

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

August 2016

Vol.31, No.8 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.30 No.8 ISSN 954-5891

No Commemoration Here!

Whilst Nationalist Ireland is bending over backwards to accommodate the great Imperial blood sacrifice of the Battle of the Somme in its historical memory there is no spirit of reciprocity in the DUP toward the Irish democracy. For the DUP the Irish democracy, which had to be established by a war of independence when the state that declared the Great War was fighting a world "war for small nations" failed its first test after winning that war by ignoring the result of the General Election of 1918.

Ronald McNeill (Lord Cushendun) wrote in *Ulster's Stand for Union*:

"The disloyal conduct of Nationalist Ireland during the war, and the treason and terrorism organised by Sinn Fein after the war, had widened the already broad gulf between North and South. The determination never to submit to an all-Ireland Parliament was more firmly fixed than ever" (p.281).

Is Ulster Unionism's attitude to the Irish State any different than it was nearly a century ago?

To the DUP the Irish who fought for democracy and independence, after the ballot was suppressed, were "terrorists" pure and simple. And they remain so a century later. Nationalist gestures to the Imperial loyalties of the Ulster Protestant are largely wasted if it is believed there will be any reciprocity of feeling from people with such fundamentalist impulses.

Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council was established in April 2015. It covers most of the northern coast and replaced Ballymoney Borough Council, Coleraine Borough Council, Limavady Borough Council and Moyle District Council. The first elections to the new Authority held on 22nd May 2014 left the nationalists of the Antrim Glens, who had previously had a majority in Moyle, in a small minority, with only 13 of 40 councillors. Almost immediately there were threats to fly the Union flag over Council buildings in areas where it had not been flown e.g. the old Moyle Council buildings in Ballycastle. Supremacism is die hard.

continued on page 2

Trump!

Michael Flynn, former the head of the US Defence Intelligence Agency, the Pentagon's intelligence arm (retired in 2014), is now a foreign policy adviser to Republican Presidential candidate Trump:

In an interview with SPIEGEL, Donald Trump advisor Mike Flynn explains why the presumptive Republican Party presidential candidate admires authoritarian leaders and considers the US foreign policy of recent years to be a disaster.

Here is an extract:

"SPIEGEL: General, we are here to say goodbye.

Flynn: Why goodbye?

SPIEGEL: Donald Trump announced that if he wins the election, he will not continue trans-Atlantic relations in their current form. He has threatened to withdraw the United States from NATO.

Flynn: This is where I think the world has misread Donald Trump. He has no intention to step away without examining

The Democratic Burden!

The United States Government must run the world. That is its pleasure and its self-imposed duty. A world that carried on without its active intervention in its affairs at every turn would not be right, and therefore would be intolerable to it.

There was a time, not very long ago, when it was Britain's duty, imposed on it by Providence, to run the world as its Empire. Somewhere about 1917 the small British homeland of the Empire realised that the task of making the world its Empire on behalf of a Higher Power was beyond it. It transferred its destiny to its offspring, the United States, and it undertook to place its wisdom at the disposal of Washington.

The political structure of the British state has, for 300 years, consisted of two parties. The constant party throughout that period has been the Tory Party. Since 1919 the other party has been the Labour Party. (Before that it was the Whig, or Liberal, Party.)

The British populace has always been organised for political action, and

continued on page 7

all relationships that we have. His intent is to relook at the way we are organized globally, ...at these alliances and these charters... to make sure that they are still viable for the 21st century. It doesn't mean that President Trump comes into office and NATO goes away. But I would say that NATO as a political alliance does need to be relooked at in terms of everything—resourcing, capabilities.

SPIEGEL: Now you are challenging NATO after all.

Flynn: NATO was formed post-World War II. We're a little bit more than a half-century old. Do we want NATO to go on for another half-century?...

continued on page 11

CONTENTS

	Page
No Commemoration Here! Pat Walsh	1
The Democratic Burden! Editorial	1
Trump. Contributed by David Morrison	1
Readers' Letters: Paul Bew Is Citeless! Niall Meehan	3,5
In Defence of Casement. Tim O'Sullivan	
Shorts from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (NAMA in the North; Housing Crisis; False Solutions: Repossessions; False Solutions: Selling Council Houses; Charitable Services; Italian Banks)	6
Sasamach/Brexit. Niall Cusack	10
Lord Roberts and Luke Wadding: Memorials in Waterford. Pat Muldowney	12
For Sale Or To Let. Wilson John Haire (Poem)	13
No Truce With Revisionist Myth, Propaganda And Fabrication. Manus O'Riordan	14
History Hollywoodised: Casement Art Installation. Tim O'Sullivan	16
Armenians: Irish Times at it again. Pat Walsh	17
The Independence Story. Donal Kennedy (Book Review)	20
Biteback: Chilcot Report: Blair, America And Eastern Europe. Caoimhin de Bhailis (Report of Letter)	21
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Invasive Plants; Computer Coding; Monsignor Pádraig O'Fiannachta)	22
Casement's Ashes. Contributed by Jack Lane	23
Lock Up. Wilson John Haire (Poem)	23

Labour Comment, edited by **Pat Maloney:**

Trotsky: On the Events in Dublin

(July 1916)

(back page)

The behaviour of the DUP since the people of the Glens of Antrim fell into their hands has shown what life would be like under Unionist majority rule for the Catholic community. In June the DUP sent its men during the dead of night to demolish a small monument to 1916 in Carnlough. The monument did not have planning permission—routinely granted to loyalist monuments—because it would never have been given for "a shrine to terrorists" by the DUP. Many more monuments, symbols and edifices to loyalism, many of the purely terrorist variety, remain unmolested by the Law. Now a large Community Centre, desperately needed by the people of Glenariffe, has been blocked by the DUP:

"Council funding for a new £1m state-of-the-art community centre in Co Antrim has been pulled indefinitely because of a row over the names of two IRA men on the gates into the planned site. The proposed new sports and community centre in Glenariff is due to be built within the grounds of Oisín Glenariff GAA club. But opposition has been brought by the DUP members of

Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council.

"Gates near the site bear the names Charlie McAllister and Pat McVeigh while the ground is named McAllister-McVeigh Memorial Park in their honour. The two IRA members were killed in 1922—some seven months before the signing of the Anglo-Irish Treaty.

"Planning permission was granted in March 2014 for the centre to cater both the social and sporting needs of the community. The Friends of Glenariff had been working on plans for the shared community space for the past six years and applied to the council for £180,000 funding, which was approved at a council meeting last week, in spite of objections from the DUP. The future of the project is now in jeopardy after DUP members decided to call-in the council's decision.

"A council spokesman said: 'Following the Council decision on 24th May 2016 to adopt a capital grants fund process and consequently part fund the Glenariff Community Facility, the DUP has invoked call-in, which now necessitates legal opinion in relation to the decision made by Council. Until the call-in process is complete the decision of Council is 'frozen'

"The DUP has said the building of the centre in Glenariff would 're-traumatise' people affected by the Troubles.

"Coleraine councillor Trevor Clarke said there were also 'procedural issues' as well as 'very serious concerns' the project was being fast-tracked ahead of others. 'We will continue to have difficulty in supporting a facility which is connected or named after any terrorist or terrorist related organisation,' he added" (*Irish News* 3.6.16)

One historical point about the *Irish News* report: Charlie McAllister and Pat McVeigh were killed in June 1922—seven months *after* rather than "*before the signing of the Anglo-Irish Treaty*".

The journalist probably thought that, after the signing of the Treaty in December 1921, that was that. But he did not realise that for Michael Collins that was only the start of things. For Collins the Treaty was a holding operation to gain the bulk of the territory on the island so that the remaining bit could then be taken, by hook or by crook.

In September 1921, during the Truce that preceded the Treaty, Collins made it clear to a large gathering of IRA volunteers in Armagh that the Six Counties were a "*still born child with no name*" that he was going to abort (IN 5.9.21). The Northern Catholics, who had seen the Devlinites' promises come to nought, with Partition and worse instead—the perverse construct of Orange Terror known as 'Northern Ireland'—started going over to Collins in large numbers.

The following passage from '*Catastrophe*' by the present writer explains the political situation:

"Michael Collins sold the Treaty to Northern Nationalists as a means of undoing the 1920 Act which had cut them off from the rest of the Nation: The Free State was to be the base of operations against the Unionist regime; the new Dublin Government, which was on intimate terms with Whitehall, would influence British policy towards the Ulster Unionists; and then, finally the Boundary Commission, which, Collins had secured in the Treaty, would whittle away 'Northern Ireland' by awarding predominantly Nationalist areas to the Free State, making the rest of it unviable.

"That was the Collins plan for the deliverance of the North.

"The first thing Collins did upon signing the Treaty was to assume the leadership of the Northern Catholics. The signing of the Pact with James Craig was the opening move in this. Collins had no intention of making peace in Ulster through this Pact in January 1922. It was part of his campaign of subversion of 'Northern Ireland'.... This unilateral decision more

than anything else showed Northern Catholics that he was taking them in hand and going to decide their future in a personal capacity.

"Collins then moved to take direct control of the Northern IRA. The IRA, while maintaining a central command structure in its GHQ staff, had remained a fragmented and local-orientated force based on geographical divisions. Collins got Eoin O'Duffy to establish a new Northern Command through an 'Ulster Council' making the IRA in the North the united instrument of his policy. This composed the 6 O/Cs of the 6 most Northerly Divisions of the Army. The 'Ulster Council' was headed by Collins himself and it was conducted under the auspices of the IRB—indicating that its work would be conspiracy, even though open government had by this time been attained. One of the first things it did was to begin paying the salaries of all Northern IRA officers, securing their personal loyalty to Collins...

"The IRA in the North had seen itself as part of the all-Ireland struggle coming from the 1918 Election result. But it had had to operate in a more hostile environment than other areas of the country due to the Unionist presence and the Hibernian influence in its own community. It also suffered from a lack of weapons. From mid-1920 it became, by necessity, engaged in defensive work, particularly in Belfast. Because of these considerations Robert Lynch claims that 'the creation of IRA Divisions in Ulster in the Spring of 1921... signalled the birth of the Northern IRA itself.'..." (pp.147-8).

The Northern IRA was a blank slate for Collins. It became his instrument of manoeuvre with regard to the Treaty—which was unpopular at best among Republicans. There had been a great increase in IRA membership and training in the North during the Truce with the British, and Collins decided to use his new men in a spring offensive by providing them with the necessary weaponry and support from the South.

The Antrim Brigade was the 2nd Brigade of the 3rd Northern Division. It was really a North Antrim Brigade since Belfast was the 1st Brigade and the greater part of territory—about 50 miles—between Belfast and the Glens was held by Unionism. It was composed of four battalions organised in Ballycastle, Ballymena, Cushendall and Dunloy.

The Glens was an area quite suited to guerrilla activity but many things were against the development of a Republican military force. It was an area entirely cut off from the rest of the Nation by the great buffer of Protestant Ulster lying to the south and west. It was difficult to supply it with arms and materials for warfare.

Paul Bew Is Citeless !

Jack Lane's review (July *Irish Political Review*) of Paul Bew's *Churchill and Ireland* cited the author on the northern "conflict hit[ting] the Catholic minority [in Belfast] hardest" during the early 1920s, but that (this was Bew's main point) "Protestants in Cork were even more vulnerable than Catholics in Belfast" (p.114).

Jack referred then to "the now unmentioned (unmentionable?) Professor Peter Hart".

If Hart, the standard source on this type of allegation, was not referenced, who was? Surprisingly, Bew's startling claims are, at that point, unsourced.

Nine pages later (p.123), however, Bew cited chapter nine of Hart's 2003 essay collection *The IRA at War* on "thirteen Protestant men... killed in Cork" in late April 1922 (no page number).

That chapter is in fact an essay Hart wrote in 1996, which claimed that Cork Protestants suffered "ethnic cleansing". The source is both wrong and out of date. Hart invented an extra victim. He mistakenly claimed that 14 (not 13) West Cork Protestants were "massacred" in late April 1922 (2003, p.237). Furthermore, Hart contradicted himself in a new 2003 essay: "What happened in southern Ireland did not constitute 'ethnic cleansing'" (p.246).

Bew cited one more source: a 'recent fine essay' (in fact a speculative 2014 *Irish Independent* article) by Brian Walker, in which Walker challenged Barry Keane's much finer *Massacre in West Cork* (2014, see my response to Walker, www.academia.edu/7250216/).

In typically revisionist mode, Bew ignored Keane and other Hart critics. Perhaps they influenced his composition, however.

The question is why did Bew not cite Hart's definitive research on the subject of alleged persecution of Protestants, *The IRA and its Enemies* (1998)? It is not as though Bew took issue with the work. He enthused in 1999:

"This is a great book. The first work on the Irish revolution which can stand comparison with the best of the historiography of the French Revolution: brilliantly documented, statistically sophisticated, and superbly written."

Bew went further in the *TLS* in 2004, endorsing Hart's presentation as the yardstick by which other histories should be judged. Hart disclosed "a dirty [IRA] war" consisting of "majority Catholic violence against a minority Protestant population". Bew chided David Fitzpatrick's biography of Harry Boland for failure to emulate Hart's "sordid civil war" mode, in which Hart "offended the upholders of the nationalist version of Ireland's past". Hart "is to be praised for resisting... so bravely, at whatever price" a "sanitised version of the War of Independence".

"Whatever price" was that? Criticism of Hart's deeply flawed methodology by Brian Murphy, Meda Ryan, John Borgonovo, John Regan, Barry Keane, Padraic O'Ruairc, and others eroded ('corroded', in the words of David Fitzpatrick) Hart's reputation. So much so that in 2016 Professor Bew appears no longer in a position to cite Hart's "great book". As far as that aspect the past is concerned Paul Bew is citeless.

That has been the price of Hart's pursuit of a flawed sectarian account of the War of Independence. That account survives without benefit of evidence in the minds of true believers. In it thousands of Catholics in the North, put out of their homes and expelled from their jobs after July 1920, are somehow less 'vulnerable' than Cork Protestants. That is despite contemporary southern Irish Protestants stating the claim to be a figment of Ulster Unionist imagination. Those are the type of Protestants who did not interest Peter Hart and do not interest Paul Bew.

Niall Meehan

And most of the population was Hibernian. Ballycastle had a Sinn Fein councillor by the name of Louis Walsh but that was about it.

The IRA in North Antrim had been

formed in early 1919. Its O/C was the Belfast man Tom Glennon, who remained in charge until Tom Fitzpatrick took over in 1921. During 1920 it engaged in arms raids, gun-running, seizures of the mail, the cutting of telegraph wires, raids and

burnings of coastguard and railway stations. During 1921 it extended its operations to attacks on RIC stations in Rasharkin and Loughgiel and attempted the formation of flying columns on the Tom Barry model. The strength of the Antrim Brigade was 111 men at the start of the Truce in June 1921. By August it had increased to 260 volunteers. It retained these numbers until it met disaster in 1922.

This was an impressive development considering the circumstances and showed that North Antrim could not be cut off from the life of the Nation, despite its geographical isolation.

During the Truce large training camps were established for both the Belfast and Antrim Brigades outside Ballycastle by Eoin O'Duffy, who Collins put in charge. He acted from St. Mary's Hall in the centre of Belfast. An Engineering Department was set up and an ammunition factory created. The expanded army was re-organised, trained and armed by Collins for offensive operations. When the Unionists attempted assaults on these camps they were deterred by solid preparations.

Collins imagined that having signed a Treaty with Britain he was going to be allowed to wage a war against what Britain was constructing in the North through the Unionists. Lloyd George seems to have led him to believe this would be possible in encouraging Collins to sign the Treaty.

It was wishful thinking, of course. The moment the Treaty was signed the Unionists, in the process of organising their security apparatus, started attacking the IRA HQs and training facilities Collins had established and then Pogroms were launched against the Belfast Catholics.

After the signing of the Treaty the loyalty of the bulk of the Northern IRA was secured by a visit from Richard Mulcahy in which the Antrim commanders were assured they would be fully backed, armed, and resourced from Dublin and assisted in the destruction of the entity being constructed in the North.

The centrepiece of the plan was a Northern Rising backed by an 'invasion' of the Six Counties by the IRA Divisions loyal to Collins, in alliance with experienced Anti-Treaty fighters who Collins had lured up to the Border to bolster his offensive. An initial "Stand to" was ordered for St. Patrick's Day before mobilisation was put off by a new Collins Pact with Craig. The Northern rising was re-scheduled for mid-May 1922.

On 12-14 May hundreds of rifles sent by Collins arrived in the Glens in an oil tanker driven by an ex-British soldier,

Charlie Connolly, who bluffed his way into getting the British military to assist him when his transporter broke down. Volunteers were mobilised to distribute them and prepare for the Rising.

The Northern Rising went ahead on 19th May. It involved widespread IRA activity across Belfast and the rest of Ulster. In North Antrim the main railway line was sabotaged at Dunloy; Ballycastle Barracks was attacked; Ballymena Railway station was fired; Massereene Castle was destroyed in Antrim; Cushendun and Martinstown barracks were attacked; an assault was made on Randalstown; the Unionist (Lord Cushendun) John MacNeill's house was gutted; and bridges were demolished across the County.

However:

"Having drawn many of the most active Republican fighters to the North Collins, presumably under increasing British pressure, decided to subvert the Northern offensive himself, resulting in it going off at half-cock.

"The 2nd Northern Division went into action in the Six Counties but found the two Pro-Treaty Border Divisions mysteriously failing to act in support of it. Collins held back the Pro-Treaty IRA in Longford and Monaghan, presumably in preparation for his impending war on the opponents of the Treaty in the South... The 3rd Northern Division began its offensive in Down only to find itself confronted with large amounts of Specials coming from Newry, who were supposed to have been engaged by Frank Aiken's men. O'Duffy was contacted to order the 4th Northern Division into action but it failed to take the field. The 4th Northern Division under Frank Aiken which had assembled in large numbers throughout Armagh and South Down called off its offensive and began, instead, settling accounts with local Unionists. The IRA in Belfast, Down and North Antrim were isolated and mopped up by the Specials.

"Although Frank Aiken had been ordered to stand down his men and to cancel the offensive Collins neglected to inform the 2nd and 3rd Northern Divisions which covered the bulk of the Six Counties outside of Armagh and Fermanagh" (*Catastrophe*, pp. 165-6).

In any objective assessment of the conflict in North Antrim, the terrorism that took place was done so entirely by the Ulster Unionists against the ordinary folk of the Glens. The IRA conducted the open and honourable warfare as part of the Irish democracy, assisted by those in Dublin who signed the Treaty. A look at the events of June 1922 in North Antrim, after Collins had subverted his own policy, reveals this.

On 23 June three lorry loads of police

rolled into Cushendall. The day before Collins had had Sir Henry Wilson, former Chief of the Imperial General Staff, and then organiser of the new Ulster security apparatus, assassinated in London. The Specials were determined on reprisal and any Catholic would do.

In calling for an inquiry into the events in Cushendall that day Joe Devlin asked Churchill in the House of Commons on 27th July:

"Mr. DEVLIN asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the circumstances under which three young men, John Gore, James McAllister, and John Hill, were killed in Cushendall, County Antrim, on the night of Friday, 23rd June last, by members of the Ulster special police, who arrived in the village with British soldiers in motor lorries and Crossley cars; whether he is aware that the Northern Government has issued an official statement to the effect that these men were killed in an attempt to ambush a party of special; that overwhelming testimony is forthcoming from eye-witnesses that there was no ambush or attempted ambush on the occasion; that the killing was deliberate and unprovoked; that on arrival in Cushendall the specials opened fire on the people who were standing in the streets, and when these scattered and fled to shelter, the specials entered houses where John Gore and John Hill were, and, after asking these men what religion they were, shot them on learning they were Catholics; and that the specials had arrested James McAllister when he was cycling along the country road to his home in Glenariffe, and brought him in a motor to Cushendall, where they shot him dead under revolting circumstances; and whether, in view of these facts, he will appoint an impartial commission to inquire into the matter, or, otherwise, send an independent representative to investigate the facts on the spot and report to the Imperial Government?"

The subsequent Inquiry into the cold-blooded massacre was quashed on the basis that it was the responsibility of the new 'Northern Ireland' Government, rather than an Imperial matter. So nothing ever came of it. The details of Barrington-Ward's Inquiry were placed under the *Official Secrets Act*, barring it from view for 50 years. T.P. O'Connor was told that the British Government had commissioned the report only because British troops had been involved. The Coalition made only a feeble effort to get Craig's Government to explain themselves. Barrington-Ward's report was due to be made public in 1972 but was then delayed for a further 25 years until the Good Friday Agreement talks forced its release.

On 24th May, just outside Cushendall,

at Glenariffe, local Volunteers assembled a large ambush on the coast road the Specials had to negotiate beside the cliff face. (*Antrim's Patriot Dead* gives the Ambush date as 24th June, after the massacre in Cushendall, in conflict with other accounts.) Reconnaissance took place at the lower levels of the glen, known as the 'sand fields', not far from what is Glenariffe's hurling pitch, today. This flat area, with its hedgerows and ditches, offered the Volunteers cover whilst also providing areas to retreat if necessary.

However, the Specials did not show all day and, as darkness fell, the Volunteers stood down leaving only Charlie McAllister and Pat McVeigh remaining in position while the other members of the unit retired for the night.

During the evening McAllister and McVeigh decided to leave the sand-fields and take up higher ground on the side of Carneill Mountain in a rocky area known as the Slaughans. They may have been journeying to the other side of the rock face to join up with an ambush party further down the road preparing a mine on Ardclinis Bridge for the Specials. This was, for some reason, detonated before two lorry loads of Specials arrived and McVeigh and McAllister appear to have engaged the Specials from the rock face, perhaps to cover the retreat of their comrades. The two men had been joined by Pat Graham, another local Volunteer.

The three Volunteers were trapped on the rock face and engaged the enemy over a prolonged period until all their ammunition was spent. The Specials closed in and killed Pat McVeigh and Charlie McAllister, mutilating with bayonets as they had done with one of the victims of the Cushendall massacre a day earlier. Their bodies were left for locals to find and recover—which they did with great shock.

Pat Graham managed to escape over the top of the mountain under fire from the Specials and trekked across the Antrim plateau to Carnlough. A bullet is reputed to have fortunately struck his revolver. He later fled to America.

An attempt was made by another volunteer unit from Waterfoot, led by the O/C, Tom Fitzpatrick, to rescue the men. This help, however, arrived too late to save McAllister & McVeigh.

Pat McVeigh and Charlie McAllister are buried not far from where they fell in the small churchyard in Glenariffe. Glenariffe GAA club, The Oisíns, play their hurling matches at the McAllister & McVeigh Memorial Park, in Glenariffe,

which was opened in 1947. It is here, through the gates, that the community centre was to be built.

The price that the DUP seems to be attempting to exact on the Nationalist people of the Glens seems to be one of having to erase their memories of the struggle they took part in to establish a national democracy in Ireland in order to receive Council money. Perhaps some of the money frittered away on reconciliation with fundamentalists could be given to the people who supported democracy in 1918-22 instead.

Whilst Dublin collaborates in Remem-

brance of Britain's Great War it all washes over the Unionists. *No Commemoration Here!*

The people of the Glens were badly affected by what happened after Collins' plans led to disaster in 1922. They were largely quelled for the best part of a century. But the DUP actions have shown that passivity is really no longer an option. The build-up to the Centenary of these events will indeed be interesting if the DUP find that, instead of destroying memory, they contribute to a revival of it.

Pat Walsh

The Catholic Predicament In 'Northern Ireland', by Pat Walsh:

Catastrophe: 1914-1968
334pp. €24, £20

Resurgence: 1969-2016
586pp. €30, £25

Postfree in Ireland and Britain

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR · LETTERS TO THE EDITOR · LETTERS TO THE EDITOR ·

In defence of Casement

In response to David Alvey's letter (*Irish Political Review* July 2016, *In defence of Casement*) I wish to confirm that the paragraph he quoted is not an expression of my attitude to the centenary but rather a summary of the viewpoint upon which Alan Phelan's exhibition is based.

This viewpoint sees the nationalism of Casement and his political comrades, as pertaining to the contemporary world, to be defective and passé. It sees that nationalism as something needing to be superseded. In its place will gradually emerge a blending of nations into pan-European and, eventually, even global structures.

It is ironic that we commemorate the 1916 Rising which sought Ireland's exit from a sovereign political union which embraced England, Scotland and Wales, while simultaneously upholding a long term goal of entry into a sovereign political union consisting of a multiplicity of former European nation states, in which, because of our proportionate size in relation to the whole, we will be in a position of yet much greater insignificance.

It is such ironies as the above which ought to induce reflection.

Of course, it could be, the movers and shakers at the top of our political structures do not fully believe in the ideal of an eventual sovereign European union, but rather play along with the concept for pragmatic reasons.

The outlook expressed in Phelan's exhibition is widely held within artistic and literary circles as well as influential circles of state and commerce.

Let us take the arch-Guru of Globalism himself, Peter Sutherland, now the United Nations special representative of the secretary general for international migration. Sutherland was educated by the Jesuits at Gonzaga College, Dublin. While manifesting physically before pilgrims at the National Novena to Our Lady of Knock, at Knock Shrine on 17th August 2015, Sutherland, expressing his interpretation of Catholic social teaching, stated "people are to be united, not divided, on the basis of their shared values, not on the basis of national identities, such as those which some have thought of in the past as a basis for dividing humanity.."

Instead of going through the motions of centenary commemoration in a spirit of thoughtless compliance Phelan challenged head on. While not sharing his views, I can respect the provocative stance the artist has taken.

Tim O'Sullivan

Shorts

from
the Long Fellow

NAMA IN THE NORTH

In all the hue and cry over corruption nothing of substance has been found against NAMA. There have been minor incidences of insider trading by employees of that organisation, which have been dealt with by the courts. But this is not to say that there has been no corruption by other parties.

One of the difficulties that NAMA faced was that it was not allowed to sell loans back to the original debtor. This was understandable from a political point of view: the idea of delinquent debtors who caused the crisis being allowed to benefit from it would have been difficult to sell politically. However, the consequence of this was that a vast swathe of domestic property developers were excluded from the selling process. This gave an advantage to foreign investors.

It was in the immediate interests of NAMA for the foreign investors to enter the game. Firstly, foreign interest in the property backed loans would mean that a reasonable price could be obtained for the assets in a situation where a market hardly existed. Secondly, the ability of foreign investment funds to buy multiple assets meant that NAMA could offload its portfolio quickly and thereby saving on transaction costs.

While property developers in Northern Ireland were excluded from the process, this did not apply to the accountants and lawyers who had advised them. No class of people were in a better position to advise on consolidating the assets to be sold and carrying out the necessary due diligence (they knew all about the assets from their former clients). These people were able to name their fee to the prospective foreign buyers.

The foreign investors have made vast profits, but it should also be remembered that they put vast amounts of their money at risk. Also, many of the critics of the asset sales are speaking with the benefit of hindsight. When the assets were originally transferred from the banks they thought that NAMA had bought duds.

With such vast sums at stake it seems that some of the accountants and lawyers have been greedy. To add spice to pro-

ceedings the Democratic Unionist Party appears to have had a close relationship with many of the individuals involved. But so far there has been no evidence of political corruption in relation to the NAMA sales. While at least one DUP politician attempted unsuccessfully to make NAMA waive loan guarantees, there is no evidence of a politician using his influence in order that NAMA would obtain a price that was less than it would have otherwise achieved.

HOUSING CRISIS

When the recession first hit the Republic of Ireland in 2008, it was widely believed that it was partly caused by a property bubble and that the economy had become unbalanced. Too much of our resources were devoted to property. And yet within a few years we now apparently have a housing crisis.

Recent figures suggest that building new houses is only part of the solution. The legacy of over 30 years of no property taxes has had its effect. The vacancy rate of our housing stock (excluding holiday homes) is about 12%. This compares to about 4.3% in the UK (2015 census figures cited by *Sunday Independent*, 12.6.16). Given that there are about 230,000 vacant housing units in this country, a vacancy rate equal to that of the UK would release almost 150,000 housing units onto the market.

It might be said that the vacant housing units are in places where nobody wants to live. But this argument does not stand up to scrutiny. The vacancy rate in Dublin is at 8%, which is still twice the UK average. While the rate in rural Ireland is about 20%, why shouldn't these properties be occupied? The most recent Census shows that the significant increase in our population is unbalanced, with big increases in Dublin and declines in Donegal. Why shouldn't the high vacancy rates in rural Ireland be used as an impetus for policies encouraging decentralisation?

FALSE SOLUTIONS: REPOSESSIONS

It is likely that the re-introduction of property taxes (opposed by the Left) will help reduce vacancy rates, but other so-called solutions will be of no help.

Recently, the Oireachtas Committee on Housing recommended a moratorium on repossessions. It does not seem that repossessions are causing homelessness. Indeed, if a recent report on court repossessions is anything to go by, the opposite is the case: the slow rate of repossessions is exacerbating the housing crisis.

In a 2015 survey (cited by Karl Deeter in the *Sunday Business Post*, 26.6.16) of 2,600 cases it was found that 97% of repossessions involved zero payments of the mortgage. While there are hard cases, this statistic suggests that many borrowers are "taking the piss". In only 10% of cases the borrower bothered to attend the court hearing. Also, in 20% of cases the repossession occurred in a vacant property. In 17% (or 450) of cases the repossession order was struck out when the borrower agreed to pay some small amount.

There is obviously a balance to be struck, especially when it comes to keeping a roof over a family's head. But has a 'humane' policy led to unintended consequences? A recent ESRI report (*The Irish Times*, 21.6.16) suggests that one of the reasons that our mortgage rates are so high (2.6% compared to an EU average of 1.9%) is that the difficulty of repossession is priced into the mortgage rate. In Spain where repossessions are easier the rate is 1.7%.

FALSE SOLUTIONS: SELLING COUNCIL HOUSES

It is difficult to understand why there has not been a political outcry at the Labour Party's policy of selling Council Houses in the midst of a housing crisis. The policy of selling Council Houses was discontinued in 2012, but was recently re-introduced with a vengeance by Labour Minister Alan Kelly. While the pre 2012 scheme gave a maximum discount of 30%, the current one gives discounts of between 40 and 60%.

And it appears that one stupid policy leads to another. Even at discounts of up to 60% many Council House tenants cannot obtain the finance to purchase their homes. If such tenants can show that they have had two refusals from the mainstream banks, they can obtain finance from the Local Authority. So, the Local Authority is lending to people that no commercial bank in its right mind would consider. It is no wonder that a massive 50% of Council mortgages are in arrears (*Sunday Independent*, 12.6.16). Dublin City Council has repossessed 3.5% of the housing it lent money to, compared to a 0.3% repossession rate by the mainstream banks (*Sunday Business Post*, 10.7.16).

CHARITABLE SERVICES

The issues raised by the maladministration in the suicide prevention charity *Console* suggest that there has been a proliferation of badly-run charities, run by highly-paid Executives, that are duplicating services, which could be more efficiently provided by the State. On RTE's *Drivetime* (15.7.16) Fergus Finlay, the

former Labour Party Programme Manager and current Chief Executive of *Barnardos*, was asked why the State was contributing funds to charities. He responded by saying that Charities can do things that the State cannot. For example, the public sector embargo on recruitment did not apply to charities. But is this not an argument for lifting the embargo rather than throwing money at wasteful charities?

ITALIAN BANKS

The recent travails of the Italian banks must have caused a wry smile among some of our senior politicians who were in the eye of the financial storm eight years ago. Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi is proposing that the State provide liquidity of up to 150 billion euro to the Italian banks. The EU, on the other hand, is opposed to such State aid and is insisting

on a creditors' bail in ("*burning the bondholders*") instead. In other words it is doing precisely the opposite to what it was compelling the Irish Government to do.

The problem that Renzi has is that, while the Italian State has a tradition of profligacy, the ordinary citizen has been prudent. Unlike in Ireland the loans to banks have come mainly from domestic Italian savers. 'Burning' such creditors will have damaging knock-on economic consequences, to say nothing of the political implications.

The Long Fellow thinks that Italy will have her way for two reasons. Firstly, it is too big to fail; and secondly, the current head of the ECB Mario Dragi was the head of the Italian Central bank when the dodgy loans were made. He will not want the collapse of the Italian banking system to be part of his legacy.

in 2003, that destroyed the functional Iraqi State and reduced Iraqi society to a condition of murderous anarchy that remains ongoing. It can be assumed that the purpose of the timing was to divert attention from the Parliamentary Party's responsibility for the War by creating a Party crisis on another issue.

The Parliamentary Party might have chosen to deal with Chilcot's condemnation another way. Its new Party Leader was one of the small number of MPs who voted against the War on Iraq. The PLP might have regained its virtue by remaking itself around the fact.

It chose the alternative course of evading discussion of its responsibility for the War by threatening the Party with destruction if the Party membership does not reverse its decision of last year.

The Parliamentary Party hinted at declaring itself to be the Labour Party and electing its own Leader, in disregard of the Party membership, on the ground that its mandate was from the electorate while Corbyn's mandate as Leader was only from the membership.

If it believed its own debating point, there was a very easy way of putting the matter to the test. Angela Eagle, a senior member of the Party, with experience in Government, might have resigned her seat and re-fought it. Why did she not do so, and prove her point that she was electable and Corbyn wasn't? Because it was a virtual certainty that she would have lost her seat—and would have had difficulty getting herself nominated by her Constituency Party. In fact, she would probably have faced an official Labour candidate in such a by-election.

Although the General Election was only last year, a great change has happened in Britain since then. Brexit has happened and Blair has become damaged goods. Deference has weakened, and in the Labour Party it has broken because, in the extreme form it took under Blairite charisma, it became very brittle when it fell to ordinary careerists to operate it.

An element not much mentioned as influencing the conduct of the Parliamentary Labour Party is the Washington connection.

The Special Relationship is a relationship of British military and economic, and therefore, political, dependency of Britain on the USA. It operates through both British parties but it comes more naturally to the Tories than to Labour—since it

Democratic Burden!

continued

influenced in its opinion, by the two-party system. It has never been the case until this year that the populace formed its own opinions and acted contrary to the advice of the two political parties that shaped it.

The two-party system ceased, at least for a moment, to be hegemonic over the populace. It seems likely that the rupture will soon be mended on the Tory side. The Tory leadership was itself divided on the issue of leaving the European Union, and the part of it that was in sympathy with the rebellion of the Tory populace has now taken command.

On the Labour Side there has, however, been a basic disjuncture between the Parliamentary Party and the Party membership. The members have elected a Leader that the Parliamentary Party refuses to serve with. The majority of the Labour Parliamentary Party now sit on the backbenches and attack the Party Leader in chorus with the Tory Party.

Jeremy Corbyn was elected Leader under a new electoral system which gave a determining influence to the ordinary party members. The election of Corbyn is being compared to the action of a Trotskyist group, the Militant Tendency, which gained control of a couple of local Labour Parties in the 1980s. Stephen Kinnock, MP—son of Neil Kinnock, who scotched the Militant Tendency years ago—says: "*We dealt with them before and we'll deal with them again*" (Sky News interview on July 12th).

The Militant Tendency at its strongest was a small fraction of the Party members who voted for Corbyn last year—and it has long been extinct.

Corbyn was in no way responsible for bringing in the electoral system that elected him. That change was made by the Parliamentary Party majority, led by Ed Miliband, that now boycotts the Leader elected by it. Tony Blair welcomed the new system.

The reason given for the boycott is that the evidence shows that Corbyn could not win an election. But the boycott began as soon as Corbyn was elected, before there could be any electoral evidence one way or another. And the evidence since Corbyn was elected shows the Labour Party improving its position at every election.

The elder statesman of the Parliamentary Party is Neil (Lord) Kinnock, who had been vociferous about Corbyn's unelectability. Lord Kinnock is one of Labour's Leaders who never won an election—and he is the only Labour Leader who threw away an election victory that was all but in the bag when he made a reckless eve-of-election speech in 1992.

The Parliamentary Party, having boycotted Corbyn's leadership for 10 months, decided to force the issue in early July by forcing another leadership election.

The timing of the push coincided with the publication of the damning Chilcot Report on the Labour Party's war on Iraq

conflicts with the socialist ideology which Labour cannot quite discard without ceasing to be Labour. Washington therefore needs to take extra special care of Labour to keep it in line.

Some details of the most recent Washington operation in the inner circle of British Labour have been brought to light recently by Robert Stevens. He explains:

"The murky world of the UK's Blairite anti-Corbyn coup plotters"

The attempt to remove UK Labour Party leader Jeremy Corbyn is being spearheaded by right-wing supporters of former Labour leader Tony Blair. These forces, who aim to either take over or destroy the Labour Party and set up a new right-wing party, are working in intimate collusion with the security services in Britain and the United States.

The plot was enacted immediately after the June 23 referendum vote for Britain to leave the EU. The organisers of the putsch seek to reverse the referendum result and re-fashion the Labour Party as the central tool to carry this out.

Among those playing a leading role against Corbyn is Labour MP Ruth Smeeth. She was elected as a Labour MP at the 2015 general election, after working in public relations at multinational food and facilities management company, Sodexo. She later worked in public relations for Nestlé. In between, she held a post with the pro-Israel lobby group, Britain Israel Communications and Research Centre (BICOM).

On June 27, Smeeth resigned her position in Corbyn's shadow cabinet as Parliamentary Private Secretary for the shadow Northern Ireland and Scotland teams. This was part of more than 60 coordinated resignations from Corbyn's shadow cabinet organised by the plotters, with the aim of precipitating a no-confidence vote and forcing his resignation.

Corbyn refused to resign.

On June 30, Smeeth staged a stunt at a press conference where Corbyn was launching a report into the manufactured claims from Labour's right wing that the party under his leadership was anti-Semitic. Smeeth stormed out of the meeting, with her office later claiming she had been reduced to tears. She made an official complaint to the party after claiming, "a Jeremy Corbyn supporter" had "used traditional anti-Semitic slurs to attack me for being part of a 'media conspiracy'"—a reference to a statement that she was working with the *Daily Telegraph*.

Smeeth claimed that under Corbyn, Labour was not a "safe space for British Jews". She called on Corbyn to stand down as leader "immediately and make way for someone with the backbone to confront racism and anti-Semitism in our party and in the country."

Smeeth describes herself as "a lifelong Labour Party campaigner," a former trade union officer and activist.

What is generally not known is that she was identified by WikiLeaks, via a US embassy diplomatic cable, as a "strictly protect" US informant.

The cable, dated April 24, 2009, was one of more than 251,287 made public by WikiLeaks and is headed "UK POLITICAL SNAPSHOT". It notes, "Labour Prospective Parliamentary Candidate for Burton [the seat she contested and lost, prior to winning another in 2015] Ruth Smeeth (strictly protect) told us April 20 that [former Labour Prime Minister Gordon] Brown had intended to announce the elections on May 12, and hold them after a very short (matter of weeks) campaign season."

The cable ends: "(Note: This information has not been reported in the press.)"

The cable testifies to the intimate connections that Labour's plotters have to the US state and intelligence agencies. However, it is just the tip of the iceberg.

Ruth Smeeth is married to Michael Smeeth, a member of the executive body of the British-American Project (BAP). The BAP describes itself as a "transatlantic fellowship of over 1,000 leaders, rising stars and opinion formers from a broad spectrum of occupations, backgrounds and political views."

A November 2004 *Guardian* article noted that the BAP, which was essential in the formation of Blair's New Labour, "has been described as a Trojan horse for US foreign policy."

The article reported that following Blair's first election victory in 1997, BAP released a private circular headlined, "Big Swing To BAP." The circular stated, "No less than four British-American Project fellows and one advisory board member have been appointed to ministerial posts in the new Labour government."

These included Mo Mowlam, Chris Smith, Peter Mandelson, Baroness Symons, George Robertson, Jonathan Powell, Geoff Mulgan, and Matthew Taylor."

Mandelson was Blair's closest adviser. Powell was Blair's chief of staff and was previously posted at the British Embassy in Washington in 1991. Robertson, now a life peer as Baron Robertson of Port Ellen, was Blair's Defence Secretary. He became NATO Secretary General from October 1999 to January 2004. Symons was Blair's Minister for the Middle East, International Security, Consular and Personal Affairs in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. The *Guardian* named another Blairite, Douglas Alexander, then Foreign Office and Trade Minister, as a BAP member. David Miliband, the brother of Ed Miliband, Corbyn's predecessor as Labour leader, was another BAP member.

The BAP includes a number of prominent UK and US journalists and broadcasters among its membership. A UK journalist, Yasmin Alibhai-Brown, told the *Guardian* of one BAP conference: "The amount of drink, the way you were treated, the dinners with everyone who

was anyone. ... Jonathan Powell [Tony Blair's chief of staff] used to come a lot. I remember having many an argument with him beside swimming pools in white towelling dressing gowns. ... It was money that I'd never seen at any conference before. We [the participants] used to joke, "This is obviously funded by the CIA."

The BAP is certainly well financed. Journalist John Pilger wrote in a December 2007 article published in the *New Statesman*, "Since 1985, BAP 'alumni' and 'fellows' have been brought together courtesy of Coca-Cola, Monsanto, Saatchi & Saatchi, Philip Morris and British Airways, among other multinationals."

The BAP was established in 1985 under the US Republican administration of Ronald Reagan with a mission "to perpetuate the close relationship between the United States and Britain."

...

Labourite Nick Butler was central to the BAP's formation. The *Guardian* article states that he "was treasurer of the influential left-leaning pressure group the Fabian Society and a promising junior player in the Labour party." It cites Butler as saying, "The UK was in a bad state. ... America seemed much more dynamic, full of ideas, open" ... (22 July 2016, World Socialist Party website: <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2016/07/22/smee-j22.html>).

Another member of the BAP circle is Sadiq Khan, recently elected Mayor of London, who resigned from Parliament on becoming Mayor and therefore was not required to take up a position on the Parliamentary mutiny against Corbyn. He has not declared support for Corbyn's rival, Owen Smith, possibly seeing that he is too shallow an opportunist to succeed.

He is saving himself for a future opportunity.

That David Miliband, the last Labour Foreign Secretary, had an extra special relationship with Washington came as no surprise. The surprise was that his brother, Ed, was not in that circle. Was he courted and refused, or was he just considered not worth courting? It was known that Ed disagreed with his brother about the significance of their father, Ralph (Editor of *The Socialist Register*), as a socialist influence. David rejected his father and Ed didn't, so perhaps Washington decided he was gormless and ignored him. And then Ed won the previous leadership contest with his brother by a nose—and he changed everything by changing the method of electing the Leader.

Ed was elected Leader by the old, balanced, electorate. The Trade Union vote helped him to win. Ruth Dudley Edwards (who was for a generation a

member of the Tory elite in England but has now reverted to an appropriate mode of Irishness) took a side-swipe at the British Trade Unions in her *Sunday Independent* column of July 17th:

"On a Sunday afternoon in May, I was sitting in a pub with friends when Len McCluskey, the Unite General Secretary, brushed past our table, saw on it the pub's copy of *The Sun On Sunday* and said quite aggressively, 'You shouldn't read that paper. It's fascist, sexist. You shouldn't be reading it.'

This self-important, far-left bully is the man who brought the Labour Party Ed Miliband, helped create the crazy voting system that elected Jeremy Corbyn, and is keeping in power an incompetent who can no longer even staff his front bench. The party's Kingmaker has become its Destroyer."

Edwards contrasts the "*steeliness*" with which Theresa May took command of the Tory Party and overcame the Brexit confusion with the way "*the Labour party is being destroyed by the hard-left*" but she doesn't explain the basis of the difference.

The Tory Party never lost touch with its fascist, sexist hinterland on the Right.

Tory leaders have always understood—with only one exception in recent generations—that they led a semi-fascist party and that an important part of their business in the Centre Ground role-playing of what is called Parliamentary Government is the handling of the fascist hinterland—not to suppress it or try to eradicate it, but to handle it while allowing it room for existence.

The leader who did not know that, or who forgot it, was the naive, petty-bourgeois European, Ted Heath, who was the first elected Tory leader. Heath was given his head for the purpose of getting Britain into a Europe that was doing very well without it. But then, when he tried to adapt Britain to the European mode instead of using British membership to obstruct European development from within, he was got rid of, and the Tory Party reverted to the Churchillian mode under Thatcher.

The stability of the British system since the Great War has depended largely on the ability of the Tory Party to restrict the fascist element by representing it.

Churchill was a declared supporter of European fascism as being necessary to preserve capitalist civilisation amidst the elemental forces set loose by the Great War and the catastrophic Versailles Treaty. And he was frankly of the opinion that the Parliamentary system could not survive

the emergence of a two-party system that was Capitalist versus Socialist in earnest.

The Parliamentary system was preserved during the 1930s by the effective suspension of party-politics by a series of National Coalitions: Tory/Labour/Liberal Coalitions, led first by MacDonald, who was as close to being a Socialist as any Labour Leader has ever been, and then by Baldwin, and Chamberlain and Churchill, Tories.

If that suspension of party-politics had not worked, and an explicit fascist movement had developed, there is little doubt that the Fascist Leader would have been Churchill.

There was no Party Government in Britain from 1931 to 1945. The third Tory leader after the restoration of party democracy in 1945, the all-knowing and studiously 'moderate' Harold Macmillan, reflected that, if explicitly fascist government had been found necessary in Britain, its enthusiasts would not have worn Brown Shirts or Blue Shirts but Norfolk Jackets.

It was bad of Len McCluskey not to have understood the historic significance of the *Sun On Sunday* lying on Ruth Dudley Edwards' table. But then again it is a necessary quality of the unique British party system that neither party understands how the other works—or does not admit to it if it does.

The system works best when it works by means of ignorantly abusive repartee between the parties. But, in the Northern Ireland region of the state, excluded from the system but subject to it, one was driven towards analysis and a degree of dispassionate understanding.

The problem with the British Labour Party is that the Parliamentary Party disowned its Socialist hinterland and tried to stamp it out. This work was begun by Neil Kinnock and carried to apparent success by Tony Blair's evangelical campaigns. It is said that British Socialism owed more to Methodism than to Marxism, and Blair was skilled at manipulating the Methodist residue for the purpose of negating the Party membership and re-making the Party into a replacement for the great Liberal Party that destroyed itself in 1916.

The Blairite regime treated the Trade Unions like dirt. But the Trade Unions retained a flicker of life and made a small gesture of dissent, which led to the unravelling of Blairism.

The wastelands of what was industrial

England until Margaret Thatcher took it in hand rebelled against Blair's uncharismatic heirs.

The Labour Party is going to be remade one way or the other—whether by Corbyn himself or by an opportunist rival who recreates himself in Corbyn's image. The balance of English democracy may yet be restored in close approximation to its historic norm of contained Fascism on one side and contained Bolshevism on the other.

Postscript

An item confirming the statement made in the opening paragraph of this Editorial has come to our attention. In a speech made to military graduates, made by President Obama on May 28th 2014, he said:

"The United States is and remains the one indispensable nation. That has been true for the century passed and it will be true for the century to come. ... Russia's aggression toward former Soviet states unnerves capitals in Europe, while China's economic rise and military reach worries its neighbors. From Brazil to India, rising middle classes compete with us, and governments seek a greater say in global forums... It will be your generation's task to respond to this new world. The question we face, the question each of you will face, is not whether America will lead, but how we will lead—not just to secure our peace and prosperity, but also extend peace and prosperity around the globe..."

"America's willingness to apply force around the world is the ultimate safeguard against chaos, and America's failure to act in the face of Syrian brutality or Russian provocations not only violates our conscience, but invites escalating aggression in the future... We don't have a choice to ignore what happens beyond our borders."

The world conflict between the systems of Capitalism and Communism was won by Capitalism 25 years ago. The middle classes of the world were set free to follow their own inclinations. That was repeatedly said to be the purpose for which Communism must be defeated. But now it is revealed that the prospect facing the world as a consequence of the freeing of middle class development is chaos.

Capitalist freedom which will not result in anarchy is only possible under United States world dominance, "*A most ingenious paradox!*"

Sasamach

"La vraie vie et absente'... Mais nous sommes en monde. La métaphysique surgit et se maintient dans cet alibi" —**Emmanuel Levinas: *Totalité et Infini*** ("The true life is absent'. But we are in the world. Metaphysics misses and is maintained in this alibi.")

The *European Idea* arose from a yearning for something that was missing, something once present and was lost, without which life ceased to have inherent meaning.

The origins of the European Union are succinctly outlined by Seán de Fréine as follows:

"Sa bhliain 1945, tar eis an *Dara Cogadh Domhanda* bhí mórúin den Euraip ina smionagar den dara huain laistig de ghlúin. Ach an t-am seo bhí an scéal í bhfad níos measa ná mar a bhí í 1918. San ár nua seo maraíodh 55 mhilliún duine ar fad, goineadh 35 mhilliún, bhí 3 mhilliún ar iarraidh. San Euraip feib bhí 30 mhilliún díláithread. Gearmánaigh den chuid ba mhó, a díbríodh as a náitreabh dúchais. Bhí tíortha Oirtheas na hEorpa ar fad beagnach faoi smacht Rúiseach, agus an t-aon dá thír nach raibh, an Fhionlainn agus an Ghréig, bhí siad faoi bhagairt.

Tháinig triúr státaireí chun cinn a raibh de aisling acu córas nua a thógáil nach ligfeadh a leithéid de thubaiste tarlú arís. Ar dhuine acu bhí Robert Schuman (1886-1963) na Fraince, a bhain le Páirtí Ghluaiseacht Dhaonlathach an Phobail (MRP). Sa bhliain 1950 d'fhoilsigh sé doiciméad ar a tugadh Plean Schuman Mhol an plean go mbanófaí comhargadh guaíl, iarainn agus cruach ar feadh croga bliain i measc tíortha Iarthar Eorpa, D'fhailligh beart Daonlathach Críostaí go croíúil roimb an phlean, Konrad Adenauer (1876-1967) seansailéir na hIar-ghearmáine (fear a d'fhulaing príosún faoi na Naitsithe) agus Alcide de Gasperi (1881-1954), príomh-aire na hIodáile."

(*Ciste Cúrsaí Ríaita*, p53-4)

"In the year 1945 after the Second World War much of Europe was in smithereens for the second time within a generation. But this time the story was much worse than it had been in 1918. In this new slaughter 55 million people in all were killed, 35 million were injured, 3 million were missing. In Europe itself there were 30 million displaced persons, Germans for the most part, who had been driven out of their homes. The countries of Eastern Europe were almost all under Russian rule, and the only two countries that were not, Finland and Greece, were under threat.

Three statesmen appeared who had the vision of building a new system that would not allow such a disaster to happen again. One of them was Robert Schuman of France, who was a member of the MRP party. In the year 1950 he published

a document. It was called the Schuman Plan. The Plan recommended the foundation of a common market for coal, iron and steel for 50 years among the countries of Western Europe. The plan got a hearty welcome from two Christian Democrats, Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of West Germany (a man who had suffered prison under the Nazis) and Alcide de Gasperi, Prime Minister of Italy."

"*Ne sluchayno, tovarichchi!*"

"*It is no accident, comrades!*" (as Stalin used to say) that it was Christian Democracy that was the source of the European project. Apart from Christianity, Europe really has no meaning other than a geographical expression.

Outside the Minster in the city of York there is a statue of Constantine lounging on a throne with his back to the Church. He looks thoughtful. He has just been told that he is now Emperor. When Constantine got up off his throne he turned round and entered the Minster.

He found, or rather forged, in Orthodox Catholic Christianity a convenient ideology for the diverse subjects of a cosmopolitan Empire. It wasn't easy to impose—accounts of Constantine's antics at the Council of Nicea are reminiscent of the Cultural Revolution in China, including Orthodox Bishops *jet-planing heretical* Bishops. But he achieved it. But, up to the Protestant Reformation, there was a cultural entity called Europe which survived the Dark Ages and enjoyed at least two Renaissances, once in the 12th and 13th century and another in the 15th and 16th. It had an international language, Latin, and Jerome's *Vulgate* translation of the Bible into the international tongue.

When Nietzsche described Luther as "*a bigoted mediaeval monk*" I think he was probably right. But Luther did comparatively little harm. It is Henry VIII's creation of a purely political church—a truly Constantinian creation—that laid the foundation for an English policy in Europe that only really took off after the English had tried and failed to solve their theological differences and had resorted to the Glorious Revolution.

Eighteenth and nineteenth century English Balance of Power interference in

Europe culminated in the onslaught of 1914. I mean an onslaught that destroyed European culture because it destroyed the civilisation that was the bearer of that culture. "*The lamps are going out all over Europe*", murmured Sir Edward Grey, "*I fear we shall not see them lit again...*" And they never were lit again.

Both Italian Fascism and German Nazism are essentially English creations, the former being the product of British conduct towards Italy during and after the First World War; the latter the product of an extraordinary love/hate attitude compounded of resentment at the Versailles settlement and goggle-eyed admiration for the genocidal efficiency of the Anglo-Saxon Race—especially in America.

When Britain started the Second World War it ensured that the continent of Europe would be devastated. The survivors had every reason to look askance at British foreign policy: *timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*—I fear the British even when they bear gifts.

Samuel Huntington pointed out in his book on the clash of civilisations that during the Second World War Europe simply ceased to exist. And, after the Russian and American interventions had created the framework for a new Western and a new Eastern Europe, Europeans still found themselves living in a battlefield of warring ideologies representing world-historical choice between Communism and Capitalism. The Alliance of German and Italian Christian Democracy with some sort of secular equivalent in France formed the nucleus of a system which might prove immune to British Balance of Power manoeuvres, while it could not conceivably be impermeable to American Great Power hegemony.

When Heath succeeded where Macmillan had failed, and gained entry to Europe for the UK, it was on the basis of the Napoleonic maxim: "*On s'engage et puis on voit!*"—"You make contact, and then we'll see!" There has to be engagement with the enemy, and Europe has been the enemy since the French Revolution. It is the home of dangerous heresies but also dangerously seductive delights, a sort of cross between the Land of Murder [murrderrr] and the Costa del Fish 'n' Chips.

For 40 years now the British have been carefully managing the affairs of Europe to no-one's mutual advantage. They had made themselves indispensable, central; they have created a *de facto* hegemonic role for themselves despite the far greater weight of France and Germany by all

rational calculations. They can only have done it by sleight of hand, and today there is no Adenauer or Gasperi to draw attention to the shortcomings of the European costume. It has been a truly remarkable achievement.

And now it is over. For the English people have spoken. The real England—not Middle England either in its geographic or social sense, but the real England. They have reverted with exultation to being what it was once their proudest boast to be: the Protestant Island!

Nowadays, of course, that has no theological overtones, since none are needed, as they were when it was found expedient to invent the Church of England. Today, it simply means that England can bask in splendid isolation and go on living off the rest of the world without indulging in the gross hypocrisy of pretending to be anything other than what it is: insular, chauvinistic, xenophobic, deferential and docile. And old lion gone in the teeth, probably wagging its mangey tail.

But there is a problem for the Protestant Island: it has land borders with Scotland and Ireland. In Northern Ireland only the Protestant heartland of Antrim and Down produced a majority for Brexit; the Foyle constituency voted 78% to remain and the poor BBC newsreader had to explain to viewers that it was a Northern Ireland constituency—without, however, mentioning Stroke City! In Scotland 68% voted for the European Union, and preparations are already underway for the next referendum on Independence.

The Foreign Office must be furious that some idiot actually let the people have their say.

Just before the Falklands War, at a meeting of the Conservative Philosophy Group, Edward Norman (then Dean of Peterhouse) attempted to mount a Christian argument for nuclear weapons. The discussion moved on to "*Western values*". Margaret Thatcher said in effect that Norman had shown that the Bomb was necessary for the defence of our values.

Enoch Powell replied:

"No, we do not fight for values. I would fight for this country even if it had a communist government."

Thatcher said: "Nonsense, Enoch. If I send British troops abroad, it will be to defend our values."

"No Prime Minister", said Powell, "values exist in a transcendental realm, beyond space and time. They can neither be fought for, nor destroyed."

Mrs. Thatcher looked utterly baffled. She had just been presented with the difference between Toryism and American Republicanism. (John Casey.)

It is tempting to close with Enoch's most famous utterance: "*As I look ahead, I am filled with foreboding. Like the Roman, I seem to see the River Tiber foaming with much blood.*"

However, I prefer the slightly more upbeat Heine:

*"O lasst uns endlich Taten sehn
Verbrechen, blutig, Kolossal,
Nur diese satte Tugend nicht
Und zahlungsfähige Moral."*

"O let us see deeds at last, crimes bloody and colossal, but not any more of this bland virtue and solvent morality."

Niall Cusack

TRUMP

continued

SPIEGEL: Germany obviously plays an important role in Trump's considerations. He addressed Germany specifically and demanded that the German government pay in the future for the security provided by the American troops stationed there—otherwise they could be withdrawn.

Flynn: We have to look at the cost of resourcing the US military around the world. How is that cost incurred, and how is that cost paid for? I'll give you an example. The Chinese get over 40 percent of their oil from the Middle East through the Persian Gulf, but have you ever seen a Chinese aircraft carrier sitting inside the Persian Gulf? For at least 40 years, the United States of America has been guaranteeing Chinese energy supplies. Sitting here today, the US provides funds to, honest to God, 99 percent of the countries on the planet. We even give North Korea humanitarian aid. We give them food, and God knows what they do with it. They probably feed it to the crooks in the headquarters. This is not about an antagonistic relationship with Germany or NATO. This is about looking and examining what the needs are going forward for the 21st century and who is going to pay for it.

SPIEGEL: In December, Trump cursed German Chancellor Angela Merkel, complaining that she was too soft in the refugee crisis. Is that not counterproductive for cooperation?

Flynn: Yes.

SPIEGEL: Beside the factual questions, he was very tough in his language.

Flynn: I think all of Europe has been too soft on the refugee crisis.

SPIEGEL: But he offended Merkel.

Does that serve to strengthen alliances?

Flynn: If she was offended by it, she was offended by it. That's the business. But the point was the really incredibly poor decisions when it comes to allowing this unbelievable, unprecedented refugee crisis that's going on in Europe. Why are these people rushing to the beauty and strength of Europe and to the United States and not rushing to their own capitals or the capitals of the Muslim world? We ought to be pushing back. We ought to be putting people back on these boats and putting them back into the places where they came from and telling these leaders in the Arab world, "*You have a responsibility as well*"...

SPIEGEL: Can you explain Trump's fascination for strong leaders like Vladimir Putin or Saddam Hussein, whom he recently praised as an effective hunter of terrorists?

Flynn: He respects people who are selfish about their country. Putin is a guy who is very selfish about Russia and about the Russian federation, and he understands the history of his country. You can't say, "I don't like you." You've got to respect him. He's a world leader.

SPIEGEL: Is Putin a reliable partner for America?

Flynn: Putin will be a reliable partner for certain things for the United States, yes. Absolutely. We need to have a relationship from the top to the bottom, same with China.

SPIEGEL: Trump just urged Saudi Arabia and Japan to become nuclear powers as well. With comments like that, is he not encouraging a dangerous nuclear arms race?

Flynn: The threat of nuclear warfare is very, very low. Trump is no fool, and he sees the world as a globalized world. In the conversation we're having right now, we're talking about historical aspects of regions of the world, so sort of world history. It's not that he needs a lesson in world history, but it's very important that you understand the history of Europe, the history of Africa, the history of the Middle East. What are the trends that we could expect to see in the next few years, like the next 10 to 50? Will there be another major war? Will there be a war between China and the United States? We talked a lot about that, and we talked about sort of what were the "What If's?" What are the potentials, and what are the things you need to be prepared for when you step into office?

SPIEGEL: North Korean dictator Kim Jong Un endorsed Trump and pledged to support him in the campaign.

Flynn: I found it funny. I mean, the guy is smoking cigarettes while they're launching missiles. Trump probably laughed about it, like I did.

SPIEGEL: How important is foreign policy to Trump?

Flynn: His No. 1 priority is the US economy, but I would say foreign policy and national security are in the top, probably, two if not three topics.

SPIEGEL: His foreign policy speeches have sounded vague and in some parts even contradictory. Would you agree that there is no solid foreign policy program right now?

Flynn: No. Foreign policy is about US national security, it is definitely not non-intervention. It is definitely not isolationist. That's where people want to hear what they want to hear and not listen to what he says. It is about national security for the United States, and that's fine.

SPIEGEL: Either way, he is demanding in his speeches that other countries take care of their own problems.

Flynn: And I think that's right—that the United States should not have to intervene in every single problem around the world. The voters of this country are reacting in a very big, broad way to Mr. Trump. They are frustrated by lousy decisions made by both George W. Bush and Barack Obama. Look at the mess we have.

SPIEGEL: Are you speaking about the Iraq war?

Flynn: We're speaking about three incredibly stupid decisions. The first one was the invasion in Iraq. They said there was a nuclear weapons thing, but we were actually responding to the attack of 9/11. All of a sudden, somebody threw in this other, like, "Hey, maybe we can use this as an excuse."

SPIEGEL: That was Bush's decision. What about Obama?

Flynn: Obama's decision to leave, to not sustain the victory that resulted after eight years of fighting, from 2003 to 2011 in Iraq, was another incredibly stupid decision. It was totally based on politics, not based on any notion of national security. It's a nightmare for our national security. And then you have the Libya intervention.

SPIEGEL: You're speaking about the decision by NATO to overthrow Libyan dictator Muammar Gadhafi in the fall of 2011.

Flynn: You look at Libya, and you go, "Jesus, why the hell did we do that?" That's beyond stupid. That's so irresponsible and dangerous for our national security and frankly for the national security of Europe because you go and you look at where a lot of these refugees are coming out of, they're coming out of Misrata and Tripoli.

SPIEGEL: Trump would not repeat those kinds of mistakes?

Flynn: He would avoid those stupid decisions. When you look back, history is not going to be kind to these last 16 years.

SPIEGEL: For a long time, conservatives have pushed for the export of democracy and human rights. Will that come to an end if Trump becomes president?

Flynn: Yes, because it's wrong. The United States acted under a mis-interpretation of a concept that we wanted to implement the system of democracy all around the world.

SPIEGEL: After the harsh words about

Muslims, many view Mr. Trump as being racist and an enemy of freedom of religion.

Flynn: The wording was sort of wrong and I would not have said it the way he said it. But I also would not try to be politically correct either. There must be a ban for individuals who espouse this notion of radical Islamism, period.

...

Flynn: I know Donald Trump as a very adaptive person. In my nearly three and a half decades of being in the military, I've had maybe one, maybe two guys that I've worked for that were that adaptive in combat. He adapts to the great challenges, with his own sort of street smarts and his instincts.

(Contributed by **David Morrison**)

Lord Roberts and Luke Wadding: *Memorials in Waterford*

According to the *Irish Times*, 18th May 2014:

"Waterford today honoured its war dead when it unveiled a specially commissioned memorial to the youngest recorded casualty on the Allied side in the first World War, Waterford-born Private John Condon who died in Flanders at the age of just 14.

Hundreds of people were on hand to see the specially commissioned sculpture by artist Paul Cunningham be unveiled in Cathedral Square by Mayor of Waterford Cllr John Cummins. Members of the Naval Service Reserve, the Organisation of National Ex-Servicemen and the British Legion were present."

On 5th October 2015 a bust of "Bobs"—Field-Marshal Frederick Roberts (Lord Roberts of Kandahar, Pretoria and Waterford)—was unveiled in Cathedral Square by British Ambassador Dominic Chilcott, attended by Irish Naval Reservists, the Deputy Mayor of Waterford, Lt. Col Stephen Ryan of the Irish Army, British Legion boss Major General the O'Morchoe, and by Major Michael Keown of the Irish Guards. No sign of Michael D., no Government minister, no Mayor; only a few naval reservists, fetched out of the pub for the occasion.

The Roberts bust was donated to Waterford City by the Irish Guards Regiment, founded by "Bobs" in recognition of the services of Irish soldiers in the Boer Wars.

Ambassador Chilcott said that, while the causes and justification of the Great War could be debated, it was fitting that the sacrifice involved should be commemorated, and he welcomed the new Irish openness to this.

John Roberts, an 18th century ancestor of "Bobs", restored the Protestant Cathedral where the unveiling ceremonies took place, and designed the Catholic Cathedral in Barronstrand Street, the first such to be built in Ireland for many centuries.

It was notable that, at 14 years and 82

years of age, Condon and Roberts were the youngest and oldest serving soldiers to die in the Great War. "Bobs" died of pneumonia on ceremonial duty. Condon's end was a bit messier.

Lord Roberts was born in Cawnpore (Kanpur) in India, the epicentre of the so-called Indian Mutiny. He made his military reputation in the Second Afghan War, and commanded the British forces in the Second Boer War, which he won by means of atrocities against the non-combatant civilian population, including Concentration Camps which cost the lives of tens of thousands of women and children. He was a prime mover in the formation of the Ulster Volunteer Force, and in the Curragh Mutiny.

Why would Waterford want to honour a war criminal? Why did they not just tell the Irish Guards where to stick their bust?

It is fairly well known that, outside the unionist part of Dublin, the only constituency in the south of Ireland to elect a non-Sinn Féin TD in the 1918 General Election was Waterford, which returned John Redmond's son, Willie. It is perhaps less well known that Waterford elected a Redmond in every election from 1892 to 1952, mostly heading the poll. In an election in 1892 which was marked by a week or so of street brawling, the anti-Parnellite Michael Davitt was narrowly defeated by Parnellite John Redmond, who held the seat until his death in 1918. His son Willie Redmond gave up his Tyrone seat to contest and win Waterford, where he held a seat until his own death in 1932. His widow, Bridget Redmond, then held a Waterford seat for Fine Gael until she died in 1952.

Unlike most places, a hard Redmondite rump sentiment is sometimes perceptible in Waterford city affairs. Could this be a factor in the Bobs-Condon memorials?

What about other less British commemoration in the municipality?

At present Waterford city, with Tramore included, has four Councillors in each of Fine Gael, Fianna Fáil and Sinn Féin, along with six Independents. Waterford County is broadly similar. To give an idea of official memorialising, the main bridge connecting the city to the Dublin road was called Redmond Bridge until it was replaced by the new Rice Bridge in 1982. This Rice was Edmund Ignatius Rice who founded the Irish Christian Brothers teaching order in the city.

There is now no Redmond memorial in Waterford that I know of. The city could, if it wished, boast of Richard Mulcahy, and also other War of Independence figures, like Rosamond Jacob for instance. But there is remarkably little official memorialising of such people, either pro or anti-Treaty, in Waterford city. (The County area is different.) It seems a sort of compromise stalemate has been reached. The new (2009) River Suir bridge in the motorway bypass is called after Thomas Francis Meagher ("Meagher of the Sword"), the Waterford Young Irelander who brought the Irish Tricolour over from revolutionary France in 1848.

Rosamond Jacob ticks many of the "Decade of Centenaries" boxes: women's rights suffragist, Quaker, connected to the Jacobs' Biscuits brand, never fired a shot. But she was also anti-Treaty, Gaelic Leaguer, Cumann na mBan.

Until about 20 years ago the main historical monument in Waterford city was a statue of Luke Wadding (1588 – 1657) on the Quay.

Luke Who???

Wadding was a Franciscan priest from an old English commercial family in Waterford. Following the Elizabethan religious crackdown, he founded the Irish College in Rome, where he played an important Big Power role in the Vatican, including organising the Rome or Habsburg part in the 1641–1653 Irish rebellion which was defeated by Cromwell.

A couple of centuries later Thomas Francis Meagher was born into a similar Catholic merchant family in Waterford.

You could say Friar Wadding failed. But his efforts eventually produced the modern Irish nation as an amalgamation of the previously antagonistic Old English and indigenous Irish; including some of its enduring texture, colour and flavour, such as the cult of St. Patrick. Wadding succeeded in getting St. Patrick's Day

officially adopted as a Church Feast Day or Holy Day.

So there was historical justification that his statue, with beard and Friar's smock, should have pride of place in Waterford, if not in the rest of Ireland. Meagher and Pearse and Connolly & Co. may have contributed to the liberation of the "*real and existing Irish nation*" (or one of them, anyway), but Wadding & Co. are the ones that created the possibility of this phenomenon.

About twenty years ago the life-size statue of Wadding was removed from the Quay, and replaced by a very large and imposing equestrian statue of Thomas Francis Meagher in military uniform with Raised Sword. From the point of view of selfie-taking American tourists in Waterford, no doubt this made good practical sense. Meagher, a Young Ireland hero, died in American military service. How could an obscure little mediaeval bearded man in a long dress compete with this?

I missed the inauguration of the Condon and Bobs memorials, so decided recently to seek them out in Cathedral Square in order to have a look at them. The Condon monument does not include provocative words such as "*heroism*". It includes a few bogus, sanctimonious lines by Tom Kettle ("*Know that we fools, now with the foolish dead, Died not for flag, nor King, nor Emperor, But for a dream, born in a herdsmen shed, And for the secret Scripture of the poor*"). But nothing of Kettle's more authentic and crazed hate-speech. Such as his analogy of Germans, Austrians, Turks and Bulgarians as rats, lice, fleas, and poison-carrying flies:

"So the great quintessential Super-Rat, the Rattish *Ding an sich*, left to mobilise his forces, and the Kaiser drew over a sheet of paper and wrote the magical and black word that unlocks Hell. And the Great Rat called in his Austria, which is the Louse, and his Turkey, which is the Sand-flea, and his Bulgaria, which is that porter of poison, the Fly. So the battle was joined between the Clean and the Obscene."

Not much secret scripture in that, is there?

I could find no trace of a Lord Roberts memorial in or around the Condon monument in Cathedral Square. When I inquired about it in the Tourist Office, they asked among themselves and remembered it had been moved into the Waterford Museum of Treasures, a collection of what is described as Georgian Waterford, located in the former Bishop's Palace, now a municipal building, which

was originally designed by John Roberts.

"*Georgian Waterford*" is mostly remnants of rich and forgotten eighteenth century Ascendancy types, presented in the Bishop's Palace by flunkies in period costume. I suspect it is not that much of a hit with tourists who, if they wanted Downton Abbey, would take themselves over to England for the real thing.

This watery project is no doubt an ongoing manifestation of residual Waterford Redmondism.

Before leaving the Tourist Office I asked why Waterford would want to highlight a war criminal like Field-Marshal Roberts. It seems this was not the first time this question came up. Quick as a flash they said Thomas Francis Meagher was the person that Waterford commemorated.

Redmondite or not, the Bobs-Condon memorial effort is a bit of a fiasco. Examination of birth registers indicate that the "*14-year-old*" war casualty John Condon was actually 18 or 19 in 1915, no different from the other cannon-fodder, and his present-day fame is due to a military typing error. And while Frederick Roberts may have actually set foot in Waterford a few times during his long lifetime, he had little direct personal connection with the place, and certainly had no affinity with the enduring phenomenon created by Friar Luke Wadding.

Pat Muldowney

FOR SALE OR TO LET

Anon, having died and leaving no will, I, Sean Doe, solicitor for the deceased, seek a buyer to fill the bill for this going business with a long lease. The present administrators may see fit to sell abroad less intellectual rights already sold to Oxford and Cambridge. The following we admit without being trite: Anon made no will for he had no will. It was buzz-words as biting as the Scottish Highland midge when our opponent's wars became ours loud and shrill Anon had been part of a large conglomeration had fought bravely to create their own small firm at a great price, becoming a world sensation Anon seemed in it for the long term but now it's: 'take us back we've lost our rudder.' In times past we might have asked you ever so politely for our freedom, instead there was violence by our recalcitrant brothers. All tenders and enquiries to Ireland@Dail.com.

Wilson John Haire. 25 April 2016

No Truce With Revisionist Myth, Propaganda And Fabrication

The March issue of *Irish Political Review* published the remarks made by Pádraig Óg Ó Ruairc on the occasion of the launch of his book, *Truce: Murder Myth and the Last Days of the Irish War of Independence*. Ó Ruairc then presented his book as "a challenge to myth, propaganda and fabrication".. Indeed it is. For, from the word go, the author tackles revisionist academia head on:

"Eunan O'Halpin, Professor of Contemporary Irish History at Trinity College Dublin, stated in a recent television documentary that (RIC Constable Alfred) Needham had married in a church ceremony and was shot dead in front of his new bride just minutes after they had exchanged wedding vows. A common element in most of these accounts is the suggestion that the IRA Volunteers who killed Needham knew a ceasefire had been agreed with the British forces and that was a motivating factor in the attack. The stories about Needham's wedding are part of a wider narrative about the War of Independence, which claims that the announcement of the Truce on 8 July 1921 led to a wave of unjustifiable 'eleventh-hour' IRA attacks before the ceasefire began. Supporters of this narrative claim that republicans launched a determined campaign to kill as many people as possible before the war ended and that these final IRA attacks were made mainly against so-called 'soft targets', i. e., unarmed members of the British forces and loyalist civilians... Some of these stories have a grain of truth in them. Others are entirely fictional, or are genuine killings taken out of context and with new details invented for propaganda value."

Ó Ruairc exposes the Needham tale, which had been related with such feeling by Professor O'Halpin, for the fiction that it is:

"There was no wedding ceremony, no teenage bride... Needham, a Black and Tan from London, was shot standing at the door of a stable with two other armed members of the RIC—not while leaving a registry office with his new bride. This tale about Needham being killed immediately after getting married appears to have been invented for melodramatic effect in a propaganda story. Yet different versions of this story continue to surface every few years masquerading as factual history" (pp 9-11).

In his history of the build-up to the Truce itself, Ó Ruairc also makes clear how the war violence of the preceding seven months was solely the British Government's responsibility, for in December 1920 it had rejected what it would accept in July 1921, Michael Collins's proposal for a comprehensive bilateral Truce, with a commitment that "*the entire Dáil shall be free to meet and that its peaceful activities not be interfered with*" (p 31). But, of course, the very reason for the War of Independence had been Britain's refusal to accept the democratic validity, and its actual outlawing, of that same Dáil Éireann. "*The British generals insisted they they could crush the IRA within six weeks*", while the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Sir Hammar Greenwood, assured Prime Minister Lloyd George that "*the Sinn Féin cause and organisation is breaking up ... there is no need of hurry in settlement*". (p 36). He would, however, have to eat his words:

"At a cabinet meeting on 27 April 1921, in an apparent *volte-face* from his previous position, Greenwood agreed with Tom Jones' prediction that Sinn Féin would sweep the board at the (May 1921) elections and questioned Generals Macreedy's and Tudor's claims that the British forces would regain control of the situation within three to four months" (p39).

This time Greenwood had read it right. The extra seven months of warfare that Britain insisted upon meant that its failure to defeat the Army of the Irish Republic—and Dáil Éireann itself—resulted in a Truce that had Britain's Generals frothing at the mouth. The author relates:

"The republicans had secured a number of concessions from the British which effectively conferred 'belligerent status' on the IRA as lawful 'combatants' in a 'legitimate army'... The Anglo-Irish Truce agreed in July 1921 was a formal public agreement between the IRA leadership and the British military command in Ireland... Major General Jeudwine wrote to his subordinate proscribing the use of the term '*Truce*'... The RIC's *Weekly Summary* newsheet published on the morning of the Truce committed a serious *faux pas* in British eyes by referring to the IRA as '*the Irish Army*'..." (pp 61-64).

Ó Ruairc continues:

"The available evidence from contemporary British documents and from the personal accounts of both IRA and British veterans shows that rank-and-file combatants on both sides had no idea that a ceasefire was imminent before the Truce was officially announced at 8 p.m. on 8 July (with 'active operations' to be 'suspended as from noon Monday 11th July')... News of the agreement spread even more slowly through the IRA's communications network, which was reliant on couriers travelling with written dispatches. IRA Volunteers in Dublin city were the first to learn of it, on the evening of 8 July and morning of 9 July. Clearly many of their counterparts in provincial areas only learned of the agreement on the evening of Sunday 10 July or early on the morning of Monday 11 July" (pp 68-69).

Ó Ruairc reproduces the most militant IRA document in response to the Truce that he could find, issued on Saturday 9th July by the Divisional Adjutant of the IRA's 1st Eastern Division, and calling on all IRA brigades in Meath, Kildare, South-East Cavan, South Louth, North-East Offaly, East Westmeath and Dublin Fingal, to "*hit anywhere and everywhere*" right up to Monday noon:

"The principal objective should in all cases be members of the old RIC or their Barracks. ALL SPIES of whom you may have already been advised of are to be executed also before said hour on MONDAY."

"*Ah ha!*", might cry the revisionist academics, who become orgasmic at finding any old document whatsoever, whether it be authentic or forged, but who never bother their asses to further research if such a document is actually matched by facts on the ground. In this case, the document is the exception that proves the rule, but it is nonetheless authentic. However, being the meticulous researcher that he is, Ó Ruairc has researched its reality on the ground:

"Despite the free hand and encouragement this order apparently gave, no civilians suspected of spying were executed by this Division between the time the order was issued and the beginning of the Truce. Furthermore, despite the explicit instructions issued, not a single member of the RIC was killed in the Division's operational area in the same time period" (p 71).

Under the Chapter heading "*The execution of suspected spies*", the author challenges revisionist mythology with reference to the War of Independence as a whole, but with particular reference to the period just before the Truce. Major Hugh

Pollard, a life-long British Intelligence Officer who would navigate the plane that flew General Franco from the Canary Islands to Spanish Morocco on 11th July 1936, so that Franco might commence his rebellion against the Spanish Republic a week later, had been in charge of Dublin Castle's 'dirty tricks' operations during Ireland's War of Independence. Ó Ruairc writes:

"Hugh Pollard ... claimed that most of the civilians killed by the IRA as spies were innocents murdered because of petty jealousies and rivalry over farmland."

But he notes how revisionist historians have taken it further:

"Professor David Fitzpatrick of Trinity College Dublin added a new dimension to these assertions by suggesting that, in addition to Protestants and ex-servicemen, the IRA also targeted several other isolated social groups, including itinerants, adulterers and homosexuals... Fitzpatrick's extraordinary claim that homophobia was a factor in some IRA killings is very difficult to take seriously, as it is not supported by any examples or references" (pp 74-75).

Ó Ruairc then moves down the ranks:

"Eunan O'Halpin has claimed ... *The decision to execute spies may have arisen partly from a desire to fire a fatal shot for Ireland while there was still time to do so. The IRA killed Peter Keyes ... on 5 July ... John Poynton ... was also shot at 4 a.m. on the morning of the Truce.*' ... According to Marie Coleman, the IRA in Offaly knew a truce was looming when they killed the Pearson brothers... However ... the Pearson brothers and Keyes—registered in both cases by the British Compensation Committee as 'Accepted British Liability' (*de facto*, and not just 'suspected' spies—MOR)—were killed a full week before the Truce began. The ceasefire had not even been agreed at the time of these shootings, and none of the republicans involved knew that the Truce was imminent. While Poynton's killers undoubtedly knew about the Truce, the circumstances of his case—including Poynton's service as a Black and Tan—suggest that he had been under suspicion of spying long before and that the timing of his killing on the eve of the Truce was largely coincidental" (pp 76-77 and 122).

The author also takes on British academics like Professor Charles Townshend, author of *The Republic: The Fight For Irish Independence*. Ó Ruairc points out that not only Fitzpatrick, but others have attributed similarly bizarre and unreliable motives to IRA killings:

"For example, Charles Townshend claimed that moral outrage led the IRA to

kill Patrick O'Gorman because he was engaged in an extramarital sexual relationship. In fact, the Limerick IRA did not succeed in killing O'Gorman, and there is ample evidence which suggests that he was targeted because he had passed intelligence to the British forces that led to the killing of an IRA officer" (p 324).

In his demolition of revisionist myths, the author is quite evenhanded as to whether it is the lunatic fringe or tenured academia which needs to be exposed:

"In his book, *The Year of Disappearances*, Gerard Murphy made the fantastic claim that the IRA executed three Protestant teenagers after the Truce and secretly buried their bodies on the outskirts of Cork city. According to Murphy, the trio confessed to being spies before they were shot and this sparked an IRA campaign of sectarian murder, ... 'dozens of deaths ... and the flight of hundreds of Protestant families'. However, there is no verifiable evidence that these anonymous victims ever existed, much less that the IRA killed them... Murphy claimed that IRA veteran Connie Neenan had referred to the killing of these three boys in an interview recorded by Ernie O'Malley. However, Murphy misread the document and used an inaccurate transcription of it in his book—in fact Neenan's interview does not mention the alleged incident at all. O'Malley's son Cormac has confirmed the accuracy of my transcription of the account, which shows that Neenan referred to two spies killed before the Truce and **not** three Protestant teenagers killed afterwards as Murphy alleged..."

"Murphy also claimed that another Protestant youth, Edward Olliffe, was killed by the IRA after the announcement of the Truce... Olliffe emigrated to the United States after the conflict ended ... and in December 1979 was still alive in California... Eunan O'Halpin's 2013 TV documentary *In the Name of the Republic* concluded with a 'List of the known disappeared' ... supposedly 'known with certainty' to have been 'disappeared' by the IRA. Among those listed was William Shiels, a British spy from Bweeng in Co. Cork, whom O'Halpin claimed was killed by the IRA on the day the Truce began. However, the republicans never captured Shiels and he fled Ireland after the ceasefire. During the Civil War both the IRA and the Free State Army attempted, without success, to locate and assassinate him. It is clear that when Shiels 'disappeared' it was to some far-flung location with the assistance of the British government, and not into a shallow grave dug by the IRA" (pp 79-81).

Ó Ruairc examines case after case and, more important, also details the murders carried out at the time of the Truce by the

British, killings systematically 'overlooked' by the revisionists. No less significant is his analysis of how few were the attacks on off-duty British troops (with 12 fatalities) following the announcement of the Truce, compared to the multitude of large-scale military IRA operations against 'hard targets': "*The IRA made at least sixty-four attacks on the British forces between the announcement of the Truce and its implementation*", whether on British patrols or British barracks. (pp 187-8). Although limited to 11 fatalities, these too have been painted by revisionists as an insatiable Republican bloodlust to the bitter end. From the West British perspective, what was sauce for the goose should not have been sauce for the gander, however meagre the Irish ration. As the author relates:

"The rush of combatants to take part in last-minute attacks following the announcement of a ceasefire was not limited to the Irish War of Independence. The announcement of the Armistice that ended the First World War resulted in similar actions by combatants eager to continue fighting until the moment the ceasefire came into effect... Despite knowing of the 11 a.m. ceasefire, US troops in the 79th Division continued to advance on their enemy's positions as late as 10:59 a.m., while their German counterparts were making frantic efforts to signal to them that the war was about to end... Of course they would never know what casualties, if any, their 'parting shots' had inflicted, but those under fire certainly did. Anton Lang, a German soldier, recalled: *The battle raged until exactly 11 a.m. and all of a sudden a 'big freeze' set in... The sudden stillness was interrupted by a single heavy shell which exploded ... among a platoon of infantry and killed four and wounded about a dozen... This made us sad and mad. Some joker on the other side probably wanted to fire the 'last' shot.*' The collection of the Imperial War Museum in London ... shows that artillery units on the Western Front kept firing at their enemy until the very last second before the Armistice began. The legacy of such 'eleventh-hour' fighting zeal was that 10,944 casualties were recorded on the Western Front alone on 11 November 1918. This included 2,738 fatalities, a figure far in excess of the average daily fatality rate of 2,088 troops killed." (pp 218-9).

Lest we forget what James Connolly called "*the War upon the German Nation*"! But, of course, it is not that War, but Ireland's War of Independence, that is the focus of the author's comprehensive investigation. Pádraig Óg Ó Ruairc's *Truce* is indeed a major contribution to our understanding of that history.

Manus O'Riordan

History Hollywoodised

Casement given the Hollywood biopic treatment by way of an art installation

The Humanizer by Simon Fujiwara
At IMMA, Kilmainham, Dublin
till 28th August 2016

The standard way to experience a film is by way of a visit to the cinema. You pay for and receive a ticket. Then you find a place to sit down in the darkened space of the movie theatre. You sit through various advertisements and distractions and trailers for films some anonymous busybody hopes you might on some other occasion wish to view. Eventually you get to passively visually absorb on the big screen the picture of your choice while enveloped in the sounds of the unfolding narrative.

The installation artist, the Japanese/British Simon Fujiwara, along with his collaborator, the scriptwriter, Mike Lesslie, have come up with a novel approach to experiencing a film which cuts out much of what has been described above. Gone are the purchase of a ticket (along with popcorn and/or other refreshments), and the waiting in a cinema queue. There is not much to object to here.

Gone also is the big screen. Gone even is the motion picture itself! However, all is not lost. This new way of experiencing cinema does hold some similarities with what we are used to.

Instead of the conventional cinema complex we encounter a series of connected darkened rooms. The dark and the red velvet décor recall the traditional picture house interior. As our eyes get accustomed to the lack of light we notice various objects have been placed in the rooms. We recognise these as props. In the first room there is a birth certificate for Casement, a book *The King of Ireland's Son*, and some items of clothing one would expect to belong to a young man of modest means in the 19th century.

There are three other rooms dealing respectively with his life in Africa, his time in Germany and capture in Ireland, and finally his trial and execution. In each room are props corresponding to these biographical phases. In the African themed room there is a trunk containing among other items a carved wooden ceremonial head, a whip and a copy of the *Daily Mirror* for 11th April 1904 which reports on the front page "*Casement's Congo Report! Atrocities Of King Leopold Exposed*".

Other props include a characteristic German officer's spiked helmet, Irish and German political banners, a 1905 personal diary, a portrait of Adler Christensen, Casement's alleged lover, and a letter from Julius Klein of Universal Studios from 1934 inquiring about the possibility of a biographical film.

The props are akin to objects in a museum. They invite us to examine them and reflect on their purpose. Meanwhile, the audio track of what sounds to be a movie trailer takes possession of one of the rooms. Then it continues in the succeeding room in the biographical narrative and finally back to the first room. The four sections corresponding to the four rooms add up to seven minutes. They contain 27 dialogue lines. These lines encapsulate the script plan. The lines were recorded using Abbey Theatre actors.

Many of these lines are unsubtle, high pitched and over the top. The intended script is intentionally oversimplified, distorted and contrived. This is how Hollywood does a biopic and this installation is primarily about Hollywood rather than about Casement.

A nationalistic school teacher tells his boys: "*The English can rule our lives, but your mind, your mind must never be conquered*". A male voice rings out: "*How can I betray the man I love?!*" A Dublin male voice shouts: "*Independence for Ireland. Down with England!*" A German voice assures "*Of course, Germany will protect you..*", but there is a hint of irony and menace.

A voice asserts "*You are hiding something!*". An English voice advises: "*I don't care if the public think he is a saint. If you can't find evidence, invent it!*". A concerned Irish voice implores: "*Public opinion has changed. Pleading madness is your last hope!*"

The music is glossy, pulsating and extravagant. It is music which can pull an audience along with a story. The tone of script and soundtrack is emotionally highly charged while the story is full of distortion and falsification. The props described above, while appearing authentic, are all, in one way or another way, fakes. Most of them were constructed by Oscar winning designer Annie Atkins.

One might imagine the powerful and moving music was especially composed. In reality, the music required for a film can be got by visiting a specialist website. There one can pick from thousands of music tracks. By similar means plot appropriate sound effects can be acquired.

At a public panel discussion on the day of the launch on 20 May last Fujiwara and Lesslie explained their conceptions of what the installation was about. They had previously been classmates in school in England.

Five years ago, while travelling in the Amazon region, Fujiwara had been introduced to the story of Casement by a tour guide. He became fascinated and investigated more. He developed the idea for the project and drew in his former classmate, Mike Lesslie, now a professional scriptwriter, to make a contribution. It was only then Lesslie learned of the multi-faceted Casement life-story.

The script, as per Hollywood, had to be a very reductive and manipulated version of the original biography. So, the story of Casement's investigations of abuses in South America was simply removed as it was so similar to the story of his involvement in the Congo. There is a rule in Hollywood film scripting that a section of a plotline can not be repeated. So, in the film, contrary to reality, he earns his knighthood based on his work in Africa.

While the Hollywood biopic is reductive the installation was yet more reductive in that the very film itself was taken out of the process and as was the hero, in so far as Casement was not one of the voices heard in the elongated trailer. The installation attempts to give visitors an experience of a film they have not seen by way of sound and visual imagery in the form of props. As with commercial cinema they are presented with "*emotion without substance*".

Fujiwara stated "*we will never know the true facts*" of Casement's life. He was open to a wide variety of possibilities as to what these were. The installation was not concerned with biographical facts but rather with how the Hollywood commercial machine might deal with the life of someone such as Casement.

It was while researching Casement in the National Library in Dublin that he came across a letter from Julius Klein of Universal Pictures written in 1934. In the letter Klein was attempting to further a project for a filmed Casement biography. It was this letter which gave him the idea for the current installation.

The film was never made owing to objections and threats of censorship from various influential quarters in British and Ireland.

A poster, in full Hollywood blockbuster style, goes with the installation. It contains the film title in bold capitals; *The Humanizer*. The rather foolish sounding title can mean somebody who makes things more humane and civilised. There is also an inane tagline to go with it: *Every human matters*.

The installation includes a detailed note from Simon Fujiwara, affixed poster style to a wall, by way of explanation. The greater part of it is worth quoting:

"Sound and sculptural instillation

The Humanizer is Simon Fujiwara's proposition for a Hollywood biopic composed almost uniquely of sound and based on the life of historical Irish nationalist figure Roger Casement (1864-1916).

Known as the world's first human rights campaigner, and knighted for his fight against slavery, Sir Roger Casement turned against the British in the Irish Nationalist movement leading to the 1916 Easter Uprisings. His demise and execution came at the hands of the British state and he was denied clemency on the grounds of moral perversion following the discovery of a highly controversial diary—The Black Diaries—containing explicit 'evidence' of his homosexual activities.

.....

Inspired by an archival letter from 1934 in which a Universal Pictures executive outlines his plans to make a Casement biopic that was eventually abandoned, Fujiwara enlisted a group of contemporary Hollywood movie professionals including Oscar winning designer Annie Atkins (*Grand Budapest Hold*, 2013, *Bridge of Spies*, 2015), screenwriter Michale Lesslie (*Macbeth*, 2015, *Assassins Creed*, 2016), as well as sound designer Moritz Fehr, to collaborate with him in imagining how the facts of Casement's biography might be depicted through the lens of the multinational movie corporations who produce the Hollywood heroes of today. Together with a selection of props loaned from Berlin's renowned Bablesberg Studios, *The Humanizer uses a bare minimum of means to evoke the power and seductiveness of the Hollywood Image machine to which our identities and even the facts of history are in service.*"

The exhibition continues at the Irish Museum of Modern Art, Kilmainham, Dublin until 28th August 2016.

Tim O'Sullivan

Armenians: *Irish Times* at it again

The *Irish Times* is at it again. For the last few months the remnant of Imperial rule in Ireland has been slandering "our gallant allies" of 1916 in a series of articles, book reviews and comment columns. It seems that the great popularity of the Centenary of 1916 among the Irish people has prevented direct assaults upon the Rising and instead we have attempts to bolster the British Imperial narrative by resurrecting the atrocity propaganda of the War against the Germans and Ottoman Turks:

"April 24th (Easter Monday), 1916, was the foundation moment of an Irish State. At the opposite end of Europe, what Pope Francis has described as "the first genocide of the 20th century" began in Constantinople (now Istanbul) on April 24th, 1915. Several hundred Armenian leaders were abducted and later murdered. On the same day orders were issued for Anatolia to be ethnically cleansed. From May to September it was emptied of Armenians, pursuant to emergency deportation laws. The 'Turkification' programme cost the lives of one million people, more than half the Armenian population in what was then the Ottoman empire."

This is written in '*An Irishman's Diary on the Armenian Genocide*' by the journalist and historian, Brendan Ó Cathaoir (IT, 21.4.16).

The first thing that should be noted is the very tenuous connection between the two events—the excuse for the article. The 'Armenian Genocide' began in 1915 and the Easter Rising in 1916. Why are they linked? There is no apparent reason except 'guilt by association'.

At the end of his musings O'Cathaoir pronounces:

"As a measure of restorative justice, Ireland should join the 20 national parliaments that recognise this crime against humanity as genocide."

Parliaments can do what they please but it doesn't alter anything. They are responsive to pressure groups and can pass motions to their heart's content. No facts are altered when they do, since parliaments have no competence in this area. It should be pointed out that what matters is International legal judgement. The UN defines what constitutes "Genocide" and it has not defined the Armenian events as such. Neither has any

other international court—quite the reverse in fact.

Therefore an assertion that the events of 1915 constitutes a genocide is nothing but opinion. It is not Law and it is not historical fact. So anyone asserting such a thing should be very careful about making such accusations without the evidence to back it up.

What right does O'Cathaoir have to make such a pronouncement? Who is he to make such a serious accusation against a nation? He needs to tell us.

O'Cathaoir, is a historian of 19th Century Ireland. To my knowledge, he has never published anything about Ottoman Turkey or the Armenians. He has made no investigations into the events of 1915—before or after. His knowledge is presumably based entirely on the tales he has read on the internet and books by bitter Genocide propagandists he has probably scanned. Does he really believe, if he is a real historian, that accepting highly biased sources at face value is acceptable in scholarship? If it is not in such an ephemeral pursuit as academia, is it acceptable to accuse a nation of genocide on such a basis?

If he does not come up with research, evidence, publications etc., we must conclude he is an ignoramus doing some moral grandstanding, for whatever reason.

There is usually a simple test about whether a piece of writing about the Armenian/Ottoman issue is serious study or mere moral grandstanding. It is the presence of a single sentence:

"Hitler asked in 1939: 'Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?'"

And there it is, in the middle of O' Cathaoir's article. He just couldn't resist it, could he, a fool like all the others, investing in the cheap slur without bothering to check on validity?

How many times does it have to be repeated that there is no valid evidence that Hitler actually said such a thing! There was so much doubt over the authenticity of the document presented to Louis Lochner of the Associated Press containing the quotation, that it was discarded as evidence at the Nuremberg Tribunal into Nazi war-crimes. The

original document in which it was asserted (L-3) was submitted to the Nuremberg Tribunal as evidence, but withdrawn. The document was suspected to be a forgery, since the original German was incorrect in a number of grammatical ways and it had unusual vocabulary. The typewriter used was not a German one, having no capacity for accents and suspicious spaces existed within the composition.

The Nuremberg Tribunal rejected the document as evidence against the Nazis in favour of two other official versions found in German military records. Neither of these, which have detailed notes of Hitler's Address, contain the Armenian reference. One is authored by Admiral Hermann Boehm, Commander of the High Seas Fleet. In addition, an account by General Halder was used to prove consistency with the other two accounts used as evidence and this again makes no mention of the Armenians. This strongly suggests that the Armenian reference was added later by someone who wished to associate Hitler with the events of 1915 in the Ottoman Empire.

None of this has however deterred historians, lawyers and various media commentators using the Hitler forgery ever since. But it is a sure sign they are not interested in real historical fact, only propaganda making.

O'Cathaoir says that "*Pope Francis has described (it) as 'the first genocide of the 20th century'.*" But Pope Francis is a Pope, not a historian. And one of his predecessors, Benedict XV, the Pope at the time of the Great War, called for the release of Turks detained by the British for the "Genocide". So he obviously didn't think the same way as his successor, a century later. The Popes seem to be divided on the issue. So we should give the benefit of doubt to the Pope of the time, a Pope who struggled for Peace in a very difficult situation.

And what is so important about the 20th Century? Do 19th Century genocides not count?

Here is something Lord Birkenhead, a member of the Lloyd George Coalition Government, said in 1923—after the "*Armenian Genocide*"—a view that would have been fully agreed by the *Irish Times*:

"The general extrusion of savage races from regions—for instance the American continent and certain of the South Sea Islands—to which (they) have some considerable legal right, shows that, rightly or wrongly, nations of stronger

fibre, confronting the indigenous weaklings, have always asserted the right of forcible expropriation. No one who has studied the history of the world has ever defended the view that the supreme interest of evolutionary humanity can support a definitive delimitation for all time of the surface of the world" (*The speeches of Lord Birkenhead*, p.216).

So, it was accepted by all in England (as well as the *Irish Times*, presumably) that superior races had the right to exterminate and ethnically cleanse inferior ones in the name of Progress. And, of course, this programme for Genocide was carried out extensively by England across the world. The problem with what befell the Armenians seems to have been that they were the 'superior' race being "*extruded*" by the 'inferior'!

O'Cathaoir says: "*the first genocide of the 20th century began in Constantinople (now Istanbul) on April 24th, 1915. Several hundred Armenian leaders were abducted and later murdered.*"

But this was a 'Genocide' in which nobody actually died! What happened on that date was the internment of a couple of hundred Armenians connected with the Dashnaks (Armenian revolutionaries who went into alliance with the Tsar and England to destroy the Ottoman state). Quantities of arms were seized by the authorities and suspects were moved by train to various locations, where they were mostly placed under house arrest or told to report to police regularly. It was a bit like the Falls Road curfew and Internment operation of the British Army in 1971, minus the killing and brutality. Those affected were granted a living expenses subsidy. Most of those relocated were subsequently released and survived the war. Only a minority, around 20, were subsequently hung as traitors. The relocation or forced migration of Armenians did not begin until June 1915.

"On the same day orders were issued for Anatolia to be ethnically cleansed. From May to September it was emptied of Armenians, pursuant to emergency deportation laws. The 'Turkification' programme cost the lives of one million people, more than half the Armenian population in what was then the Ottoman empire."

However the "*orders*" were not carried out. Anatolia was never "*ethnically cleansed*". Let us just pause and think about what O'Cathaoir is saying here. That the Ottomans fighting a war on numerous Fronts against British invasions in the Dardanelles and Mesopotamia and Tsarist invasion in the east were able to

accomplish the deaths/deportation of a million people in four months. How the Nazis must have marvelled at ruthless efficiency!

And if there was a '*Turkification*' programme instituted, why was it so unsuccessful? Why were so many Armenians, Greeks, not to mention Kurds, still in the area in 1916, unmolested?

The Ottoman forced migration policy is the centrepiece of the "genocide" allegation. The moving of populations aiding enemy invaders was an emergency war measure. It had no programme for genocide behind it. The Ottomans were the least racially-orientated people in Europe. The Armenians served in significant positions within the Ottoman State through its history. Sultans often took Armenian women as wives so the Ottoman line became mixed with Armenian blood—something the English saw as "*race suicide*". At least 12 Ottoman Ministers between 1867 and 1913 were Armenian. They also served as Ambassadors, Bankers, translators, consuls and deputies in the Ottoman Parliament—14 in 1908. The Ottoman Foreign Minister in the year before the Great War was an Armenian. It is extraordinary that the belief exists that there was an Ottoman desire to destroy the Armenians: they were an important pillar of the Empire and its functioning. Can it be imagined Hitler having a Jew as his Foreign Minister in 1938?

It is suggested the Ottomans sent the Armenians on death marches into the deserts. The Turks actually acted in accordance with standard military practice of the time. The most civilised power in the world (and mother to the *Irish Times*) used a forced migration policy only a decade earlier in South Africa. And it used it again 40 years later in Kenya.

There is no evidence of a premeditated Ottoman plan to remove the Armenians. The forced migrations were improvised because of the situation that had developed. A Law was passed openly to declare the State's intention, so that preparations could be made. Sufficient time was not always available in war areas, like the east, where Russian armies were close. However, it was insisted that convoys were guarded and life protected. A major problem was that most of the gendarmerie that would guard the columns had to be pressed into military service due to Armenian action behind the lines.

Not the whole Armenian population was relocated. It was mainly those in the

warzone and immediately behind the lines that were required to move. Elsewhere migration was very selective. Catholic and Protestant Armenians were less likely to be moved. Around 350,000 were totally exempted. Armenians in Istanbul were largely left alone and Moslems in the east were also moved. Armenians in the west were allowed back once the Gallipoli assault was beaten off.

Convoys had their priests, canteens, and were provided with oxen and carts. Foreign Missionaries kept a watchful eye. Armenian possessions were neatly stored and labelled to await their return. All these things tend to suggest there was no genocidal intent. Individual Turks and Kurds did a lot of bad things to the relocated people, of course. Kurdish bands which were beyond the authority of the State—outlaws in a war situation, resisting conscription—attacked many of the convoys. Some Ottoman employees robbed and killed people. There were also some massacres conducted by civilians.

Talaat Pasha, the architect of the migration policy, established Commissions in late 1915 to investigate abuses and crimes, and ended the forced relocation policy in the Winter of 1915-16. Thousands of Ottoman officials were subsequently tried by the Ottoman State for maltreatment of the Armenians and about ten per cent were hung. These included commanders who failed to protect columns of migrants. On the other hand, the Armenians tried no one for massacring Moslems. Criticism can be made about the inadequacy of the way the operation was organised and the failure of the Commissions to punish all war criminals but it is a fact that the Ottomans had no intention of annihilating a race.

The forced migration policy adopted by the Ottoman State to deal with the Armenian insurrection was a Western military measure employed to solve a military problem. It was outstandingly successful. Once the insurgents behind the Front were separated from their mass base, the small forces available to the Ottomans mopped up the Dashnak bands.

About 650,000 Armenians were relocated to Syria/Iraq. Around 400,000 went east to (friendly) Russian territory under the influence of the War. Russia refused them the right to return home when they captured the territory where they had lived. Over 160,000 died in this relocation, which took place entirely outside Ottoman territory. Around 500,000 Armenians were counted by US observers

in 1916 in Syria/Iraq. It appears, insofar as we can find out, that over three-quarters survived their forced migration. Around 400,000 Armenians remained in their homes at the time of the Armistice in 1918, out of the pre-War Empire's population of 1.6 million.

There were about 1.6 million Armenians within the Ottoman Empire in 1914 and around a million survived the War. The nearest we can get to a total death toll of Armenians is 600,000. This figure is usually inflated to 1.5 million and it is inferred that it came about exclusively from Ottoman massacre and death marches i.e. an intentional policy of Genocide. However the 600,000 we have noted includes all deaths, military and civilian, from all circumstances—natural, violent, starvation, disease etc. and takes in the entire period between 1914 and 1922. Hundreds of thousands died in the Russian/Armenian retreats in the east and the French retreats in Cilicia. Many more died as the new Erevan/Armenian Republic collapsed through mismanagement.

Does O'Cathaoir know any of this? I doubt it.

The rest of the *Irish Times* column would be too tiresome to deal with. Much of it is based on Geoffrey Robertson's book, *'An Inconvenient Genocide: Who Now Remembers the Armenians?'*

O'Cathaoir blames the Germans for not keeping order in Anatolia—a strange thought, considering that British and Redmondite War propaganda described the Germans as "*Huns*" and "*Barbarians*", and had gone to War against Germany partly because of its pre-War relationship with Ottoman Turkey. Like the War propaganda, O'Cathaoir seems to want it every way. He has got the following idea straight from Robertson:

"Initially, the British government took steps to punish the 'crime against humanity and civilisation' (Edward Grey's phrase). Sixty eight Turkish officials suspected of ordering atrocities were taken to Malta for trial, but released eventually in exchange for British soldiers held as hostages for this purpose by Ankara."

Because O'Cathaoir has lifted this idea straight from the book of Robertson, he has not thought through what he is saying. What he is expecting is that the Black and Tan regime should be the source of Justice in the world! O'Cathaoir is an Irishman with an English mind, it seems.

Prominent Ottomans were actually interned in Malta and the British, holding

the Ottoman archive, attempted to establish War Crimes trials. They appointed their most senior law officer to the case and viewed it with the upmost seriousness. The British, despite holding the Ottoman archives and having access to Ottoman territory, could find no evidence against the Turks and had to release them. When the cases collapsed for want of evidence, the 'hostage' story was employed, despite the fact that Britain, occupying Istanbul, had every means at its disposal to follow through with the prosecutions and gain the release of any prisoners. The fact remains that there were no orders to annihilate found and no mass graves discovered. And there still hasn't been after a century!

I bet O'Cathaoir doesn't know about Mr. Robertson's one adventure into the world of history. If he did I'm sure it would not inspire him with confidence about his judgement on matters of 'genocide'.

In the Guardian of 23rd April 2011 Robertson described John Cooke, Oliver Cromwell's Solicitor General and the man he appointed to be Chief Justice in the conquest of Ireland, as "*my hero*". He wrote a book about his "*hero*" called *'The Tyrannicide Brief'*. A reviewer in *'Westminster Wisdom'* (October 2009) has the following estimation of Mr. Robertson as a historian, which is very relevant:

"Geoffrey Robertson... evaluates purely as a modern lawyer rather than demonstrating any political or historical nous and demonstrates at every page his ignorance of and contempt for the many great historical works written on the period."

The reviewer continues, commenting on Robertson's claim that Cooke conducted the first "*war crime trial*" in history against the English King:

"Robertson does not really see Cooke as a figure in the historical past but as Robertson *avant la lettre*: Cooke was we are told the man who lit a blaze under tyrants, a blaze that would continue to the days of Milosevic and Pinochet... and that he destroyed sovereign immunity. No matter that nowhere in the trial of Charles I... was the modern concept of war crimes mentioned, Robertson still believes that they believed in war crimes in exactly the same way as we did."

Perhaps O'Cathaoir, who has written about the Great Hunger in Ireland, is familiar with the town of Drogheda in Ireland. It was here that the humanitarian relief sent to the starving Irish in 1848 by the Ottoman Sultan was landed. The town has a crescent in its emblem to this day.

Two hundred years previously Cromwell conducted a notorious massacre in this town which historians recognise—but Mr. Robertson denies took place.

After the massacre in Drogheda, Cromwell gave a justification of his actions to the English Parliament describing his action as "*a righteous judgment of God upon these barbarous wretches, who have imbrued their hands in so much innocent blood*". He claimed that "*it will tend to prevent the effusion of blood for the future, which are satisfactory grounds to such actions, which otherwise work remorse and regret.*"

In other words, the Irish had to be killed to prevent trouble in the future.

Cromwell's and Cooke's policy in Ireland would be called '*genocide*' and '*ethnic cleansing*' today. His statement about Irish hands "*imbrued in blood*" is a reference to a rising in Ireland in 1641 in the course of which tall tales reached England that up to 200,000 English colonists were massacred by the Irish in horrible ways. These tall tales were to be used for the purposes of conquest of Ireland and the attempted extermination of its people.

Mr. Robertson's "*hero*" Justice Cooke declared that all Irish men and women living on 23rd October 1641, or born in Ireland since that date, were traitors and should be punished. Cooke provided the legal justification therefore for Oliver Cromwell's policy that reduced Ireland's population by over a third, through death or expulsion to slavery in Barbados.

"*These were turbulent times when England was under imminent threat from the Royalist army in Ireland*" writes Robertson in '*England's Bravest Barrister*' (Counsel 2005). Presumably when a State is under threat, even by its lawful ruler, it must defend itself through extraordinary means.

Is Brendan O'Cathaoir comfortable about all this and the parallels it has for his '*Trishman's Diary*' on the Armenians? One historical fact here is that, whilst in 1649 Ireland was a peaceful and loyal country, in 1915 the Ottomans were fighting for their very survival against invasion, blockade and insurrection. Which military action was more justified?

O'Cathaoir uses a number of other rhetorical devices against the Turks apart from the Hitler association, including references to ISIS. Here is another false statement to drum up Christian outrage:

"Armenia was the first country to adopt

Christianity as its official religion."

What runs through English Liberal propaganda on behalf of the Armenians is the belief that they were a special people, marked out by their Christian heritage, to rise up above the surrounding dross of humanity, and become a rightful nation. It was therefore a historical imperative that they did so, something which had to take place if Progress was to be promoted. This, of course, is racism. But, as it is spoken by moralists on behalf of the oppressed, and in the name of Progress and Civilisation (which is really just another name for England) it is seemingly acceptable. O'Cathaoir resorts to it without thinking of himself as a racist.

There were two different areas in the Caucasus/Anatolia ruled by Armenians for a short period. They were both military conquests. The Armenians arrived, probably from the Balkans, around the 7th century BC in eastern Anatolia. Armenians were not the first rulers of the areas they began to occupy—many others had ruled these areas, both before and after, like the Hittites. These Kingdoms only had Armenian Kings and not necessarily a majority of 'Armenian' subjects. The character of these Armenians is very questionable. It is said that the Armenians established the first Christian kingdom but that is only because the Armenian king Drat was converted by Gregory the Illuminator and then forced his subjects to convert to Christianity *en masse*. And if it had not been for Roman military power this conversion would have been temporary.

However, it was this conversion imposed by a King, around 300 AD, that marked the Armenians out, which was to make them a special people for the West 1500 years later.

I presume O'Cathaoir knows nothing of all this, of course. But he still accuses a nation of the greatest crime to fill an Irish Times column!

Pat Walsh

The Armenian Insurrection And The Great War by *Pat Walsh, Garegin Pastermadjian* ("*Armen Garo*"). 218 pp. €20, £18

The Great War And The Forced Migration Of Armenians by *Prof. Dr. Kemal Çiçek*. 280pp. €24, £20

Forgotten Aspects Of Ireland's Great War On Turkey. 1914-24 by *Dr. Pat Walsh*. 540pp. €36, £30

Review: *The Road To Independence: Howth, Sutton and Baldoyle play their part* by Philip O'Connor.
1916 Commemoration Committee
Howth Sutton Baldoyle

The Independence Story

I lived the first 23 years of my life on Howth Summit and environs and, although I always had an interest in history and haunted the local Library, I knew almost nothing of the local cultural, social, athletic, economic, Trade Union and political movements in the area which culminated in the establishment of a democratic republic and its institutions, its defence against murderous oppression, its temporary interruption by an externally engineered civil war and final emergence in neighbourly reconciliation.

I knew of people living locally who had played famous parts on the national stage and had settled in Howth. I knew of a few local people who had been active. But knew nothing of a great many unsung men and women, or whole families of fishermen, farm labourers, tradesmen and clerks who laboured for decades, fought when necessary, endured imprisonment and hunger strikes and neither sought nor received recognition.

They are all dead now and some of their descendants have remembered some stories, discovered letters and mementos, photographs and other scraps of material. Philip O'Connor, who has lived in Howth for 10 years, has interviewed those descendants, examined newspapers and other documents covering 1900 to 1925, and has put the local story in the context of the national and international events of those times.

To read some ignorant or dishonest commentators, you'd imagine a bunch of firebrands with death wishes launched an insurrection in 1916 in a country ruled by a loving Government in a time of peace and with Home Rule assured, and that from 1919 to 1921 Republicans, armed to the teeth, waged a campaign of terror on their peaceful neighbours and their British protectors.

When in 1912 James Connolly and James Larkin founded the Irish Labour Party it was their intention that it would contest seats in a Home Rule Parliament. When, in 1913 policemen broke the heads of Dublin workers, Connolly and Larkin founded the Irish Citizen Army to protect the workers, following the precedent set in Belfast where

Sir Edward Carson had set up the Ulster Volunteer Force to ensure that no Home Rule Parliament should be set up. In 1912 Patrick Pearse, who had no military interests or ambitions, shared a pro-Home Rule platform with John Redmond. In 1914, when Britain declared war on Germany, a war which her ruling clique had long planned, the world was changed, changed utterly. Carson and his friends were brought into the British Cabinet, and the General Election scheduled for 1915, was, like Home Rule, set aside.

And the fool John Redmond and his party sent thousands of their Irish followers to fight and kill men with whom they had no reasonable quarrel, and to be themselves killed in that criminal Imperialist enterprise.

Philip O'Connor challenges the widely-accepted statement that, among the National Volunteers who remained loyal to John Redmond, the majority followed his call to enlist in the British Army. He states that throughout the whole War 28,000—about a fifth of the National Volunteers, joined up, most of them in its first year. He has established that, by the end of October 1914, just 60 men in County Dublin had enlisted, of whom 48 had been in the Volunteers, and that by the end of November only 104 National Volunteers, of a total of over 4,000 in the County had followed Redmond's call. Given recruitment figures for the rest of the County, he says, at most a dozen of these men were from Howth and Baldoyle, and that even of these, probably a third were reservists anyway, who had no choice when they were recalled to service.

Recruitment throughout the War was far more successful in the cities, and in Dublin the great majority of recruits were not members of the Volunteers at all, but firstly either reservists or men from the impoverished tenements of the inner city. or men from the Protestant Unionist community who enlisted from a sense of British patriotism.

Total recruitment throughout the four years of war in the Howth-Baldoyle area came to about 110 men, sixty in the first year, with nearly a third from the Protestant community, another third from the poorer, labouring families, and a minority from the Volunteers. Howth, Sutton and Baldoyle were sparsely populated a century ago and population density fifty years ago was but a fraction of what it is now. Howth, Donnycarney, Artane and Swords combined had a single Company of about 110 FCA Reservists in my time.

Twenty three men from the Howth, Sutton and Baldoyle area died with the

Chilcot Report: Blair, America And Eastern Europe

While the report concentrates the minds of commentators on the invasion of Iraq and culpabilities there are other very informative statements within the Blair/Bush memos that have a bearing on the British relationship with the E.U.

Parts of the memos highlight the influence of Margaret Thatcher's policy on trade and globalisation, as can be gleaned from her Bruges speech of 1988.

The section of the memos that headed as 'The Fundamental Goal', and 'the ridding of Saddam as the real prize', needs to be read carefully. In this section Blair outlines his understanding of the U.S./E.U. and E.U./Russian relationships.

In the subsection, headed as 'Detail' Blair states that the 10, then, accession states were supportive of U.S./U.K. intervention in Iraq and that France and Germany 'must be told in terms not to play games with their accession and the 10 should be specifically thanked' as they may be needed again in the future. Importantly, Blair states that 'if we can solidify them they will change dramatically the balance of power in Europe viz the attitude to the U.S.' such a more [sic] being in the U.S./U.K. 'long-term strategic importance'.

As the memo proceeds we find further evidence of Thatcherite influences in what can only be described as a drive to create a U.S./U.K. dominated economic set of treaties that appear, in ideology to herald a form of TTIP.

I hope that some of your more erudite commentators and correspondents will examine these issues based on the state of Europe and the left/right balance that existed at the time and which held much of Thatcherite economics at bay and the state of Europe in the recent past that has seen this balance move more to the right and the consequences of this in the current political climate.

Caoimhin de Bhailis

Letter in *Irish Examiner*, 1.7.16

British forces in the Great War.

The 1916 Rising, the courage, discipline and humanity of the insurgents, and the murder of Irish prisoners—some, but not all of them insurgents—by British forces, effected such a change in public attitudes that within fourteen months the Lord Lieutenant wrote secretly to the Cabinet that John Redmond's party was finished; and the RIC reported that "*the Republic*" was on the lips of the young.

In December 1918 Sinn Fein candidates pledged to a Republic took 73 of the 105 Parliamentary seats in Ireland, and those of them not in British jails met as Dail Eireann and ratified the 1916 Proclamation as promised. In 1920 Municipal, County Council and other Local Elections throughout Ireland gave Sinn Fein and Republican Labour candidates even more emphatic majorities. But England wouldn't stand for democracy and embarked on a war of murder, terror, and lying propaganda. The lying propaganda persists and has enlisted many Auxiliaries.

The parts played by men and women of the area in the 1916 Rising, the 'Tan War and Civil War I leave to readers to find out for themselves from this book. They will also discover the generally good and constructive roles played by Republicans

and Unionists in the Howth District Council elected in 1920. It had 12 members, 5 from Sinn Fein, 3 Nationalists, 3 Unionists and 1 Independent. The tiny Jewish community was active in Sinn Fein and the National movement generally.

And young Alfred Willmore, who as a child first trod the boards with his contemporary compatriot Noel Coward in their native London, learned Irish and taught the language in Howth.

There were one or two nasty individuals who lived in the district mentioned *ach fagaimid siud mar ata siad* [we will leave them as they are].

Donal Kennedy

**THE ROAD TO INDEPENDENCE
Howth, Sutton and Baldoyle
play their part.**

Philip O'Connor

Published by Howth Free Press
310 pages. Numerous Illustrations
15 Euros.

This article first appeared on Jude Collins' website:

[HTTP://WWW.JUDECOLLINS.COM/WP-CONTENT/
UPLOADS/2016/07/HOWTH-BOOK-COVER.JPG](http://www.judecollins.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Howth-Book-Cover.jpg)

[HTTPS://](https://)

WWW.YOUTUBE.COM/WATCH?v=0RDE_40Ah5M

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

INVASIVE PLANTS

The Spring was late this year, causing farmers to delay the sowing and planting of crops. Technology came to the aid of the farmers who used the plastic-tunnel system to speed up germination. After the crops have sprouted, the plastic then self-destructs and eventually the remnants of the plastic are trodden under by the harvesting machinery. And so the chemicals from which the plastic is made become part of the soil and, of course, become a part of the organic make-up of next year's food crop. Ugh! Well yes! Wherever else do we think it went to?

In the meantime, although Spring was delayed into early May, the Summer when it came in June and July was damp and warm resulting in an abnormally luscious crop of greenery. Trees, bushes, grasses and weeds burst out all over as if by magic. On roadways the verges and the hedges were severely cut back, in spite of Environmental Regulations forbidding such cutting until mid-August. Among the plants which were cut and thrashed by the hedge-cutting machines was *Japanese Knot Weed* which responds to cutting by spreading itself even more widely. The Japanese Knotweed can destroy buildings, roads and airport runways, sewerage systems and many other things. It is very very destructive.

County Councils treated the matter like all such urgent matters are treated—they appointed committees. Like, lots of committees! One in most Counties in Ireland. The Japanese Knotweed Committee in Cork County Council (the largest County Council in Ireland) was set up over a year ago as a 'Working Group' to tackle the issue. The first meeting of this group is taking place now a year later. Can we expect action? That is, any meaningful action? This year's hedge-cutting frenzy has ensured that over the next few months—there will be widespread re-seeding of Japanese Knotweed. How bad does the problem get before it is dealt with?

Local Authorities everywhere have a bad record in dealing with noxious and invasive weeds. (Incidentally, the Japanese Knotweed is not noxious—it can be cooked and eaten as a sort of cabbage).

The greatest infestations of the *Buachalán Buí* are on the road verges and motorway borders which are controlled by the road authorities. It is poisonous to animals. Many city and town locations are invested with a variety of *Valerian* which thrives on masonry and can destroy walls and buildings and it seems to be a protected species such is its apparent immunity from attack by Local Authorities. This does not stack up until we look at the actual activities—not the words—of politicians after they are elected. The actual activities are to draw their salaries and their expenses and eat, drink and travel at taxpayer's cost and keep the voters happy with plenty of TV Sport—if you can call soccer that—so as to put off as far as possible the next election. Then it all stacks up.

COMPUTER CODING

The fashionable thing in education now, Coding is the buzz-word. Coding is what is done by highly skilled professional computer programmers and it is also the expertise of hackers. Do we want to teach a nation of computer hackers? Certainly not! And it is not a realistic objective to teach every child to be a professional programmer. But Silicon Valley companies such as Google, Apple and Facebook are attempting to normalise computing so as to increase their already bloated profits at our expense. You do not need to be an accomplished motor mechanic to drive a car. Or even to drive a truck, a bus or a train.

So why should computer users need to know coding? It just does not stack up. The school curriculum is already full of necessary subjects and even so some students are leaving school without an adequate knowledge of the basics. What existing subjects are to be sidelined to make way for coding? Is it Silicon Valley's objective to do away with Reading, Writing and Arithmetic so that we will need computers to do these things for us and reduce us all to ignorant narrow-minded computer experts? This is dangerous stuff and the Minister for Education should not be promoting Coding.

MONSIGNOR PÁDRAIG O'FIANNACHTA

One of Ireland's most learned Gaelic scholars passed away on the 15th July 2016. He was buried on Tuesday 19th July in the churchyard of Séipéal Naomh Chaitriona in Fionn Trá, Dingle, Co. Kerry.

He was fluent in many languages. He translated St. Augustine's Confessions from Greek into Irish. He translated and

edited the modern Irish Catholic Bible—*An Biobla Naofa*. As well as being Professor of Old Irish and Welsh at NUI Maynooth, he made time to be Editor of 283 issues of *An Sagart* and was involved in producing forty four volumes of Colmille and was Editor of *Leabhair Maigh Nuad* for forty years.

After his retirement, he was appointed Professor Emeritus of NUI Maynooth and he turned to pastoral priesthood duties in Baile Bhúirne and then Canon and Parish Priest of Dingle from 1993. In Dingle he founded An Díseart College—a third level college where students of Sacred Heart University Connecticut USA now study. He was honoured by the title Monsignor in 1998 by Pope John Paul 11.

In 2014 he went with his parishioners on a pilgrimage to Rome, though he was now confined to a wheel-chair, where he met Pope Francis whom he called "*a kindred spirit*". When we met him some time ago in Dingle—what impressed us mostly was his beautiful radiant smile through which his holiness shone through.

A great scholar has passed away and truly we are all diminished by his death.

"Ar dheis Dé go raibh a h-anam dílis."

Michael Stack ©

WHEN STATELETS CRACK

It was not a war fought on behalf
of academics
by liberals
for liberal polemics
nor fought to boost newspaper
sales
with distorted derring-do
tales
It begins when you've had enough
like your neighbour
or the corner
tough
and when it's done
and the casualties
mount
and those who should have helped
can only
count
for they had their fighting done
for them
and coined it after the event
condemning
the new foundations they stand
upon
as they attempt rob the proceeds
of victory in a grand
con.

Wilson John Haire, 6 May 2016

Casement's Ashes

The following report is based on a Morning Star (ex-Daily Worker) story of 13th March 2016.

The *Daily Worker* of 13th March 1936 said "startling light" was thrown on the real reason for the British Government's refusal to transfer the body of Roger Casement to the Irish Free State for reburial. It is made by an ex-convict who helped in the burial of Casement after his execution for treason in 1916.

A British diplomat of Irish extraction, Casement had been honoured for his report on human rights abuses in the Belgian Congo and Peru before he tried to gain German military aid for the 1916 Easter Rising.

Requests to move the remains to Dublin had been frequently made and turned down. The British Prime Minister, in reply to a question in the House from Communist MP Willie Gallacher, restated that position.

An eye-witness account from the former convict who was used as a grave-digger's orderly detailed how he placed two sacks of charcoal and of unslaked lime at the bottom of the grave. After the execution, the coffin containing Casement's body was laid on top of the lime and charcoal, and then other sacks were placed upon it.

Clay was then put on top of it and when no-one but orderlies were about, a hosepipe ran water into the grave for half an hour. Everything except buttons would have been dissolved.

"The grave rose up to a height of two or three feet as if alive with the combustion, and took about two weeks to settle down to normal", reported the witness.

*

It seems the Brit. Govt. were scared of Casement's emotional power even after his death!

Jack Lane

LOCK UP

How secure you felt when father
locked up for the night
he checks the doors and windows
shoots the bolts top and bottom tight
turns the key and that reassuring click
a troubled world locked out
the rasp of the corncrake stops as it pecks
at the hayrick
the B'Special patrol behind the hedgerow
waiting for a parachuted German spy
anticipation grows
or a fenian in that guise
all locked out
night pours thick and black as tar barred
locked out.

Wilson John Haire
29 May 2016

TROTSKY continued

In a pathetic and shameful article, Plekhanov recently pointed to the "harmful" character of the Irish uprising for the cause of freedom, rejoicing that the Irish nation "to their credit" had realised this and not supported the revolutionary madmen. Only complete patriotic softening of all the joints could lead anyone to interpret the situation as if the Irish peasants had declined to participate in the revolution from the standpoint of the international situation, thus saving the "honour" of Ireland. In actual fact they were led only by the obtuse egoism of the farmer and complete indifference to everything beyond the bounds of their plots of land. It was precisely because of this and only this that they supplied the London Government with such a quick victory over the heroic defenders of the Dublin barricades.

The undoubted personal courage, representing the hopes and methods of the past, is over. But the historical role of the Irish proletariat is only beginning. Already into this uprising—under an archaic banner—it has injected its class resentment against militarism and imperialism. That resentment from now on will not subside. On the contrary, it will find an echo throughout Great Britain. Scottish soldiers smashed the Dublin barricades. But in Scotland itself coal-miners are rallying round the red flag, raised by Maclean and his friends. Those very workers, who at the moment the Hendersons are trying to chain to the bloody chariot of imperialism, will revenge themselves against the hangman Lloyd George.

Nashe Slovo, 4th July, 1916

From Trotsky's Writings On Britain, Volume 3, 1975. Online Version: Marxists Internet Archive, 2000.

* Henry Hyndman, 1842-1921, founder of the Social Democratic Federation and of the National Socialist Party.

** In fact, the substance of the Land Reform was conducted by the Tory, Arthur Balfour, who responded to a strong rural agitation by enabling tenants to buy out their landlords with the aid of Government subsidies under legislation passed in 1903.

*** Georgi Plekhanov, 1856-1918, a founder of the Russian social-democratic movement; one of the first Russians to say he was Marxist. Supported the Entente against Germany in WW1. Though a Bolshevik, he opposed democratic centralism and the Soviet regime. The CPSU respected him as a founding father of Russian Marxism.



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 34 No. 8

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

Leon Trotsky: On the Events in Dublin

(July 1916)

The former prominent colonial bureaucrat of Great Britain, Sir Roger Casement, by conviction a revolutionary Irish nationalist, the go-between for Germany and the Irish uprising, on being sentenced to death declared, "*I prefer to sit on the bench of the accused than in the seat of the accuser*", before the reading of the sentence, which ran according to the old formula that Casement should be "*hung by the neck until dead*", at which God was invited to have mercy on his soul.

Should the sentence be carried out? This question must have given Asquith and Lloyd George many troubled hours. To execute Casement would make it even more difficult for the opportunist, nationalist and purely parliamentary Irish party, led by Redmond, to ratify a new compromise with the Government of the UK on the blood of the insurrectionaries. To pardon Casement, after having carried out so many executions, would mean an open "*display of indulgence to a high-ranking traitor*". This is the demagogic tune of the British social-imperialists of the Hyndman* type—downright blood-thirsty hooligans. But, however the personal fate of Casement is resolved, the sentence on him will bring to a conclusion the dramatic episode of the Irish uprising.

In so far as the affair concerned the purely military operations of the insurrectionaries, the Government, as we know, turned out comparatively easily to be master of the situation. The general national movement, however it was expressed in the heads of the nationalist dreamers, did not materialise at all. The Irish countryside did not rise up. The Irish bourgeoisie, as also the upper, more influential layer of the Irish intelligentsia, remained on the sidelines. The urban workers fought and died, together with revolutionary enthusiasts

from the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia. The historical basis for the national revolution had disappeared, even in backward Ireland. Inasmuch as the Irish movements in the last century had assumed a popular character, they had invariably fed on the social hostility of the deprived and exhausted pauper-farmer towards the omnipotent English landlord.

But, if for the latter Ireland was only an object of agrarian plunder and exploitation, for British imperialism it was a necessary guarantee of their dominion over the seas. In a pamphlet written on the eve of the war, Casement, speculating about Germany, proves that the independence of Ireland means the "*freedom of the seas*" and the death blow to the naval domination of Britain. This is true in so far as an 'independent' Ireland could exist only as an outpost of an imperialist state hostile to Britain and as its military naval base against British supremacy over the sea routes.

It was Gladstone who first expounded with full clarity the military imperialist

consideration of Great Britain over the interests of the Anglo-Irish landlords and laid the basis for the wide agrarian legislation by which the state transferred to the Irish farmers the landlords' land, very generously compensating the latter, of course. Anyway, after the agrarian reforms of 1881-1903**, the farmers turned into conservative small property owners, whose gaze the green banner of national independence is no longer able to tear away from their plots of land.

The redundant Irish intelligentsia flowed in their thousands into the towns of Great Britain as lawyers, journalists, commercial employees, etc. In this way, for the majority of them, the 'national question' got lost. On the other hand, the independent Irish commercial and industrial bourgeoisie, in so far as it has formed over the past decades, immediately adopted an antagonistic position towards the young Irish proletariat, giving up the national revolutionary struggle and entering the camp of imperialism.

The young Irish working class, taking shape in an atmosphere saturated with the heroic recollections of national rebellions, and clashing with the egoistic, narrow-minded, imperial arrogance of British Trade Unionism, naturally swing between nationalism and syndicalism, ever ready to unite these two concepts in their revolutionary consciousness.

It attracts the young intelligentsia and individual nationalist enthusiasts, who, in their turn, supply the movement with a preponderance of the green flag over the red. In this way, the 'national revolution', even in Ireland, in practice has become an uprising of workers, and the obviously isolated position of Casement in the movement only serves to emphasise this fact still deeper.

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

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

1 Sutton Villas, Lower Dargle Road
Bray, Co. Wicklow or

33 Athol Street, Belfast BT12 4GX or

2 Newington Green Mansions, London N16 9BT

or *Labour Comment*, TEL: 021-4676029
C/O Shandon St. P.O., Cork

Subscription by Post:

12 issues: Euro-zone & World Surface: €40;
Sterling-zone: £25

Electronic Subscription:

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

You can also order from:

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

continued on page 23