the democratic system itself. They were regarded by a number of critics as being too **corporatist**, a criticism not unconnected to the personality of the Taoiseach [Haughey], and were seen as somehow relegating the role of the parliamentary opposition to playing second fiddle to the social partners" (ibid).

"John Carroll, former ITGWU President, recalls his reaction to the attack on the PNR by Labour Party leader, Dick Spring: 'I made a fierce attack on the Labour Party and what appeared to be their negative attitude to the trade union movement.' Carroll himself was and still is a member of the Labour Party. He said that later Labour, Fine Gael and the PDs all accepted the aims and objectives of the PNR" (p54-

55).

"Other opponents argue forcibly that a malign dynamic has been increasingly at play, namely that social partnership tends towards a negation of our democracy, by reducing the sovereignty of parliament and increasing social partner regulation in areas hitherto the preserve of independent decision making. Supporters of partnership argue, however, that the involvement by a greater range of groups within social partnership enhances its accountability to the wider society, and helps society arrive at consensus based solutions and strategies. These arguments have emerged over the past decade without really getting the sort of sustained or considered airing they deserve in the media and in the Oireachtas" (*"Saving the Future*, p107).

"Social partnership has taken much of the economics out of Irish politics, while globalisation and EU membership have removed most of the rest" (Niamh Puirseil, a lecturer in the School of History and Archives, UCD. Her book, *The Irish Labour Party, 1922-73*, was published by UCD Press earlier this year, *Irish Times*, 6.10.2007)

"Social partnership is a unique version of **corporatism** in Europe for many reasons, not least the involvement of the community and voluntary sectors in national agreements. One reason for this is probably the comparatively large role that such organisations play in Irish society, providing services normally supplied by the State in other countries" (*Saving the Future*, p145).

"The Irish model of social partnership is not really a model at all. Academics have tried in vain to place it within a European framework, to shoehorn it in somewhere between Berlin and Stockholm. But it won't fit. It contains some elements of models from other countries, but perhaps what it has most in common with European experience is that, at the outset, it was a response to an economic and social crisis. In this respect, the parallel lies more with how other countries responded to their post-World War II devastation than with any other so-called **corporatist** style model. The crisis of the 1980s was so all-pervasive that it undermined the political system, seeming to shatter any confidence that Ireland could save itself, never mind build a future. Social partnership was a pragmatic response to finding a way out of that trough, helping—as the title of this book suggests—to 'save the future'" (*Saving the Future*, p173).

So it was just plucked out of the sky? The term pragmatic keeps coming up in relation to the Irish social partnership model but if it is based on mere pragmatism and nothing else, its future will not be saved!

CLASS DIVISIONS

"In the Ireland of the 1980s, there were few of the ideological class divisions that existed elsewhere, especially in Britain, from whom we inherited our industrial relations system. The lack of a clear left-right divide has often been blamed for holding back our development. The catch-all nature of the larger parties, Fianna Fail and Fine Gael (themselves a result of a division dating back to the civil war), seemed to many observers to put a break on 'real politics'. In 1978, however, this perceived ideological weakness turned into a strength, enabling the main social partners, with their broad political support, to establish a system or model that remains at the centre of decision-making to this day. Just two years later, the Berlin Wall was to come down, further signalling the end of old and distinct left-right divides in mainland Europe" (*Saving the Future*, p174).

We may have inherited many aspects of our 'industrial relations system' from Britain but ironically, the central institution of our labour relations, the Labour Court established in 1946, was probably the one and only body that owed its existence to the Commission on **Vocational** Organisation.

"The most striking feature of all these initiatives was that most of them were minor and all of them were peripheral to the commission's major proposals. The Industrial Relations Act 1946 was the most significant and it improved the system of industrial conciliation in Ireland by establishing a Labour Court but this Act, helpful as it was, did not set up the vocational structure as recommended by the commission" (*Vocationalism and Social Catholicism in Twentieth Century Ireland*, Don O'Leary, Irish Academic Press, 2000, p153).

In Ireland in the 1930s a strong sentiment existed in favour of **Corporatism**—or **Vocationalism**, as it was called in Ireland, based on papal social teaching. This was reflected by the inclusion of Vocationalist provisions in the 1937 Irish Constitution. A Commission was established by the Government to report on how a change to **Corporatism** might be effected.

The Commission on Vocational Organisation was established in 1939 by Eamon de Valera and concluded its work in 1944. The Commission on Vocational Organisation Report was published that year.

"An indication of the scope, variety and complexity of the commission's task is provided by the fact that the analytical table of contents, which preceded the 539 page report, extended to over 40 pages" (*Vocationalism &*

continued on page24



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 25 No. 11

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

"CORPORATIVE STATE: *A fascist conception of society, realised substantially in Italy during Mussolini's regime; also advocated by clericalism. Its essential idea is the organisation of the national economy through corporations covering the various industries, the managements to consist of representatives of the employers, the government and the employees—in other words, the destruction of the trade unions and all other independent working-class bodies; it differs from the Nazi 'Labour Front' only in unessentials*" (Marxist Glossary, L. Harry Gould, Communist Party of Australia, 1947).

Corporatism and Trade Unionism

"A UNION chief has rejected suggestions that the new Social Partnership wage agreement is modelled on 1930's Italian fascism" (*Irish Independent*, 24.5.2003).

"SIPTU Vice-President Jack O'Connor told the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) conference that he 'totally objected' to any comparison being made with Italian fascism. He was responding to criticism of the Sustaining Progress Social Agreement (signed last month) by economist Colm McCarthy.

"In a discussion on competitiveness and Social Partnership, Mr. McCarthy had said that sustaining progress 'had a strong whiff of Mediterranean corporatism from the 1930s'. Later he said he was thinking more of Salazar's Portugal, rather than Mussolini's Italy."

"This involved agreements on incomes between government, employers and trade unions" (*Irish Independent*, 24.5.2003).

No doubt if Colm McCarthy had been around in 1939, he would probably have had a star role on the Commission on Vocational Organisation, though judging by his remarks to Jack O'Connor on "Mediterranean corporatism" he would have contributed damn little to that debate. On the issue of **Corporatism**, it only proves that the Right can be just as daft as the Left.

Of course, mention of the word '**Corporatism**' in Irish or British labour politics very nearly causes an epileptic political outburst. **Corporatism** equals Fascism and that's all there is to it!

The word "Corporatism", used frivolously, has had the effect of devaluing all political concepts for the labour movement.

Corporatism is associated with fascism. The fascist experience in Europe has never been subjected to critical

understanding in the labour movement. Because, in its Nazi form, it over-reached itself and came to grief, its conditions of existence have never been made a subject of serious research.

Britain discovered in 1945 that it had fought a much better war than it had suspected. The extermination camps were revealed, and that revelation rendered fascism a subject for denunciation rather than investigation. It became obligatory to describe the rise of fascism as if its central purpose had been the extermination camps and the liquidation of the Jews. To think otherwise was wicked.

But to think thus was to cover a large tract of European experience in the twentieth century with a mental blur. And it made the word fascism an increasingly meaningless term in labour politics in these islands.

Subscribers to the magazine are regularly offered special rates on other publications

Irish Political Review is published by the IPR Group: write to—

14 New Comen Court, North Strand,
Dublin 3, or
PO Box 339, Belfast BT12 4GQ or
PO Box 6589, London, N7 6SG, or

Labour Comment,
C/O Shandon St. P.O., Cork City.

Subscription by Post:

12 issues: £17.50, UK;
Euro 25, Ireland; Euro 30, Europe.

Electronic Subscription:

Euro 15 / £12 for 12 issues
(or Euro 1.30 / £1.10 per issue)

You can also order both postal and electronic subscriptions from:

www.atholbooks.org

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Historically, the ideology of the corporate state harks back to ideas developed by 19th century Christian conservatives in reaction to what they considered the excessive individualism of French revolutionary ideology. To the allegedly mechanistic notions of the Industrial Revolution they would oppose the organic concepts of what they maintained was the corporate character of medieval society. These ideas found authoritative expression in an encyclical of Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum* (1891), and were reaffirmed in *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931) by Pius XI.

It deserves attention, however, that much of this thought was radically at variance with actual Fascist practice because of the latter's bureaucratic centralism: medieval corporatism was built upon the autonomy of the constituent corporate bodies. It constructed a multi-centred organic whole in terms of the self-sufficiency of the constituent groups. Thus, the medieval town was seen by its latter-day admirers and theorists as a co-operative union of Guilds, whereas the Fascist corporate state entailed the total eclipse of such autonomy by the radical extension of governmental control and direction to all spheres of social life and activity.

HAUGHEY WAS THE MAN!

"Haughey became interested in forging a new, more structured, social contract between the Government, unions and employers during his brief terms as Taoiseach in the early 1980s. During this period he came into contact with EU leaders who had **corporatist**

continued on page 25