

# IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

**October 2016**

**Vol.31, No.10 ISSN 0790-7672**

**and Northern Star incorporating Workers' Weekly Vol.30 No.10 ISSN 954-5891**

## The Brexit Stimulus

The future of the North is in the news again. It is put there by events and circumstances—chiefly by the shock effect of Brexit on superficial Anglophiles who were brought to a realisation that their England was a delusion. They are angry at having been deceived—but who was it that deceived them? They did it themselves through their refusal—or their honest inability—to come to terms with the fact that nationalist Ireland has achieved substantial existence in the world as a state and that relations between states are different in kind from personal relations and that professions of friendship between them can never be more than a diplomatic pretence.

Nationalism is a recent occurrence in the history of the world. There are grounds for saying that England invented it. It remained nationalist, even when it became the biggest Empire the world had ever seen, and came within a whisker of establishing itself in world dominance.

For about half a century before it launched the Great War it had an idea of itself as a new, and better, Roman Empire, which was systematically transforming the world into "*Greater Britain*". But in practice it remained nationalist state with conquests. It never became Imperial in the authentic sense. And that is why it could lose its conquests—after the two Great Wars that were intended to consolidate them—and still be itself.

After 1945 Britain approved of European countries coming together in a kind of association. That was something that English foreign policy had opposed for three centuries. But Europe had been made such a mess of by Britain's last World War—with the ultimate enemy, Communist Russia, in possession of half of it and having strong support in the other half—that Churchill gave his blessing to West European Union, but on the strict condition that Britain itself should not be part of it.

Though he had lost most of the Empire through his insistence on continuing the War after 1940 by means of spreading it throughout the world, Churchill still had Imperial

*continued on page 2*

## Of War And Famine And Suppressing The Record:

*one day in the life of the Irish Times*

Two commemorative events took place on Sunday 11th September with *Addresses* at each of them being delivered by public figures of note. This article is focused on both the how and the why of the handling of each event by the *Irish Times*—that self-styled "*paper of record*" which advertises itself as "*you are what you read*"—in its edition of the following day, Monday, September 12th.

That Sunday, in Fermoy, Co Cork, Martin Mansergh, a former Minister for State in the Department of the Taoiseach—and Advisor to three successive Fianna Fáil Taoisigh: Haughey, Reynolds and Ahern—gave an oration at the Liam Lynch Commemoration, Lynch having been the Anti-Treaty Chief-of-Staff of the IRA killed in action towards the close of the Civil War. Mansergh had the following to say:

"The cursory trials and summary executions, not to mention the out of hand executions carried out by Captain

*continued on page 4*

## Trinity College and 1916

Having followed developments in TCD history production since the 1980s the current writer is not easily shocked, either for good or ill. For the centenary of the 1916 Rising the College produced a website entitled *Changed Utterly: Ireland and the Easter Rising* ([www.tcd.ie/library/1916/](http://www.tcd.ie/library/1916/)). The site has about 52 "posts" each dealing with a different aspect of Easter Week on the basis of material in collections held by TCD.

The material is often accompanied by good, interesting commentaries. The sometimes spine-chilling diary of Elsie Mahaffy, daughter of the then Provost of Trinity, is introduced by an interesting article about her by Marie Frazee-Baldassarre. There are reminiscences of the playwright Dennis Johnston, at the time just a boy, whose house on Lansdowne Road was taken over by the Volunteers, or of others, many, though by

no means all, Unionist contemporaries.

Extracts from the papers of Colm Ó Lochlainn, an important member of the Irish Volunteers and later founder of Three Candle Press, carry an interesting commentary by Shane Mawe. Some posts even reference Athol or Aubane publications as authoritative sources, such as *The Catholic Bulletin's 'Events of Easter Week'* (referencing the definitive study by Dr. Brian P. Murphy), and *'Spot the Difference'*, on the attempts by British Intelligence to print and distribute forged copies of the *Irish Bulletin* (the Dáil

*continued on page 8*

## CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| <b>The Brexit Stimulus.</b> Editorial   | 1    |
| <b>Of War And Famine And Suppressing The Record: <i>one day in the life of the Irish Times.</i></b> Manus O'Riordan   | 1    |
| <b>Trinity College and 1916.</b> Philip O'Connor  | 1    |
| <b>Press Release: Appeal In State Papers Case .</b> Barry Keane   | 3    |
| <b>Casement Weekend Ballycastle.</b> Pat Walsh  | 11   |
| <b>Casement.</b> Wilson John Haire (Poem)   | 12   |
| <b>Shorts</b> from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (Corporate Power; Irish Industrial Policy; Evolution of Irish Industrial Policy; Morality and National Interest; The Apple Case; Political Context to Decision; Ireland's Appeal; Allocating Corporation Taxes) | 13   |
| <b>"Famine scholarship".</b> Jack Lane  | 16   |
| <b>Hubert Butler: The DVD.</b> Julianne Herlihy (Part 2)  | 17   |
| <b>A Sniper from an Ivory Tower.</b> Pat Walsh (Part 2)   | 19   |
| <b>Brexit—Land Grabs, Hard Borders, and NEuros.</b> Sean Owens  | 23   |
| <b>On the Blanks on my own lovely Lee.</b> Jack Lane  | 25   |
| <b>A Murder Of Crows.</b> Wilson John Haire (Poem)  | 26   |
| <b>Biteback: Neo-Redmondism.</b> Dave Alvey   |      |
| <b>Casement &amp; 'Armenian Genocide'.</b> Pat Walsh  | 26   |
| <b>Does It Stack Up?</b> Michael Stack (Auditors and Accountants; Constitutional Amendments)  | 27   |
| <b>Apple And Tax Justice.</b> Brendan Howlin (Press Release)  | 27   |

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

#### Thomas Johnson and the 1916 Rising

(back page)

#### The Refugee Crisis—and the real villains of the piece. Michael Robinson

(page 28)

#### Foreign Affairs Refuse to Reveal Details of US Military Use of Shannon

Shannonwatch Press Release (page 31 Shannonwatch Press 31)

hopes. The European mess to the west of the Communist states from East Germany to Yugoslavia and to the east of the stable Fascist regimes of Spain and Portugal (which were still performing what Churchill saw as the progressive mission of Fascism) should unite as an entity in the Cold War. But England should hold to the unique destiny it conceived for itself in the age of Elizabeth—which was also the age of the genocidal poet, Edmund Spenser, who is hailed as the major Cork poet in an anthology compiled by people who have not yet caught up with Brexit.

The association of West European states proved to be unexpectedly successful under the ideology of Christian Democracy—an ideology that baffled the English mind. England had to get into Europe in order to stop it. The founders of the EU, who had experienced Britain's conduct towards Europe in the two World Wars and in the interval between them, locked it out. But, when the British returned, a generation living in the illusions of United Nations ideology let it in. And now, having diverted the EU from the course set for it by its founders, Britain has decided to withdraw from it in order to pursue its separate destiny.

This puts the North back on the political agenda, from which it had been thought to be removed by the combination of common membership of the EU and the Good Friday Agreement. The North voted to remain in the EU, and the population balance in the North on the national issue is now close to parity. Sinn Fein is pressing for a triggering of the referendum on unification which the 1998 Agreement provides for. It argues that setting a date for such a referendum would trigger a debate which would clarify the issues at stake. That is what happened when a date was set for the Scottish Independence Referendum.

Negotiation on the Border has been made unavoidable. The Fianna Fail leader, who has for a number of years been indulging in ignorant and irresponsible criticism of Sinn Fein's performance in the Stormont devolved government, suddenly announces that the party would begin contesting elections in the North. And Martin Mansergh, who had been shifting Fianna Fail electorally onto a Treatyite basis, delivers the eulogy at Kilcrumper on Liam Lynch, the ultimate anti-Treaty hold-out, whose mystique was such that, if he had not been killed, the

carrying over of the substance of the anti-Treaty position into the formation of Fianna Fail would have been seriously damaged.

Suddenly Irish history is alive again. The evasive euphemisms no longer serve. There must be some thinking about facts—a thing which Eoghan Harris thought he had abolished.

But now John A Murphy, Emeritus Professor of Cork University, who stopped thinking a long time ago, tries to save the day by saying there is still no need of it because "*there are two nations in the island of Ireland*".

When acknowledgement of the two nations in Ireland might have averted the Northern War—that is, around 1970, Professor Murphy—who was then a Professor in place and not a mere has-been—was staunchly silent on the subject. He was a silent one-nationist on the Fianna Fail verge of being Stickey in 1970 and for very many years afterwards.

He appeared to have a suppressed intellect which told him the two-nationists were describing something that existed but he lacked the character that could have stood the unpopularity that saying it would have incurred.

In his *Irish Times* letter (Sept 5) he writes that "*nationalists should belatedly accept that there are two nations on the island of Ireland*". But his own acceptance of it was way beyond "*belatedness*".

He berates Gerry Adams as "*an uncompromising separatist*" gripped by "*a visceral hatred of England*". But Adams gave effect to the two-nations analysis long ago by enabling the Good Friday Agreement to come about, and by making it work when the 'constitutional nationalist' SDLP made a mess of it, while Has-been Professor Murphy still broods on the sweeping aside of the Stickers by the Provos away back then.

Acceptance of the two-nations analysis, whether timely or belatedly, is only acceptance of a fact that exists. It is not a policy. It is a fact for policy to cope with..

We proposed in 1969 that the Dublin Establishment should recognise it as a fact so that they could establish a medium of possible communication with the Ulster Protestant community—which simply would not listen if it was told that it was part of a common Irish nation. The Dublin Establishment, headed by Taoiseach Lynch and including Professor Murphy, refused. And so there was War.

The Has-been Professor now writes:

"Mr. Adams suggestion of 'interim and transitional' arrangements are old de Valera hat. By their very expression they intensify suspicion, and ignore the central fact that what the unionists want is not a special position within a united Ireland but a guaranteed British position outside it."

Adams' great achievement—which he brought about in alliance with John Hume and Charles Haughey—is that interim and transitional arrangement. To describe the 1998 Agreement as something other than *interim* is comparable to denying the fact of two national bodies in 1970.

The Unionists have no "*guaranteed Britishness*" in their political life. They are rigorously excluded from British political life. The accepted exclusion under Whitehall pressure, as a manoeuvre against Sinn Fein in 1920=21, but they have since embraced it. And British identity within the British state, but excluded from the vigorous political life which constitutes the greater part of that identity, is a curious thing. It is a kind of wraith preserved nostalgically from the time when Protestant Ulster actually was British, and was recognised as being British by the British.

Today Ulster Britishness is seen as something distinctly odd by the whole range of British party-politics. And Britain knows no other kind of politics than party-politics. It excluded Northern Ireland from its party-politics when setting it up as a subordinate Constitutional entity, for an ulterior purpose, in 1921, and therefore it now finds Ulsterish Britishness alien.

Murphy writes as if the only issue with regard to the North was Partition. This journal has been arguing since 1974 that the issue which gave rise to the War and kept it going was not Partition as such but the system of communal devolved government, outside the democracy of the state, by which it was enacted.

Professor Murphy kept silent on the issue of Two Nations at the time when it required to be spoken about. He still keeps silent on the question of what Northern Ireland is and why it was set up. The *Irish Times* would not allow the Two Nations to be discussed in its pages when it was a relevant issue but is now happy to let Murphy blather on about it irrelevantly. But if he wrote to the IT about the structure and meaning of Northern Ireland he would not be published.

Murphy's letter is a reply to an IT article by Ronan O'Brien (Aug 30) entitled *Why Redmond And Adams Have Much In Common*, with the sub-heading "*An all-*

## Appeal In State Papers Case

**Press Release: Historian Barry Keane granted Appeal hearing in long running British spies case against Home Office**

Round 5 of Historian Barry Keane's long running case against the British state's refusal to release a 106 year old file identifying '*Paid informants in Irish Secret Societies*' in Ireland and the United States is set for hearing in London on Thursday 29th September 2016. The UK Upper Tier Tribunal has agreed to hear an appeal against a split decision by a three person First Tier Tribunal to keep the file secret.

However, as it was a split decision and the minority judgement, which completely dismissed the Home Office arguments, was so different from the majority that Justice Angus Hamilton accepted that the case needed to be appealed. Judge Hamilton, who had chaired the original panel, also noted the strong split between the majority and the minority in the case. He also expressed surprise that Keane had not followed the minority verdict in the ruling which stated that the majority decision 'lacked common sense'.

Keane had appealed on a point of law: that in rejecting the appeal the First Tier tribunal had set an impossible requirement instead of a balanced one between his rights as a historian and the State's rights to protect its sources of information.

Leave to appeal was granted by Judge Angus Hamilton in September 2015 and the Upper Tier agreed to hold a hearing of the case in recent weeks.

It is likely that both sides will appeal to the British High Court if the case goes against them.

Mr. Keane will be represented by Mr. Brian Leahy and Mr. Cathal Malone at the hearing and it will take place at 7, Rolls Buildings, Fetter Lane, London (Enquiries: [020 7947 7501](tel:02079477501)) commencing at 10 am on Thursday 29 September 2016 and expected to last for one day.

Barry Keane is a Cork History and Geography teacher and author of a number of history books. The most recent was 'Massacre in West Cork' published by Mercier Press in 2014 and he currently is collating information on all victims of the War of Independence and Civil War with a view to publication next year. He is also spokesman for the Mardyke residents in their action against the ESB over the 2009 Lee Floods which was appealed last year and is awaiting hearing in the Irish Supreme Court.

**Editorial Note:** Further information on this case can be found in the *Irish Political Review* for September 2015: *No Freedom Of Information For British Court* by **Barry Keane** and *A Day In Court* by **Jack Lane** (Court Hearing On British Informants)

*island solution has been off the table since 1916 but is the key to the 'Irish problem'".*

The article discusses Lloyd George's attempt to set up a Home Rule Government in the immediate aftermath of the Rising in 1916. O'Brien says that he made "*considerable progress*" and made an "*outline agreement*" with Nationalists and Unionists that it should include Partition. The agreement was reached "*by virtue of a fudge around whether the exclusion... was to be temporary or permanent... The scheme was ultimately brought down by the English Tories*", who did not allow the fudge to pass. But "*Constructive ambiguity was not the plan's weakness, it was what made it possible at all...*"

Well, it made the plan possible, but made its implementation impossible. Home Rule with Partition which was both temporary and permanent could not be implemented.

The relevant thing today about that plan is not the duplicity by which Lloyd George made it appear for an instant that he had settled the Irish Question, but that the Partition for which it provided did not include a *Northern Ireland*, still less one excluded from British democracy. It was to be Partition with the Counties excluded from Home Rule remaining an integral part of the life of the British state.

If that had been implemented, if his belatedly beloved Redmond had agreed to it, there would not have been the Northern War which has so upset Professor Murphy.

And if, in 1919, the newly democratised British Parliament had conceded independence to the elected Dail, with Partition but without Northern Ireland, there would have been no IRA. Or, if it had conceded Free State independence in 1921-2, with Partition but without Northern Ireland, there would have been no 28 Year Northern

War, though there might have been a little military flurry at the start.

The cause of the War was the internal structure of the North outside the democracy of the state. That is what we asserted continuously, after giving Sunningdale the opportunity of proving us wrong in 1974.

And, when peace was achieved, it was by the interim and transitional basic alteration of the structures of Northern Ireland—which remains inherently unstable and is maintained by expertise and not by democratic routine, and therefore must lead to something else.

Murphy's Two Nations assertion at this juncture seems to be designed to cut short discussion on the ending of Partition now that it threatens to become a practical issue.

It appears to think that conceding national status to the Ulster Unionists gives them the right to decide the future of the North, even when they become a minority. But the Ulster Unionists chose Six Counties as their arena, and chose political detachment from the democratic system of the state, believing that their communal majority would last for ever.

They chose their ground and must abide by their choice.

"If 1916 lacked a prior mandate, the combined Sinn Féin and Volunteer Movement combined to secure it an overwhelming and enduring retrospective mandate in the 1918 General Election, despite every form of obstruction of election literature and candidates, many of whom were imprisoned. The election result was ignored by the British and by a good few unsympathetic historians since, and in 1919 both Sinn Féin and the Dáil were suppressed. Great efforts were made by both of them to win access to the peace conference and to gain international recognition or at least a hearing, which again was an attempt to follow a peaceful path... The Irish people found themselves once again on their own, and, if they were serious about independence, which they were, they had no choice but to fight without material outside assistance..."

"Inevitably, as we approach the centenary of the Treaty split and the civil war, the rights and wrongs on all sides will continue to be explored and debated... and it must never be forgotten that there was a third party, viz. the departing British power. The Treaty was a pragmatic arrangement, not based on the democratic principle of consent, still less of self-determination, and granted a limited independence characterized by the British as 'Dominion Home Rule'. The British Commonwealth of Nations that subsequently claimed to be a free association of countries was one that Ireland alone was compelled to join, under threat of 'immediate and terrible war'..."

"The problem was that the departing British had put the onus on the Free State to enforce the settlement. Conversely, if it were to be overturned in the short term, this meant civil war or renewed war with the British. The late Seán MacBride, with whom I discussed the matter and who sent me some articles on the subject, believed the agreed republican constitution, analogous to the Constitution promulgated in 1938, was the key, but of course Churchill and his advisor Curtis vetoed this. Less constructive was the collusion between both sides of the Treaty divide in attacking Northern Ireland, which only stiffened the Unionist position..."

"When the female counterpart to Lawrence of Arabia, Gertrude Bell, in her excellent Arabic, tried to put the line to an Iraqi politician in 1920 that complete independence was what Britain ultimately wished to give, something certainly not being promised to Ireland in the middle of the Tan War, he replied to her: 'My lady, "complete independence" is never given; it is taken'... The disagreement over the Treaty was really about whether to bank significant gains or whether to persevere until the Republic could be won.

"The civil war dissipated the high hopes of 'the four glorious years', and represented a serious setback... Over the

next quarter of a century, politics did succeed in removing the restrictions on the freedom of the Irish State. Dominion status was not a success. Irish democracy was. Republican politics succeeded and won public support, provided it steered clear of war.

"Nowadays, there is a broad political, economic and academic consensus that wants to write off as failure the first 40 or 50 years of independence. I regard that as very unfair. Such criticism has little regard to the difficult international environment of the 1920s and 1930s, not to mention the war years. Yet comparisons are made between countries as if normal conditions prevailed. Solid institutions were established, and Irish democracy survived much better than most... In those times, it would have been difficult to establish an initial domestic industrial base without resort to protection. Ireland in those days was determined not to be a British vassal state, and there was a certain price to be paid for that..."

On many another occasion, Mansergh would have graced the Opinion columns of the *Irish Times*, if not on this topic. But how, at least, was he reported? I cannot fault the *Irish Times* Munster correspondent, Barry Roche, for not featuring most of the above remarks by Mansergh in the report he filed that afternoon, and which is available *on the internet*. That report was more than satisfactory in displaying precision as well as integrity on the part of Roche himself. The following is just a little of over one half of Roche's filed copy:

"Delivering the oration at the Liam Lynch Commemoration at Kilcumber in Fermoy where the leading anti-Treaty commander is buried, former Minister for State Martin Mansergh echoed comments made by President Michael D Higgins at Beal na Blath in August where he called for honesty in the commemorations to come. 'Inevitably as we approach the centenary of the Treaty split and the civil war, the rights and wrongs on all sides will continue to be explored and debated but as the President has emphasised, it should not be done in an overly partisan manner or in a spirit of bitterness or recrimination.' 'No side had the monopoly of right in their actions and it must never be forgotten that there that was a third party, viz the departing British power', said Dr Mansergh who is Vice Chairman of the Government's Expert Advisory Group on Commemorations.

"Paying tribute to Lynch who was killed in a firefight with Free State troops in the Knockmealdown Mountains in April 1923 in the last days of the Civil War, Dr Mansergh noted how Lynch had been influenced in his thought by the events of Easter Rebellion and the executions of the 1916 leaders. He noted that while most people gratefully acknowledge that

## Of War And Famine

continued

Bowen-Colthurst of these parts, were a travesty of justice... Let us be clear about it. Organs of Irish Unionist opinion in 1916, like the *Irish Times*, like the *Church of Ireland Gazette*, were enthusiastic supporters of the military dictatorship established under General Maxwell, and instituted by a supine British Government, and wanted no early curtailment of martial law. They wanted revolution put down once and for all...

"President Michael D. Higgins was correct when he said at Easter that but for the Rising his office would not exist... There is one notorious Sunday columnist, who recently depicted the consequences of the Rising in terms falling little short of the vision of the four horsemen of the apocalypse, death, poverty and a divided people, as the headline put it. It would contribute greatly to the openness and clarity of debate, if commentators of that ilk would simply state, if it is their opinion, that this part of Ireland would be in a much better condition, if it had remained part of the United Kingdom, with or without Home Rule, and that unlike the freedom of practically every other nation on earth, Irish freedom in their view was never worth a single drop of blood."

the Rising was the catalyst for the process that led to Irish independence, there were still critics who query the necessity or morality of resorting to force on the Irish side while never expressing any views on the British use of force.

"Recalling the cursory trials and summary executions of the 1916 leaders and how it was supported by organs of Irish Unionist opinion at the time including *The Irish Times*, Dr Mansergh was critical of the argument by former Taoiseach, John Bruton, that Home Rule would have led to Irish independence... Dr Mansergh said in case anyone thought it was because Irish nationalists were seeking a Republic, Lloyd George said in the House of Commons that it was not about whether Ireland was to be a Republic but rather its very demand for sovereign independence which could not be permitted. Dr Mansergh noted that the late Fine Gael Taoiseach, Dr Garret FitzGerald did not share Mr Bruton's view that Home Rule would have led to independence, describing such a thesis as 'alternative history gone mad'. "He (Dr FitzGerald) argued that 'there is little reason to believe that Britain would have permitted Ireland to secure independence at least until many decades after the Second World War and by then the financial costs, because of the welfare state, would have been prohibitive'."

On the following day, Monday, September 12th, from the body of that report filed by its own Munster Correspondent, **the *Irish Times* printed—not a single word!** True, Mansergh, and, indeed, Roche's own report, had the 'effrontery' to highlight—and once again wash—that paper's dirty 1916 linen in public. But, on this occasion, an 'explanation' can more readily be found in what was that paper's overriding editorial objective for a whole week and, in particular, for that very day.

With all due respect to Mansergh, the total suppression of his Address in the print edition was of far less consequence than how the *Irish Times* chose to report another Address delivered that same Sunday. Oh, just the little matter of an Address by the President of Ireland, Michael D. Higgins, on the occasion of the National Famine Commemoration in Dublin's Glasnevin Cemetery, where 22,000 of its victims are buried, and during the course of that Great Hunger the burial rate had shot up from 20 to 60 a day.

See [www.president.ie/en/media-library/speeches/recalling-remembering-and-learning-from-the-great-famine-1](http://www.president.ie/en/media-library/speeches/recalling-remembering-and-learning-from-the-great-famine-1) for the full text of the Higgins address. And this is how it was reported by the *Irish Times* on Monday, September 12th:

"The capacity to anticipate and prevent the threat of famine exists today, but almost a billion people are allowed to

'live in conditions of extreme or avoidable hunger', President Michael D Higgins said yesterday at the national famine commemoration day. President Higgins was speaking at the event in Glasnevin Cemetery, Dublin, which also saw the unveiling of a new memorial to honour those who died during the famine. The mid-19th century Celtic cross was donated by the Glasnevin Trust, and the President said it would serve as a 'permanent memorial to and reminder of those people'. 'This memorial stone will stand here beside the other important memorials of this cemetery as a testimony to our national remembrance of, and grief for, those who endured so much suffering during an Gorta Mór', he said. Mr Higgins said Glasnevin Cemetery is the 'single largest burial ground for the victims of An Gorta Mór' with many 'interred in mass graves, or 'unpurchased graves', with no headstone to mark their final resting place'. Mr Higgins laid a wreath at the new memorial, as did several ambassadors and dignitaries from other countries who were in attendance."

Not an ounce of any political understanding of Irish Famine history in this *Irish Times* 'report', that was oh so carefully fed to its readers. No British responsibility! And yet an understanding of English politics and policy has been essential to any meaningful comprehension of the history of Irish Famines, culminating in the 19th century Great Hunger. In *A View of the State of Ireland*, written by Edmund Spenser in 1598, Famine was actually advocated as an instrument of English policy in Ireland, based on Spenser's own eyewitness experience of Famine in Munster, while participating in the English suppression of the Desmond Rebellion of 1579-83. Spenser advocated starving the native Irish into submission:

"The end will bee very short and much sooner than can be in so great a trouble, as it seemeth hoped for, although there should none of them fall by the sword, nor bee slaine by the souldiour, yet thus being kept from manurance, and their cattle from running abroad, by this hard restraint they would quickly consume themselves, and devoure one another. The prooffe whereof, I saw sufficiently exemplified in these late warres of Mounster; for not withstanding that the same was a most rich and plentifull cuntry, full of corne and cattle, that you would have thought they should have been able to stand long, yet ere one yeare and a halfe they were brought to such wretchednesse, as that the stony heart would have rued the same. Out of every corner of the woods and glynnes they came creeping forth upon their hands, for their legges could not beare them; they looked like anatomies of death, they spake like ghosts crying out of their graves; they did eate the dead carrions, happy

where they could finde them, yea, and one another soone after, insomuch as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape out of their graves; and, if they found a plot of water-cresses or shamrocks, there they flocked as to feast for the time, yet not able long to continue therewithall; that in a short space there were none almost left, and a most populous and plentifull cuntry suddainley left voyde of man and beast; yet sure in all that warre, there perished not many by the sword, but all by the extremities of famine, which they themselves had wrought" (1997 edition, pp 101-102).

Spenser is, of course, revered and much beloved in English literature for his epic poem *The Faerie Queene*. In *A View of the State of Ireland* the poet decided to develop his arguments in the literary form of a dialogue between the characters Eudoxus and Irenius (Spenser himself). In their introduction, the Editors of the 1997 edition, Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley, commented on what the above passage told us:

"This first section closes with the two speakers having agreed that the Irish are so savage and resistant to the spread of civil order that only the most drastic of solutions can reform them and transform their nation... The case is that, in order to protect civilized values from the attacks of hostile savages, savage methods will have to be used... Having separated the bad people from the good land, the second section then provides Irenius' proposed solution to this situation... Part of this process (the final conquest of Ireland and the surrender of all Irish rebels) will be the destruction of all fertile land and all goods and cattle, even those of the Irish who had already surrendered, in order to prevent the surviving rebels from using them for sustenance. Irenius estimates that the war and the subsequent famine will take about a year. Peace will be maintained by the transplantation of many of those who submitted to different provinces of Ireland (rebels from Ulster and Leinster will change places). These will be given lands run by English landlords... The logic of Irenius' harsh proposals is perhaps best illustrated in his infamous description of the effects of the Munster famine during the Desmond Rebellion, an account made all the more harrowing owing to Irenius' claim to have been an eye-witness to the conflict ('as I saw by proof in Desmonds warres'... This traumatic passage is an important crux... It provides a key to how Spenser/Irenius anticipates the final conquest of Ireland will function when, presumably, the same process will take place. If this appears too much for tender stomachs to digest ... the last sentence reveals that it is the Irish who are responsible for their own fate ... that the Irish are akin to the lowest form of savages in their resistance to the spread of English law" (pp xviii-xxi).

In *Sean Moylan in His Own Words: His Memoir of the Irish War of Independence*, that Republican military commander in North Cork wrote:

"The River Blackwater, forming portion of the boundary between Cork and Kerry, rises in the Kerry Hills a few miles west of Kingwilliamstown... From Banteer to Youghal it flows through a rich and fertile valley, past deep grasslands, shadowy woods and rugged mountains. **The gentle, murderous poet, Spenser**, sang of its beauty." (Aubane Historical Society, first edition, 2003, pp 109-200. My emphasis—MO'R)

How succinct, and yet how sufficient, was Moylan's adjectival summing up of Spenser's character! And he was also cited in President Higgins's Famine Commemoration address:

"It is unfair, I believe, to take the view of Edmund Spenser, who in 1582 had suggested the need for a new population in Ireland, one that would shed its nativism, and to transpose this view onto those who were responding to the Great Irish Famine of the mid-19th century. It is possible, however, to discern the shades of such a view in the invocation of the Famine as an act of Providence. An even more extreme version of this was invoked in response to immigrants arriving in ports in Britain, which suggested that Providence required that the fleeing Irish die where the Famine had afflicted them, in their own areas, rather than migrate as carriers of disease.

"John Kelly, in what I regard as a seminal contribution to famine scholarship, wisely suggests in an Afterword that: 'In *The Last Conquest of Ireland*, John Mitchel accused Mr. Trevelyan of creating a special 'typhus poisoning'. Mitchell should have confined himself to the truth. It was incriminating enough.' It is a truth we must respect in all its complexity. We must also be aware of how the treatment of the Irish Famine changed as one year succeeded another: the first identification of the crop failure in 1845 was different to 1846 in terms of policy response; the rhetoric as to Providence became a central feature of the discourse in 1847; and by 1848, in response to the William Smith O'Brien revolt, we have cartoons presenting the Irish as ingrates towards those who are saving them."

If, in the absence of any further elaboration, the President's reference to Spenser's end-16th century genocidal programme might be considered by many to be too obscure, what immediately followed in his address was all too obvious, in being a targeted indictment of British culpability for the 19th century *Gorta Mór* (Great Hunger). And, as such, it went totally unreported in the media. Also unreported was how Higgins described the scandal of Skibbereen:

"They (the British authorities) made disastrous calculations, even beyond the erroneous assumptions of their economics. They did not accurately assess the capacity or the attitude of the Irish landlord class; they did not take regard of the absence of a commercial infrastructure in Ireland, of an adequate distribution system, or indeed, the obduracy that existed in some parts of the country at bringing into existence a Famine Relief Committee, which, the Treasury insisted, was an essential condition for relief. Skibbereen is a striking example in this regard:

"Trevelyan had recently called a Board of Works report on Skibbereen the "most awful" thing he had read; still for reasons of policy he was unwilling to alleviate the town's misery. Under Treasury guidelines, only a local relief committee could distribute government provisions, and, at present, **Skibbereen lacked a relief committee. Given the wealth in the community, that was scandalous. The owner of the town, Sir William Wrixon-Becher, had an annual rental income of £10,000 (using the multiplier of 100 and the \$4.80 value of the 1846 pound, that is the equivalent of almost \$5 million a year today); and Stephen Townsend, a local Protestant clergyman, had an income of £8,000 per annum (\$4 million a year today).** (My emphasis—MO'R.) Nonetheless, the fact remained that Skibbereen did not have a relief committee, and if an exception were made for Skibbereen, other towns and localities might demand exemptions. A run on the government food supply would result, and the government food supply was thin. On December 18, Trevelyan told Routh that "principles" must "be kept in view."

"As we gather here, it is appropriate that we recognise those who did not share such views, or the assumptions to which I have referred earlier. In Connemara they still speak of the great Quaker James Hack Tuke and his son, and indeed, there is a song in Irish in which his name is mentioned."

Nor did the media report the fact that immediately after the President's address, there was a performance of *The Fields of Athenry*, with its evocative lines: "*For you stole Trevelyan's corn, so the young might see the morn*" and "*Against the Famine and the Crown, I rebelled, they cut me down*". In contrast to the self-styled "*paper of record*", it can be said of "*de paper*" pure-and-simple, the *Irish Examiner*, that it, at least, made the attempt to report some of what the President said of British culpability, in its report on September 12th:

"It was concluded by British administrators in the 1840s that the giving of relief directly to those dying would constitute a 'moral hazard'... The Great Hunger between 1845 and 1849 saw skeletal peasants selling their only clothing in an attempt to survive. Over a million died of hunger and related diseases, and two million fled a country 'with no hope'. Many who emigrated faced fresh marginalisation on arrival on foreign shores. President Higgins asked: 'Is there not a lesson for all of us, as we are faced in our own time with the largest number of displaced people since World War II, as the Mediterranean becomes, for many, a marine grave, as European nations fail to respond to their humanitarian obligations? Isn't some of the rhetoric invoked today similar to what in the worst periods were the opinions of the *London Times*?'"

The *Irish Independent* of September 12th, in also directly quoting the President's sentence that referred to the marine grave of the Mediterranean, decided to omit the very next sentence that had gone on to refer to the *London Times*. On Sunday, September 11th, in its 2 pm News Bulletin, RTÉ TV did indeed show footage of the President referring to the *London Times*, but by the time of 'News at 6', the footage had been carefully edited back to excise that particular sentence. Needless, to say, it was not covered at all by the *Irish Times*.

And yet there are times when the *Irish Times* can affect to demonstratively proclaim something akin to love for the President. "*My outspoken presidency: Fintan O'Toole meets Michael D Higgins*" signalled the masthead on page 1 of its issue of September 17th, drawing attention to the President's interview with that paper's Literary Editor on page 1 of its Weekend Review, with the banner headline:

"**A HEAD OF STATE UNLIKE ANY OTHER:** Michael D Higgins has shaped the presidency to conform to his unique blend of fiery intellect and down-to-earth social skills. Here he discusses the poverty of his early life, his outspoken presidency, his health, his future and the struggles of the Irish Republic."

Not for the first time, O'Toole has lost the plot. He writes of Higgins:

"It is clear that he has carved out for himself a freedom to speak that goes beyond what his predecessors enjoyed... (and he quotes him thus) '*I am actually committed to the idea that people can understand more than people say they can.*'"

But that had been the problem for the Editor of the *Irish Times* five days previously. That was the real plot, with the

Editor demonstrating that he most assuredly did not want people to understand what the President had to say about the Famine. And so it was that the most newsworthy item in the O'Toole interview, which Editor Kevin O'Sullivan felt should be highlighted on page 1 of the paper's main section on September 17th, was: "*President 'very worried about future of Europe'*".

But there was another Presidential interview also published on September 17th, in the rival *Irish Independent*. If the Literary Editor of "*the paper of record*" could only wax lyrically in the abstract about what "*people can understand*", the *Indo's* Environmental Editor, Paul Melia, succeeded in concretising that same concept in his particular interview. The banner headline for the *Indo's* front page lead story accordingly read: "*Michael D: Loosen purse strings for health and housing. President says public not angry at striking bus drivers.*" And the headline for the interview itself was in Higgins's own words: "*These are not wild Bolshevik values. They are values for decent living.*" Melia drew him out, as follows:

"He also notes the response of the travelling public to the Dublin Bus strike, which has seen thousands of commuters discommoded as workers down tools in a row over pay. I watch television and watch the public being interviewed, and there's a very significant change in the public attitude towards what is happening in Dublin. They are saying we need good public transport... What I saw was, instead of a short-term anger at the discomfiture, (there was) I'm willing to listen to what's being sought'... I thought the people in Dublin were very fair in their comments and they understand the issues and of course they should be solved, and they can be solved.'

"It's that public willingness to engage which, he said, was not being reciprocated by policy makers, particularly in Europe. **An issue of major concern across many EU countries is a trade deal under negotiation between the EU and the US, called the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). The lack of public scrutiny about proposed measures, particularly as they relate to environmental standards and impact on public services, has led to huge disquiet... The President said that if "technocrats" didn't believe the public were capable of understanding the issues involved, they should say so... The public looking on are entitled to more than a glimpse of the spectacle. They are entitled to hear the options that are in the discourse. When you talk about issues like TTIP, it's not only people in Ireland who say we must discuss this fully. In Germany, there's a very strong view.** (My emphasis—MOR). I'm not advocating

revolution, but just say what you are doing. Say you are dismissing social fora, and social consequences. Say you don't believe the citizens have the capacity to understand anything complicated. That view is around, it's in print. I take quite the opposite view... Equally, after the great wars in Europe, people said people couldn't come and live in hovels. We have to take a responsibility for public housing. Equally, it was said it was wrong that only the children of the rich have access to education. These are not wild, Bolshevik values. They're values for decent living'."

When it came to the newsworthiness of the Higgins interviews in those rival newspapers on September 17th, it was "*the paper of record*" that missed the boat. But when it came to the 'report' in its issue of Monday, September 12th, on the Higgins speech of the previous day, it was the Editor of the *Irish Times* himself who sought to sink the Famine boat. The intended report filed by the *Irish Times* political correspondent Fiach Kelly was on the internet by early Sunday afternoon itself. It accurately recorded the following paragraph from the Higgins script:

"It (the Famine) took place in the context of empire and an imbedded atmosphere of conflict. It took place in a particular context of land ownership. Yes, it took its toll on a population that had massively increased—but hadn't the population of the whole of Europe itself increased from 140 million people in 1740 to almost 270 million people in 1850?"

But certainly not in the lines that immediately preceded it. Fiach Kelly reported the President as saying the following: "The Irish Famine, he said, '*was more a series of mistakes*' and was '*not providence*'." This was the exact opposite of what Higgins had in fact said: "*Famine was never only an accident of nature. It was more than a series of mistakes. It was not Providence.*"

I pointed out this serious distortion in a Facebook post that same Sunday afternoon. And, of course, either Kelly himself or his Editor had ample time and opportunity to correct the record before Monday's issue went to press. But the Editor did not want to correct the record in respect of where the President had been misquoted. Instead he actually went on to zap the record where Kelly had, in fact, accurately quoted the President's words, and to shrink that Famine speech to a few meaningless platitudes, representing a downright insult to the character of what been said.

But everything made sense when I looked at the page where the 'report' had been squeezed in as the third of four items

in a two column side-bar of tit-bits—brief items of news that should not be allowed to distract from the full length spread—over six columns—of what was top of the *Irish Times* agenda for that day. Indeed, being the third tit-bit in the side-bar-headed "*Briefs*", the Famine commemoration item was placed underneath two other slight distractions of "*Home News*", namely, "*Taxi driver stabbed after picking up two men in Swords*", and "*Son of former loyalist leader Adair found dead*".

The better-than-most *Irish Examiner* report, of what it recognised to be a day of significant national commemoration, was accompanied by two photographs. And, however inadequate the text of its report, the *Irish Independent* carried three photographs from the ceremony. Needless, to say, the Famine commemoration photograph of the President that had accompanied the original online Kelly report was dropped for the "Brief" mention in the *Irish Times* print edition. Instead, that page was dominated by that paper's favourite Presidential photograph—which was also stretched across six columns—the President with the Queen of England.

The full length of the same six columns of that page was devoted to Day 2 of the Editor's project for the week, entitled "*Neighbours: Ireland and Britain—A series on our relationship with Britain*". Each day of the series—September 10, 12, 13, 14 and 17—featured a green, white and orange Union Jack, twice in each issue, firstly under the *Irish Times* masthead itself on page 1, and again on the page carrying the feature.

The series began with the September 10th *Weekend Review* front page, dominated by that tricoloured Union Jack across all six of its columns, where Fintan O'Toole explored "*The love-hate relationship between Ireland and Britain*", under the sub-heads of "*Breaking the connection with England*", "*Dev the rugby fan*", "*The strange death of Anglophobia*", "*Irishness = non-Englishness*" and "*The rise of English nationalism*". It concluded on page 3 of the September 17th *Weekend Review*—again dominated by the page-wide tricoloured Union Jack.

Under the heading of "*Britain and Me: readers respond*", a mildly balanced selection of 10—out of the 100 responses that had been received—were published, but with pride of place and lead advantage being given to "*The '800 years of oppression' thing is hard to shake*" from one Maeve Wallace, and "*I'm ashamed that Éamon de Valera refused to fight*" from one Tom McCarthy.

But, for the Editor, the jewel in the crown of the whole series was his Queen and President page on Monday, September 12th, where any thoughts of Famine were shrunken to next to zilch, and banished to a side bar underneath 'Mad Dog' Johnny and 'Mad Pup' Jonathan Adair.

The author of that page's main feature, London correspondent Denis Staunton, cannot have realised, until the next morning, that he had mined such a jewel. His article, as posted on the internet, carried the matter-of-fact headline: *"Post-Brexit poll racism not extending to Irish in Britain. Irish Embassy in London yet to receive any complaints of harassment of Irish nationals"*. The final column of his four column feature was under the matter-of-fact sub-head: *"EU Exit"*. Its second paragraph bluntly noted a fact of life: *"British and Irish interests, so closely aligned on many issues in recent decades, are set to diverge as Britain negotiates its exit from the EU. As Taoiseach Enda Kenny emphasised during a visit to Oxford last week, Ireland will be with the remaining EU member-states in that negotiation, on the opposite side of the table to Britain."*

But the rest of that concluding section—its first, third, fourth and fifth and final paragraph—carried quotations from Staunton's interview with Ireland's Ambassador to the UK, Dan Mulhall. The Editor obviously felt that Staunton had missed the significance of Mulhall's opening statement: *"I think there's now a very straightforward position here now whereby the Irish in a way are not even regarded as immigrants but are seen as kind of part of an extended family of people living on these islands."* And so, the initial sub-head of *"EU exit"* was binned and replaced by *"Extended family"*.

But far, far more than that. The original, matter-of-fact headline for Staunton's feature was also binned, and replaced by the banner headline: **"Irish now regarded not as immigrants but as 'part of an extended family of people'."** So the *Irish Times*, having never come to terms with Ireland being *"one island, two nations"*, and—on this evidence—no longer recognising (except in Rugby) that the island of Britain comprises at the very least two, if not three, rapidly diverging nations, proudly proclaims its current Gospel: **"Two islands—but one extended family of people"**. And, lest the message was not sufficiently hammered home to its readers, the *Irish Times* provided for a further enlargement of that message—a box, again featured in large

script, and sandwiched between inverted commas and a photo of the Ambassador himself, that loudly proclaimed:

"I think there's now a very straightforward position here now whereby the Irish in a way are not even regarded as immigrants but are seen as kind of part of an extended family of people living on these islands.' Ambassador Dan Mulhall."

This presentation, in triplicate, of a single sentence, took up more page space than that paper's shrunken Famine commemoration 'report'.

Little, if anything, happened by accident on that particular page. Immediately beside the Ambassadorial photograph, the reader's eyes were brought to focus on what one could well believe was the Editor's second favourite sentence in the feature: *"Historian Roy Foster believes the Irish image in Britain is now one of sophistication, partly because Irish voices are now so widespread in the media and in the cultural and academic spheres."* It put me in mind of those satirical lines penned by the author of Ireland's National Anthem, Peadar Kearney: *"Oh, Irishmen forget the past, And think of the time that's coming fast; When we will all be civilised, Neat and clean and well advised; Oh, won't Mother England be surprised?"*

Lest the message to its readers be lost, two days after that page, the *Irish Times* carried an Editorial on September 14th entitled: *"Neighbours: Ireland and Britain are forced into a changing relationship. On this occasion the English have changed the question."* Its key paragraph read:

"This week in *The Irish Times* our series *Neighbours: Britain and Ireland* has been contemplating the state of this relationship. In many ways, it reflects the depth of the changes over the last 25 years. It would not have been obvious while the Troubles were still raging that the Irish could ever be seen by the British as they are now: in the words of the Irish Ambassador to the UK, as part of *'an extended family of people living on these islands'*. Nor would it have been obvious that Anglophobia would all but die out in Ireland. The sterile alternatives of an Irish nationalism looking to break the connection with England versus a West British identity are largely outmoded. They have been replaced by a sense that Ireland (and increasingly Northern Ireland) are comfortable with their own distinctiveness but also happy to enjoy the benefits of being part of *'these Islands'*."

And so it was that the manipulation of a single *"Home News"* page on a single

day, September 12th, became a piece of Sacred Scripture in order to proclaim the new *Irish Times* Gospel. No sinful words could be allowed to blaspheme against it. And so it also was that every single word of what Martin Mansergh had to say on British culpability and responsibility, in respect of 1916 and the wars of 1919-21 and 1922-23, had to be completely suppressed; while the words of the President of Ireland on the Great Hunger had to be thoroughly bowdlerised.

Manus O'Riordan

## Trinity College and 1916

continued

newsheet) in 1921 (referencing Aubane's full reprint of the *Bulletin*).

But sometimes the commentaries are downright annoying. One of several such is the post, *'Defending the College'*, by Ellen O'Flaherty, on military operations at TCD during the Rising. O'Flaherty often adopts the jaundiced terminology of contemporary military reports, noting how once the College was fortified, the military on the roofs could command the surrounding streets and *"rebels passing in either direction were easy targets"*. We learn with relief that *"by Thursday of Easter Week Trinity College was secured against any rebel incursion"*. She quotes Major G.A. Harris, Adjutant of the *"Dublin University Officers' Training Corps"* (OTC) on how the College's position prevented communication between the *"rebel 'storm centres'"* (of the GPO and Stephen's Green), and adds herself how this *"facilitated the infliction of damages on the other side"*. Finally the *"Defence of the College"* (a term she uses liberally and uncritically) protected local businesses (i.e. Grafton Street) from looters and saved the Bank of Ireland in College Green. If the College had fallen to the rebels, she quotes Harris, the Library *"would have been destroyed"*.

O'Flaherty's use of this terminology and the absence of any comment on it is disappointing, but is probably unconscious and unintended, as elsewhere she writes a good account (*'Loyal and Gallant Conduct'*) of what the minutes of TCD Board meetings during and after the Rising tell us about the role and mentality of Trinity in supporting the suppression of the Rising during that fateful week.

A 'narrative' of the Rising has become current in which responsibility for the



destruction of Dublin city centre is ascribed to the rebels. This can be traced back to the *Irish Times* 1916 propaganda publication, *Sinn Fein Rebellion Handbook*, which bemoaned the loss of fine buildings without ever spelling out how they came to be destroyed. It was also, of course, an intentional propaganda ruse to encourage a view of the events as an outbreak of 'mindless violence'. The notion, often unthinkingly repeated today, that what occurred at TCD was a "*Defence of the College*", actually first appeared as a chapter sub-heading in the *Irish Times Rebellion Handbook*.

That *Irish Times* propaganda formula of the "*defence*" of Trinity and the crocodile tears it shed over the destruction of "*fine buildings*" continue, because they are let go unchallenged, to generate modern echoes, of which the above TCD web post is only an example.

Recently an official of the National Gallery told RTE that James Stephens's closing of the Gallery on Easter Monday had saved the building and its priceless collections as the Volunteers would undoubtedly otherwise have occupied such a "*large strategic building in the city centre*", leading to its destruction. This is just another example of assumptions that continue to derive from the original *Irish Times* lie.

Stephens was Registrar of the National Gallery and in charge on Easter Monday as the acting Director, Walter Strickland, was absent in London. He was a distinguished writer—including occasionally under a non-de-plume for Larkin's *Irish Worker*—and was a nationalist, though utterly contemptuous of John Redmond.

Although not involved in the Volunteers or the Rising, he believed that the pro-War antics of Redmond had made the "*Insurrection*" inevitable. He wrote after the Rising that Redmond, by his actions in 1914 in swearing Ireland's loyalty to the British war, had "*misrepresented his people in the English House of Parliament*", giving a "*pledge he had no authority to give*", swearing "*Ireland to loyalty as if he had Ireland in his pocket, and could answer for her*". This "*lie*", he wrote, led directly and inevitably to the Insurrection (*The Insurrection in Dublin*, Scepter Books reprint 1966, pp. 66-7).

By Stephens's own account his closing of the Gallery on Easter Monday had nothing to do with fear of wild Volunteers "*destroying*" the place, but was simply because all public institutions had closed on account of the fighting in the city:

"I returned to my office, decided that I would close it for the day. The men were very relieved when I came in, and were

more relieved when I ordered the gong to be sounded. There were some people in the place, and they were soon put out. The outer gates were locked, and the great door, but I kept the men on duty until the evening. We were the last public institution open; all the others had been closed for hours" (ibid., pp. 22-23).

Stephens also recounts how Myron Square rapidly became a bastion of the British forces, and remained so throughout the week. In other words it could never remotely have been under any threat from the Volunteers, even if a desire on their part to destroy the National Gallery could be even imagined. But such is the legacy of the *Handbook*.

"*Defending the College*" is a misnomer for the simple reason that not only was it never attacked but in fact became a major British *offensive* position, a bastion of the British counter-revolution. The forces amassed in it, including heavy artillery, were not there to "*defend*" it but to form the base for the counter-offensive, regardless of any consequences for the College or anything or anyone else.

In fairness to the *Irish Times's* college "*defenders*", the Volunteers did initially plan to *occupy* both TCD and the neighbouring Bank of Ireland, the former Grittiness Parliament, as part of occupying all of the city centre, and with very small contingents in mind.

MacNeill's countermand order so reduced the available force that such thoughts became academic. In his 1949 Witness Statement to the Bureau of Military History, Frank Henderson, a Dublin Volunteer and later senior IRA officer, wrote that Dick McKee (later O/C Dublin Brigade) told him that Thomas MacDonagh had drafted plans for McKee to occupy Trinity with his company while Henderson's equally small group would occupy the Bank of Ireland. Memoirs of the time recount the fretting by Pears, MacDonagh and others that no harm should come to these "*national institutions*" and hesitated at occupying them at all for fear it would put them in harm's way.

During Easter Week itself no serious rebel attack was undertaken against either TCD or the Bank of Ireland. This left them free to be taken over and transformed into military fortifications by the British. Tom Slayer, a Dublin IRK man and 1916 Volunteer, recalled MacDonagh ordering that an attempt be made by Paddy Walsh and a contingent of twenty men (!) to occupy Trinity before it could become a British base, but this was called off due to the shortage of men at Stephen's Green

and the fact that the College was already being fortified by its garrison.

MacDonagh actually forbade any action at the Bank of Ireland "*on account of its sentimental associations*" (Slayer Witness Statement, pp. 14-15). Frank Thornton recalled being detailed to roof tops covering the Bank on Easter Monday evening, while a group from the GPO garrison would attempt to attack Trinity, but this was only after British positions had been established there. In the event the attempt was abandoned.

There was firing occasionally at Trinity, such as when Volunteers occupying buildings in Abbey Street shot back with their rifles at the machine gun emplacements on the roof of Trinity that were raking the O'Connell St. area with heavy fire (e.g. Witness Statements of Loam Tannon, Ruairi Henderson and Peadar Bracken). Many more statements testify to being at the receiving end of the heavy British fire emanating from Trinity.

The destruction of Dublin buildings on a large scale was not the work of the Irish forces. Rather, following the bruising experience of fighting the Volunteers head-to-head during the first few days of the Rising, British Commander, General W.H.M. Lowe, changed strategy to one of unmerciful artillery bombardment—which not only reduced the O'Connell Street area to blazing rubble, but accounted for the majority of civilians killed.

For the commanding of this murderous artillery operation Lowe took over TCD itself as his headquarters and directed his bombardment from there, with the fulsome and active support of the College Provost, Rev. J.P. Mahaffy, the Board of TCD and the Trinity "Officer Training Corps" (OTC). It was from Trinity too that the artillery was emplaced which proceeded with the destruction of Liberty Hall and other buildings along the quays, joyfully assisted by OTC members and students helping emplace and carry shells for them.

But the TCD website account of "*Defending the College*" mentions none of this, and one is left after reading it with a vague feeling that the "*defence*" saved the college from a rebel takeover which would have ended in the destruction of the Library. It is no wonder, therefore, that the post—alone of all of those on the TCD 1916 website—has been seized on by "*Dublin & Wicklow Loyal Orange Lodge 1313*" (which is currently considering re-launching a TCD branch) and, along with a few other more or less scurrilous articles about the Rising, reproduced on its own website.

The role of Trinity College in the defeat

and suppression of the Rising has become better known in recent times thanks to the Internet. Accounts such as Neil Richardson's *According to their Lights: Stories of Irishmen in the British Army* (2015) have also brought some interesting memoirs to light, though he also heads a chapter "*The Defence of Trinity College*".

By commanding Dame Street, TCD in counter-revolutionary hands ensured a vital artery into the heart of the city remained under British control. A Church of Ireland clergyman, Arthur Luce, who fought with the TCD garrison, described it as "*a natural fortress in the heart of the city*" (Richardson, p. 363). The British gradually cleared the main axis from Kingsbridge (now Heuston) station to the College along Dame Street, and from Easter Tuesday reinforcements from the Curragh were pouring through this opening into the city. From Wednesday, General Lowe's artillery bombardment could begin, commanded from the College.

Trinity was fortified from the first day of the Rising. It had about a thousand students in 1914 but war enlistment had halved that number by 1916. Nevertheless, it had its own in-house militia, the "*Dublin University Officer Training Corps*" (OTC), founded in 1910 and composed of staff, students and ex-students. Fearing that the under-armed rebels would attack the College to seize the considerable OTC armoury of three hundred rifles and large stocks of ammunition, College authorities sent couriers around Dublin to the OTC members to garrison the College. About 150—half its total membership—rallied to the call, and were joined by about 65 individual British and colonial soldiers passing through the city at the time. The OTC in 1916 was commanded by Captain Ernest Alton, who was later one of the four Unionist MPs elected by the College in 1921 (Richardson, pp. 319-21).

Another OTC volunteer in action in Easter Week was Gerald Fitzgibbon, a 49 year old Dublin barrister and son of a former Lord Justice, who left a trenchant account of his operations:

"I haven't the satisfaction of knowing that I hit any of these Home Rule rebels. I only got shots at windows with snipers in them, and at a couple of looters. I didn't want to fire at looters, it was rebels I wanted, and the only time I ever was on a really good pitch for them, they weren't rising" (quoted by Richardson, p. 364).

On Easter Tuesday three young, armed Irish Volunteers on bicycles travelling with dispatches from Stephen's Green to the GPO were fired on by soldiers from the roof of Trinity. They were forced from

their bicycles and abandoned their weapons as they ran for cover. One was killed by a shot to the head, one wounded and the third fled to safety. The dead man was 22-year old Gerald Keogh from Ranelagh, one of whose brothers was manager of the Abbey Theatre, while another had died in the World War. Keogh's body was brought into the College, his uniform searched and dispatch documents handed over to the British command, and then his body was placed in an empty room for three days. Professor Joly, who fought with the Trinity garrison, later commented

"When will our rulers learn that these rash and foolish sons of the Empire require quiet and resolute government, sane education, and protection from the fanatic and the agitator."

Keogh was then buried in the College grounds, Fitzgibbon commenting viciously:

"We planted him out later on to fertilise the Provost's daffodils." (Richardson, pp. 337-8)

Like Alton, Fitzgibbon too became a Trinity Unionist MP and in 1924 was appointed a Judge of the Supreme Court by the Free State.

One of the colonial soldiers among those who joined the Trinity garrison later wrote in a letter:

"...we were shooting from the roof of the whole time and house-to-house searching. It was very dangerous work too, and if information came to the officer in charge of the Dublin University to the effect that a sniper was on the roofs opposite, the cry was for the 'ANZACS' numbering five New Zealanders and one Australia." (<http://irishvolunteers.org/new-zealanders-in-the-1916-irish-rebellion-by-hugh-keane/>)

The Trinity OTC was of course overwhelmingly Protestant.

There were of course also many Trinity graduates involved in or sympathetic to the Irish Volunteers.

One Catholic OTC cadet was Joseph Malone, son of the owners of the North Star Hotel on Amiens Street. He had been educated at Blackrock and Belvedere before going to Trinity, where he joined the OTC in 1915. At nineteen years of age, he fought with the OTC throughout Easter Week in the suppression of the Rising. He was later commissioned as an officer with the Dublin Fusiliers and died in the war in Flanders in August 1917 (Richardson, p. 378).

The first large British force to arrive at Trinity from the Curragh was the Leinster Regiment, and as they marched through

the front gates on Tuesday they were greeted by the cheers of the OTC. They established machine guns on the roof, commanding all approaches. General Lowe brought significant artillery into the Collage, and set up two 9-pounder field guns at the corner of College Street and what is now the Pearse Street gate to pound rebel positions, with OTC volunteers assisting in emplacing the guns and carrying ammunition, while the Leinsters occupied the south quays to engage the rebels across the river with rifles and machine guns. Soon the demolition of Liberty Hall, the north quays and O'Connell Street began (Richardson, pp. 339-40).

Elsie Mahaffy kept a diary throughout Easter week. In it she expresses her joy at the arrival of the British Army to the College, and the role her father played in subsequent events:

"... to my intense relief, I heard at last the regular march of soldiers. And looking down, I saw in the street below, a multitude of khaki clad men coming into College and I flew down to hear some news. In the Library, with my father, I found Colonel Portal. His first inquiries were for a map of Dublin and a high tower from which to prospect his field of action. He [asked] my father's advice on where he ought to place the 18-pounder to blow down Liberty Hall ...

"Very early on Thursday morning we heard the noise of the heavy guns coming into Trinity College. A little after 7.30 the pounding down of Liberty Hall began ....

"The clearing up of the slums around college still went on all morning. At luncheon several different officers came in from this disagreeable part of their duty. Each had had to shoot someone for having arms in his house.

"After luncheon the time was ripe to attack the rebel headquarters in the General Post Office. Our hour had now come! The rebels had theirs, their 'supreme moment' as they called it, on Monday. A big gun was stationed at the northern end of Sackville Street under the sheltering auspices of Parnell's monument and dropped shells on the Post Office roof."

([http://digitalcollections.tcd.ie/home/index.php?DRIS\\_ID=MS2074\\_116](http://digitalcollections.tcd.ie/home/index.php?DRIS_ID=MS2074_116))

The role of Trinity OTC did not end with the successful "*quelling*" of the Irish Rebellion. Irish Transport Union leader William O'Brien later recalled being rounded up and together with over thirty others being held prisoner in a building where the guard was "*composed of Trinity College O.T.C.*" Trinity grounds and rooms were themselves used for holding prisoners and for interrogations of prisoners by British intelligence officers stationed there (Witness Statements of

William O'Brien, James O'Connor, Msgr. M. Curran P.P and John J Doyle).

Nearly 3,000 prisoners were rounded up and incarcerated. The reaction of the Dublin Unionist leadership following the defeat of the Rising was to call for the extirpation of the forces behind it. The editorial of *The Irish Times* on 1ST May 1916 left little doubt about what it believed needed to be done:

"...The back of the insurrection is broken. Strong military forces, skilfully directed by a strong hand, have decided the issue sooner than most of us had dared to hope ... Liberty Hall is no more than a sinister and hateful memory ... We know now, beyond yea or nay, the extent, the power, the motives and the methods of the seditious movement in Ireland ... The State has struck, but its work is not yet finished. The surgeon's knife has been put to the corruption in the body of Ireland, and its course must not be stayed until the whole malignant growth has been removed ... Sedition must be rooted out ... once and for all. The rapine and bloodshed of the past week must be finished with a severity which will make any repetition of them impossible for generations to come."

This call for the extermination of the captured rebels was followed the next day by an editorial demanding measures that "will satisfy the world that the spirit of sedition and anarchy in Ireland will be crushed, not merely for a time, but for all time ... it would be the worst kind of folly ... to shear the stalk of the sedition and to leave the roots uninjured."

The Church of Ireland leadership was not far behind. In a letter of 3rd May published in *The Irish Times* (and again in the *Daily Mail*, 6 May), Archbishop of Dublin Bernard (a future Trinity Provost) demanded the continuation of Martial Law and the adoption of the sternest measures: "This is not a time for amnesties and pardons; it is the time for punishment swift and stern."

Even after the executions, Trinity Provost J.P. Mahaffy, speaking at a celebration of the "Defence of Trinity College", expressed his firm views. He described the Collage as

"not a fort of Unionists or Protestants ... we have, no doubt, plenty of Tories; we have plenty of Home Rulers, and we even keep two or three Sinn Feiners on the premises, as interesting specimens for occasional analysis (laughter). Provided they stop short of treason, we let them talk pretty much what they like."

As regards the rebellion, he joked contemptuously:

"I was not able to ascertain whether the

Sinn Feiners of the other day had any grievance except that they were not allowed to form a republic and join the Germans against the power of England (Hear, hear, and laughter)."

Describing the events of Easter Week as a "civil war", he regretted only that it was in this "miserable quarrel between sections of the Irish people" that his family had been engaged rather than in fighting the "external enemy". He recalled how his great grandfather had played an honoured part in the "suppression of Defenderism" in 1798, a movement which, he said, would "correspond to the Sinn Feiners of the present day." ("Defenderism" was a term of abuse to describe Irish native rebels). (speech in full, *The Irish Times*, 07.08.1916).

Mahaffy was also to unleash a witch hunt against national schools which after the Rising he claimed had largely been the inspiration for the outrage by their history teaching. There were calls from Unionist interests for history teaching to be banned in national schools and several school

books were withdrawn from use, much to the annoyance of respectable Catholic leaders (*Daily Express*, 26 December 1916; *Irish Independent*, 27 Feb. 1917).

The sentiments expressed during and after the Rising by Elsie Mahaffy, *The Irish Times*, the Church of Ireland Archbishop, Gerald Fitzgibbon and the Trinity Provost, J.P. Mahaffy, were deeply contemptuous of the rebels and blood curdling in their approval of the most drastic retribution. In this they were probably representative of the views of many Dublin Unionists in 1916, although there were also many who kept their counsel or considered the rebels had a case.

But the repetition a hundred years later of the propaganda formulae and weasel words of the *Irish Times Sinn Fein Rebellion Handbook* of 1916 on the "Defence of Trinity College" or the saving of historic buildings and libraries/galleries from destruction by the Irish Volunteers is a three-hand trick too far.

**Philip O'Connor**

## Casement Weekend Ballycastle

A Commemorative Weekend was held in North Antrim on the last weekend of July to celebrate the life of Roger Casement, just before the Centenary of his execution

The first event in Ballycastle took place at Corrymeela. When I arrived I was asked at the door if I "was looking for the SDLP meeting?" "No", I said, "the talk about Casement". After following directions I got lost in the Corrymeela complex and asked another employee about the Casement event. "Oh, you mean the SDLP meeting, in there" he pointed. At that point I nearly went home, thinking I had made some awful mistake, but then I saw John Gray.

Gray the "former Librarian of the Linen Hall Library" described his talk as 'Roger Casement—Realities and Illusions of Colonialism'. I wasn't left any wiser on the second bit and the part on Casement was the standard account. One interesting thing Gray said was that, whilst Casement later cited the British concentration camps in South Africa as a thing which estranged him from the Empire, at the time he was fully in favour of dealing with the Boers through harsh repressive measures like blockhouses, sweeps and relocation.

Gray took it for granted that the Black

Diaries were authentic—and expected the same of the audience—saying the British could not have forged them in the short time they had them in their possession. Several people in the audience disputed the validity of the Diaries, although it now seems to be an article of faith that Casement was homosexual and the diaries were genuine. People were genuinely skeptical about this.

Angus Mitchell noted the danger of creating a Gay icon of Casement in *History Ireland*, August 2016:

"It is now evident that the Black Diaries have enabled their own form of epistemological violence, whereby Casement's achievement... could be marginalized by playing the 'paedophile' trump... Revisionist efforts to try and turn the sexualized Casement into a kind of Proustian hero, or Gay role model, do not stand up to rigorous scrutiny of the texts... Casement's cultural construct as an urbane and playful cosmopolitan queer has little to do with the encrypted distortions evident in the sexualized version of events."

There is little if any evidence of Casement being homosexual anywhere outside of the Black Diaries and yet there seems to be a great desire to believe such a thing,

whilst taking on all the toxic baggage of the Black Diaries.

Mitchell doubts very much whether the sexual content of these Diaries are authentic:

"Casement... as a British Civil Servant ... was aware... of the role of the archive in the production of history... Heading towards his own violent end on the scaffold is it really probable that he would have so conveniently left the ingredients for the subversion of his pioneering investigations.? In any interrogation of the Black Diaries, questions to do with motive and probability weigh heavily on the side of forgery."

In the same issue of *History Ireland*, Paul Hyde, in examining the history of testing the authenticity of the Black Diaries, describes the scientifically flawed nature of these investigations which has reduced them to media events. He then comprehensively demolishes the scientific validity of the Giles Report.

Hyde describes the 2002 Giles Report as "*a verbal smokescreen of ambiguity, repetitions, irrelevant data, deceptions, omissions, ex cathedra pronouncements and disinformation*". He notes that, if the Giles Report proved anything, it was that there were definitely forged parts of the Black Diaries that "*actually demonstrate the falsity of its own conclusions*". And there are now 6 different versions of the discovery of the Diaries emanating from the master forger Basil Thomson of Scotland Yard that reveals "*dangerous instability in the foundations of the authenticity edifice.*"

Getting away from the Black Diaries, I asked Gray if he had an explanation as to why Casement went from being an Imperialist to planning Insurrection against the Empire. It couldn't just have been that he suddenly became an Irish nationalist in 1904 or felt cheated over Home Rule when the Ulster Unionists brought the gun into politics. I said that Casement's writings, contained in *The Crime Against Europe* collection, are always neglected, but they provide the answer—Casement was appalled that Britain was about to launch a catastrophic war on Europe to destroy Germany as a commercial competitor.

I told the audience that I had discovered that Balfour had indicated privately to the US Ambassador around 1909 that Britain intended to have a world war because it was easier to have a war than engage in free competition. This and a mass of other evidence—such as the writings of Lord Hankey, Lord Esher and the CID records—proved Casement right.

Gray in his reply said "*But of course Balfour had been out of power when the*

*war started*". I came in:

"Balfour was the most important figure in the British State. He had founded the Committee of Imperial Defence, which planned the war on Germany and remained a member even when he was in opposition, intimately involved in continuing the planning of the war with the Liberal Imperialists in the government. He also became First Lord of the Admiralty during the war, replacing Churchill. That was the most important position in the British military system since the Royal Navy was its senior service."

This point seemed to take the wind out of Grey and he couldn't respond.

Some of the audience said to me afterwards that Gray had made Casement sound like a fool, but the point I made changed the perception because he was not some foolish pro-German who became disenchanted with the Germans, but had good reason to sympathise with them due to the devious plans of Britain to encircle them and launch a war.

The questioning went a bit off track at this point. One man said that Collins had come to the Glens on occasion to organise the IRB there. Someone else claimed Collins and Churchill had sat by the fire in the Antrim Arms, Ballycastle around 1910-12, discussing Home Rule! No proof was given unfortunately for this wonderful story from an old farmer. It was said that the Churchills were regular visitors to Garron Tower, which was owned by the family before it became a school.

There were 2 more events in the town over the weekend. Patrick Casement talked about Casement at the Sheskburn Leisure Centre. This was a very interesting talk about Casement's rather chaotic family background and the substantial Imperial connections in it, with soldiers, admirals and servants of the Empire abounding.

Patrick Casement provided much interesting information but went out of his way to argue that, while the British Imperialists were quite mild in their behaviour in Africa etc., others e.g. Belgians, French, Germans, were much worse. He could not explain why Casement had thrown in his lot with such a bad lot, particularly in the light of atrocities in Belgium.

This meant I had to make the same point as the previous night about Casement being an insider, and seeing that Britain wanted a world war, naturally was propelled toward sympathising with the Germans. I suggested that Casement had become disenchanted with them partly

because he was a humanitarian and the Germans couldn't fight an effective defence based entirely on humanitarian principles. They had to have a hard edge to their campaign. Casement felt primarily let down due to the fact that Ireland was low on the German priority list in 1916.

There was a march at Murlough Bay on the Sunday to honour Casement. It was organised by Sinn Fein and there was a really impressive turnout from right across Antrim. It was addressed by Martin Ferris, the Kerry TD, who gave a rousing speech about the incompleteness of the struggle of 1916. The *Irish News* did not give it a mention, despite the presence of a TD and it being the only Northern event in the Commemorations.

Murlough Bay was a fitting place to be, looking out toward Rathlin and Scotland, at the place Casement had loved and always wanted to be laid to rest.

Pat Walsh

## CASEMENT

When the hangman pulled the lever  
and the trapdoor creaked  
malevolency hit  
high fever  
for the executioner wasn't  
content  
he hid in the thickets of the  
diaries  
living beyond the human span  
without repent  
though they came with quicklime to  
bury  
he sought the soul which no rope can  
hold  
and without physical substance it  
couldn't take  
gold  
he watered his lies with ink and  
watched them  
grow  
in the light of blazing headlines they  
glowed  
but the soul escaped and helped build  
a nation  
monuments point accusing fingers  
many too on the keyboard of  
digital proliferation  
still the hangman salivatingly lingers  
his calendar highlights 3rd August  
1916  
Imperial England betrayed and paid for  
a short drop and Ireland regains a  
loving son  
smirking the hangman passes on his  
genes  
it's eternal war and Huns  
fixed in aspic  
where defeat peace and victory  
are one.

Wilson John Haire

11 September 2016

# Shorts

from  
*the Long Fellow*

## CORPORATE POWER

The recent controversies over Corporation Taxes give a graphic illustration of corporate power. Corporations have achieved a massive increase in productive capacity over the last couple of centuries and have also developed the capacity to determine demand; to manufacture needs in order to satisfy them.

Just over 20 years ago the Long Fellow could live quite contentedly without a mobile phone. But within a few months of using his first one he wondered how he ever managed without it; and it was the same with the Blackberry and then the iPhone. It is a moot point whether such technological advances lead to greater socialisation or the opposite: *anomie* or social isolation. Our capacity to engage directly with the world has made us less dependent on immediate friends, family and local community.

The Apple Corporation is the most successful company in the world, but it has only one manufacturing plant, which happens to be located in Cork. Most of its production is sub contracted out to the largest electronics manufacturing company in the world: the *Hon Hai Precision Industry Co. Ltd*, better known by its trading name *Foxconn Technology*.

Foxconn conducts manufacturing at an almost unimaginable scale. Its largest production unit in China has about 300,000 employees located in the *Longhua Science and Technology Park*, which according to *Wikipedia* has an area of about 1.16 square miles containing 15 factories, workers' dormitories, four swimming pools, a fire brigade and its own television network.

The militarisation of labour involved in such a gigantic undertaking has its consequences. It is said that floggings are frequent and suicides are endemic. Do we care? When we stare at our iPhone there is no clue as to what was involved in its manufacture. As Marx pointed out about 150 years ago: social relations between men assume the fantastic form of material relations between things.

The founder and main shareholder of Foxconn is a man called Terry Gou, who comes from Taiwan, the island that Chiang Kai-shek retreated to following his defeat by communist forces. A few years ago the successors to Mao Tse Tung suggested that maybe, just maybe, it would be a humane idea to limit the size of production units to 100,000. Mr. Gou responded by saying that he could also relocate to Vietnam or India. And that was the end of that. It might be wondered: if someone from the land of Chiang Kai-shek can leverage corporate power to come out on top against Communist China, what chance has the Irish State?

## IRISH INDUSTRIAL POLICY

By the 1950s it must have dawned on our political leaders that a native bourgeoisie was unlikely to emerge of its own volition. In retrospect this was not too surprising, the national revolution consisted of intellectuals of the lower middle class and small farmers (what David McWilliams calls the *Christian Brothers boys*). The working class was represented through Connolly's Citizen Army. But the National Revolution did not reflect the aspirations of an emerging bourgeoisie. Political freedom was an end in itself.

In 1958 the solution arrived upon was to piggyback on to the massive productive capacity of Multi National Corporations (MNCs). As recently as the 1980s, Ireland's offer was a low cost labour force, as well as favourable tax treatment. Corporation Tax was zero percent for export sales. The EU deemed this to be a form of protectionism. Ireland had to abandon the zero percent rate, but instead replaced it with a 10% Corporation Tax for manufacturing profits (whether for export or not). The rate for non-manufacturing profits remained at 40%. But the EU decided that Paddy was being a bit clever by half. Everyone knew that the bulk of manufacturing had its source in export-orientated MNCs (Multi-National Companies). So the Irish were, in effect, still favouring export-orientated production over services and retail companies.

The EU's next step was to require Ireland to have the same tax rate for manufacturing and services. It may have thought that Ireland would end up having a tax rate half way between the 40% and 10%, say 25%. But Ireland instead arranged for the 40% and 10% rates to gradually converge at 12.5%. (Fine Gael and Labour like to credit the 1994-1997 Rainbow Coalition

Government with the 12.5% rate but the policy was decided long before then. There is an impressive continuity of policy on corporate taxes, which is independent of changes in government.)

The 12.5% rate, though apparently benefiting MNCs and small Irish capitalists equally, is in fact of very little use to small native capitalists. Irish residents still have to pay income taxes on dividends, whereas dividends are not taxable if they are remitted to Corporations—including foreign companies from where dividends can be paid in a more benign income tax environment. So, for all its huffing and puffing, the EU had failed to undermine Irish industrial policy which favoured Foreign (mainly American) Direct Investment.

And there the matter appeared to rest until recently . . .

## EVOLUTION OF IRISH INDUSTRIAL POLICY

But the world had not stood still since the 1980s. The Irish *Industrial Development Authority* (IDA) had to 'up its game'. The collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe in the 1990s and economic liberalisation in China meant that there were numerous locations with much lower costs than Ireland.

The IDA reasoned that, if it could no longer compete in terms of costs, it needed to increase the productivity of labour. In the international division of labour Ireland needed to 'move up the value chain'. It was impractical to go for a generalised increase in productivity, but it could create centres of excellence or clusters of skills suitable for specific industries.

Since Ireland is on the periphery of Europe, the IDA concentrated on industries that produced high value products with low transport costs and strong growth potential. The industries that it focussed on were Pharmaceuticals and Information Technology.

An ecosystem has developed around these industries. Multinationals that located here knew that there was a steady stream of skilled graduates as well as skilled non graduate labour which had experience in the specific industries. Gradually small companies developed around the large MNCs which serviced the latter's needs. While it was easy to relocate unskilled production to Eastern Europe or Asia, the higher value

production and services (the distinction became blurred) were not easy to replicate in other locations.

Other elements in the IDA offer were: an English speaking workforce; political stability; access to the European market; a reputable legal system; and low Corporation Tax. It should also be said that the IDA has done a very good selling job. Many of the successful global companies such as Google and Apple were not the dominant companies that they became when they first arrived in Ireland. The IDA has been particularly adept at picking winners.

#### MORALITY AND NATIONAL INTEREST

The policy has been a spectacular success. Indeed it appears to have been too successful for the liking of some of our European partners. Whereas in the 1980s Ireland was a relatively poor economy on the periphery of Europe, it is now among the most prosperous. Ireland is seen as a kind of Trojan Horse, which allows American MNCs to undermine the National champions of other European countries.

There is not much validity to this sentiment when applied to the IT industry because there are no European rivals to Microsoft, Google, Oracle or Apple. As regards the Pharmaceutical industry, the picture is less clear. Arguably, the Pharmaceutical industry has become so globalised with so many mergers and acquisitions that it is no longer meaningful to refer to any of the large pharmaceutical companies as French, American, German etc.

It is more likely that our EU partners' resentment relates to the fact that these American MNCs are located here rather than over there.

It is sometimes said that the Irish are competing unfairly against other European countries; that there is a race to the bottom in which each country offers the lowest Corporation Tax thereby undermining the tax base for everyone.

There are a number of points that can be made in this respect:

Firstly, as discussed, Corporation Tax is just one element in Ireland's overall offer to MNCs.

Secondly, the Irish Corporation Tax is open and transparent. What you see is what you get. Our headline rate is 12.5%

and we collect about 11% of profits made in Ireland. In France the headline rate is 33%, but the effective rate of payment is about 8%.

Thirdly, it might be wondered what rate should the Corporation Tax be? It is not obvious why Corporations—as distinct from their shareholders and employees—should pay a high rate of tax. It could be said that a policy of low Corporation Tax and high Income Tax, which Ireland has, encourages companies to hold on to their capital rather than dissipating it to their wealthy shareholders.

Perhaps our Corporation Tax rate is on the low side but it has been in place for over twenty years. The stability of our tax rate is a strong selling point for the IDA, which it would be foolish to throw away.

#### THE APPLE CASE

It is claimed by the European Competition Commissioner Margrethe Vestager that the Apple Case is not an attack on our 12.5% Corporation Tax—but if it is not about our tax policy, what is it about?

The Commissioner made a trawl of 25 years of tax records and came up with two tax rulings—one in 1991 and the other in 2007—relating to Apple, which she believes constitute illegal State Aid. In her four page press release she says that in 1991 and 2007 the Irish Tax Authorities issued "*comfort letters*" to Apple regarding the tax liability of Apple Sales International (ASI). The letters indicated to Apple what proportion of ASI's profits would be liable to Irish tax and what proportion would not be liable under Irish Tax law.

Vestager concedes that there is nothing improper about the issuing of such letters. Indeed such letters are issued as a matter of course by tax authorities across the world. And normally they are issued on a confidential basis. Her allegation is that the tax authorities made the wrong decision because they conferred an advantage on Apple that was not available to other companies. In other words, the Commissioner is arrogating the right to second guess the decisions of the Irish Revenue Commissioners. This is a new development.

The EU Press Release says that the Commission only began examining tax rulings in 2013.

If the Commissioner's decision is upheld, no company locating here can rely

on documents from the Irish Revenue. It will have to seek an opinion from the Commission with all the bureaucracy that that entails (see Seamus Coffey, *Irishconomy.ie*, 13.9.16). If that is not an erosion of the tax sovereignty of member states, it is difficult to know what is.

But not only is she overriding the Irish Tax authorities' decisions, the Commissioner's judgement is to have retrospective effect. So, for a period of 10 years before the Commission began its investigation, Apple is ordered to pay 13 billion euro, plus interest, to the Irish Tax Authorities.

Apple might feel that, if it had known that it would be liable for such tax, it would have made a different arrangement. And such an arrangement was available. Other MNCs booked their Irish profits through one company and non-Irish profits through a separate company (*The Irish Times*, 2.9.16). Apparently, the Commissioner has no problem with this arrangement, which produces the same result. Apple's 'mistake' was to book its Irish and non-Irish profits through the *same company*. It went for a "*single Irish*" rather than a "*double Irish*".

The other curious aspect about the case is that, although the Commission claims that an organ of the Irish State broke the law, *apparently* it is to be rewarded by receiving 13 billion euro plus interest (*circa* 19 billion).

The argument of the Commissioner appears to be that ASI, although a non-resident Irish-registered company, has a substantial number of employees in its Irish Branch. It has a small number of employees in its "Head office". Since the vast bulk of the employees in ASI are located in its Irish branch, the substance of ASI is Irish and therefore the profits are (and were) generated in Ireland and taxable in this country.

The effect of the ruling is that 60% of the worldwide profits of Apple are attributed to its Cork operation. This is a level of productivity of *Stakhanovite* proportions! No wonder Cork's recent GAA record has been poor. All its physical and intellectual energy has been diverted to the greater glory of Apple!

In the Long Fellow's non-legal opinion this is a lunatic interpretation of ASI's commercial substance. It assumes that all employees are equal, with equal control over the affairs of the company. Any common sense understanding of the substance of the company would consider the source of the bulk of ASI's profits to be

outside Ireland (mainly the USA). The idea that Apple in the USA would allow its Irish branch to do what it pleases with the profits that have been routed through the company defies all commercial logic.

But the Long Fellow must stress that all of the above is a non-legal opinion. It is conceivable that what he thinks is bizarre could be upheld in the European Courts.

#### **POLITICAL CONTEXT TO DECISION**

There is no doubt that Vestager's ruling is popular outside Ireland. There is general outrage at the low level of Corporation Taxes that American MNCs pay. Vestager refers to the rate that ASI paid to Ireland as being a small fraction of one percent. But this is an American problem, not an Irish one.

Most countries determine the residency of a company by where its "*centre of management and control*" is. But the USA determines it by where its registered office is located. In the case of ASI it was not resident anywhere. It was registered in Ireland and therefore according to American law it could not be resident in the US. But, since its centre of management and control was in the US, it was not resident in Ireland according to Irish tax law.

Since 2015 this tax loop hole has been closed by the Irish Revenue. A company cannot be registered in Ireland unless it is resident in a State. Of course, this does not prevent companies from declaring their residency in one of the many British protectorates that encourage tax avoidance.

The general outrage might be justified, but it doesn't follow that, because the US decides to forgo Corporation profits taxes, that those taxes should go to other countries.

#### **IRELAND'S APPEAL**

Should Ireland appeal the decision or pocket the 19 billion? Vestager in her press release has raised some doubts as to whether we will be able to hold on to the 19 billion if her decision is upheld. In her Press Release she has encouraged other European countries and the USA to make an appeal. This prompted the CEO of the IDA, Martin Shanahan, to say that the Commissioner wants Ireland to be the "*Collector General*" for the rest of the world: collecting taxes on behalf of other countries. So, on this logic, we are never going to hold on to the 19 billion so we might as well appeal.

However, it's not clear what case other countries will have, if the Commissioner's decision is upheld. If the residency of the

company is determined by where the employees in ASI are located, as appears to be the Commissioner's position, then what right have the Germans, French etc. to tax any of the profits?

The main reason to appeal is to defend the reputation of the State. The Long Fellow thinks this is a good reason. However, there is an alternative, self-loathing view, which the Long Fellow does not share, that the State is inherently corrupt and that by appealing the decision you are denying that 'fact' and further undermining the 'tattered' reputation of the State.

A second reason is to establish legal certainty, which is crucial for an economy. It could be argued that, since Apple is making an appeal anyway, this is unnecessary. However, there are vital matters of national interest raised by the EU decision, which Apple cannot be expected to defend. In particular, the tax sovereignty of the country must be defended. If it is established that the Commission can interfere with our tax system on the grounds of competition, it will be difficult to constrain its new powers. For example, it could be argued that Ireland, by having a lower Corporation Tax, is giving an unfair advantage to companies resident here over those resident in EU countries with a higher Corporation Tax. There was a protocol inserted in the Lisbon Treaty protecting our Corporation Tax rate, but if the Vestager decision is upheld, can we be certain that this protocol will remain in force?

A third reason for appealing the decision is our relationship with MNCs. This relationship goes back decades. Apple, alone, employs 6,000, with a multiple of that figure dependent on its operations here. Over the decades we have probably benefited from transfer pricing arrangements that have enabled the State to tax profits that were not strictly generated here. (This has been at the expense of the US taxpayer rather than any European country.)

It is widely believed that the recent jump in our GDP and Corporate Tax revenue is largely as a result of American MNCs (in particular Apple) transferring intellectual property to this country. It is difficult to see how the State can just cut and run without damaging that beneficial relationship.

There is, of course, a socialist argument against appealing. This is that tax harmonisation is in the interests of the European working class. Rightly or wrongly the

proponents of this view see the Vestager decision as a stepping stone towards achieving this objective. But the EU is not a State. It may be a State in embryo. But for the present its appearance as a State is an approaching and receding mirage with no unified polity. There is no guarantee that the Commission will pursue other larger countries with equal vigour. Indeed, if the Republic of Ireland does not show the capacity to defend its national interest, those interests will be ignored.

#### **ALLOCATING CORPORATION TAXES**

Finally, for all the scepticism about the Commission, the Long Fellow accepts that there is a need for the EU to decide on a rational method of allocating Corporation profits, for tax purposes, across member states. The idea that profits should be allocated on the basis of sales should be opposed on rational and national interest grounds.

So how should profits be allocated? The classic communist text *Das Kapital* might provide some guidance! In Volume 1, written by Karl Marx, it is suggested that value is only created by agriculture and manufacturing. On this basis, Apple's profits should all be allocated to Ireland, since Ireland has the only manufacturing unit! The manufacturing in China is already accounted for by the profits accruing to Foxconn.

However, Volume 3, written by Friedrich Engels, suggests a more sophisticated approach. He makes the point that profit is allocated across manufacturing, services and distribution etc according to the proportion of capital invested. There is a tendency for the rate of profit (i.e. profit divided by capital employed) to equalise across the various sectors of the economy.

What could be simpler! Profit allocated in proportion to the capital invested (i.e. investment in manufacturing, R&D, marketing, sales and distribution). At the stroke of a pen it would eliminate profits being funnelled to brass plate entities in the Cayman Islands etc. This is the way forward!

*Das Kapital Reviewed,*  
**A Modern Business Approach  
To Marxism**  
by  
**John Martin**  
124pp. **€12, £10**  
postfree in Ireland & Britain

## "Famine scholarship"

In his speech at National Famine Commemoration, Glasnevin Cemetery, Sunday, 11th September, 2016 President Michael D. Higgins said:

"Today we are in possession of a wonderful body of scholarship that has provided us with material for reflection, understanding, and indeed resolution. Between the publication of Cecil Woodham Smith's *The Great Hunger. Ireland 1845—1849* and John Kelly's *The Graves are Walking* came a fine body of scholarship that has given us information and analysis on the regional and national experience of the Famine and indeed also its international significance. We are now in a position, without facing any accusations of hyperbole, to draw some conclusions from that scholarship and also draw some instructive lessons."

I have taken an interest in this scholarship and one question that remains unanswered is the number that died. I find it morally offensive that mass deaths, anywhere, are rounded up or down to the nearest million which is what Michael D., like everybody else, did in his speech. John Kelly does the same though he quotes two figures in his book, one million and 1.1 million, which indicates the flippancy with how this issue is treated.

Before estimating the figures, we need to know one basic fact—what was the population of Ireland in 1846 just before the 'Famine' in this country full of food? None of the '*scholarship*' even considers this as an issue. Nobody knows.

Another basic fact, or question, is how do we know how many died when nobody counted the dead? Again, nobody knows. But another issue that is ignored by the '*scholarship*'.

We are presented with Census figures for 1841 showing a population of 8.1 million. This is 5 years before the 'Famine' and even though the Census Commissioners themselves admitted in their Report that this figure was an underestimate. But this figure, though disowned by the Census Commissioners, and referring to five years before the 'Famine', is taken to be the relevant population of Ireland.

The fact that an agency of a foreign State, the para military Irish Constabulary, in conflict—to put it mildly—with the population, being used to make the count is never considered as a fact that would hamper the accurate collection of such

information. In fact "*the scholarship*" accepts the Constabulary to be very appropriate enumerators.

Michael D. went to say that:

"It is unfair, I believe, to take the view of Edmund Spenser, (sic) who in 1582 had suggested the need for a new population in Ireland, one that would shed its nativism, and to transpose this view onto those who were responding to the Great Irish Famine of the mid-19th century. It is possible, however, to discern the shades of such a view in the invocation of the Famine as an act of Providence."

I don't see the '*shades of such a view*' in the mid 19th century. I can only see a repetition of the very same view: Ireland is a problem because of the people who inhabit it and they should be replaced for their own good—the logic of Plantations. As was done in America, Australia, and is happening in Palestine today, Spenser was explicit and original in advocating Famine as the more effective and economical way to destroy and replace the people. Famine was simply cheaper and more reliable than military means because the English State simply could not yet afford to clear away populations by military means alone. I don't know of any British statesman by the mid 19th century who had who disowned Spenser's basic approach. Only Carlyle was even blunter. Trevelyan's *Providence* put the same message in a religious framework. That did not change the reality of what had been policy since Spenser, it was old wine in new bottles. And of course if mass deaths are justified for religious reasons it fits the definition of a *Holocaust* much more appropriately than mass deaths organised for secular reasons, whether racial, class, etc.

Spenser saw that Gaelic society was a powerful and self contained alternative society and it had to be broken in mind and body. And the breaking of the mind was the most important. He appreciated the difficulty of the task because he had taken the trouble to get an insight into the mind of that society and had glimpsed its 'soul'. Insofar as that task succeeded, it meant the destruction of the normal bonds that had kept that society developing as it had done for centuries.

In the course of being disrupted by English agency, Gaelic society lost control of itself and one reckless consequence

was the too rapid growth of population. That is what caused dependence on the potato—not the other way around.

In Kelly's book there is much moralising about what the '*Times*' had to say at the time about Ireland, but nothing is made of one startling fact it reported:

"The workhouses are full and only hold 100,000 while 4,000,000 are starving. The workhouses are mere charnel-houses. In one there is an average mortality of a death an hour, day and night" (15 March 1847, p. 4. col.3).

Even though the author is aware of the figure reported, there is no appreciation of what must have happened to these four million starving people right at the beginning of the 'Famine'. The blight returned twice and the Government aid originally provided was abolished.

Starving people do not emigrate. They can hardly walk and any resources they have are used to get food, not Trans Atlantic fares to the USA. So what happened to the Four Million mentioned in *The Times*?

Kelly comes to a unique conclusion about British intentions in summing up his book: "*what turned a natural disaster into a human disaster was the determination of senior British officials to use relief as an instrument of nation building*". But this way of expressing British policy is just another euphemism for doing what the Spenser wanted and what the Plantations were all about: replace one people with another.

Of course Kelly denies the charge of Genocide more than once, but this description of the policy as "*nation building*" confirms that charge. Again the same wine in a new bottle. Such is an example of the "*wonderful body of scholarship*" we now have on the matter.

**Jack Lane**

### Seán Moylan In His Own Words.

His Memoir of the  
War of Independence.  
With Index of Bureau of Military  
History Statements.

€21, £17.50

postfree in Ireland and Britain



## Part 2

### Hubert Butler: The DVD

Fintan O'Toole:

"It is very striking that Butler describes this period in his life as happy as he could do something practicable to help"

Rob Tobin:

"It is again a dilemma for Southern Irish Protestants that once the war begins—there is the sense and obviously the British Crown and the UK being under threat—the question is do they go and join the war effort and fighting fascism is a value that many of them have anyway and people like Louis MacNeice goes off to fight fires in London."

(All of this is spoken over the pictures of a smiling Winston Churchill and then there are pictures of London in flames during the Blitz.)

Voice Over of Rob Tobin:

"Samuel Beckett already in France but he goes to join the French Resistance, Elizabeth Bowen—there is her own strange tale of war reports to the British Government" (a famous b/w picture of Bowen, Iris Murdoch and other guests in her drawing room in Bowen's Court). "Hubert Butler flirts briefly with joining British Military Intelligence—they are interested in him, he is a linguist, he is well-travelled and he knows about the European situation. At the end of the day he says no—I have to put my efforts into Ireland".

(Here there is a picture of today's prosperous Kilkenny city with an Irish tune playing followed by a picture of Maidenhall.)

VO: Christopher Fitz-Simon. Former Artistic Director, National Theatre of Ireland.

"I was about six when I met Peggy and Hubert Butler at Anacarrig and at ages from 7-10, I stayed from time to time at Maidenhall—I was very much aware of the war because my mother kept telling us that my father was engaged in the war and he would soon come home but I really had no interest in him."

VO: Rob Tobin.

"Life in Maidenhall was a complicated affair financially" (a picture of a lovely entrance hall, with red carpet, wall pictures and bunches of flowers on a side dresser). "Obviously Butler had inherited this 18th century Mansion—a House of middling size and not an easy property to keep going" (a picture of a man on a lawnmower cutting a very large garden and a figure of a man in a suit in the background). "But, because of his literary inclinations and because of the travel he had done, Butler had never really settled into a professional life so the question

was how to keep going, how to live the kind of cultured life that he and Peggy valued" (picture of a beautifully manicured garden with a box hedge cut in the fashion of a maze).

VO: C. Fitz-Simon.

"None of them had jobs in the way of describing jobs and so with his paying guests—we paid £3 and 5 shillings a week I think to stay there and I do not know if that covered the cost of our stay, the food, the laundry and so on but it must have because they would not have gone on doing it."

VO: RT:

"And that's when Peggy again deserves so much credit for making this life possible because she was so creative she turned" (picture of a woman with at least 8 children on a donkey and cart—in the foreground looking on is Peggy) "she turned creatively into making a life for the family, making it financially viable, she raised lots of children who came to live in Maidenhall when their parents were off" (picture of nine children in various ages from 2-9 approx.) "in the colonial service or working abroad in tea plantations in Ceylon or wherever these Anglo-Irish had gone. Often it was the Butlers they would turn to and say: Please look after our children in the school-holidays and so forth so that basically was one way they had an income. It is clear that the Butlers did have to struggle to make ends meet even as they led their very cultivated life."

VO: Julia Crampton. Daughter of Hubert and Peggy Butler.

"Well I am hoping I am going to turn up something exciting" (as she is pictured going through a chest of stuff—reads from a letter she has picked out of a pile) "How much overdraft did you pay .. (she drops that letter and goes on to next one). "Yeah—they were my parents and they absolutely had no money." (Picks up a picture of a young Hubert Butler) "and my father as a market gardener didn't make very much and he didn't have enough land than really do anymore than market gardening and they had a large house and a single child which was me" (picture of a young Julia riding a horse in ordinary clothes—not in riding gear). "They took in children from families who were not able to have them for one reason or another during the war and after the war—there was of course Joseph Hone who came here the youngest and was here the longest".

VO: Joseph Hone.

"This carving suggests overwhelming arrogance on my part" (points to a tree

carved with his name and up pops the front cover of his memoir 'Wicked Little Joe' by Joseph Hone) "as a child because there are no other carvings as none were allowed—others wanted to carve their names but I said oh you go and carve your names on other trees as this is mine .. my tree."

VO: JC:

"I had no trouble with it" (of having so many other children around) "at least none that I can remember—we all got on well and it was a big group of children mostly who got on well some more so than others but really mostly got on pretty well."

VO: RT:

"And then of course Butler and not a few Anglo-Irish became interested in country markets" (snap of Butler selling tomatoes, carrots, potatoes etc) "how he could make something of a living by market gardening" (on a screen there is a montage of slips bearing the logo of Kilkenny Agricultural Society—cards citing 1st Prize, 2nd Prize and the Thomastown Horticultural Show) "and so the orchards and gardens at their height were a very big thing—business" (a low aerial picture of Maidenhall, outbuildings, trees, gardens and a long avenue.)

VO: JC:

(Points to an area at the side of the avenue) "Here are the bee-hives that my father—he was very keen on bees"; (points to gardens) "and here are the gardens with all the fruit and vegetables and they neatly lined—the apple trees up against the wall—the Apscalia Apple Trees. My father when asked to describe himself on a form or to somebody else—he would always describe himself as a market gardener" (shots of luscious gardens); "he never considered himself that he was a writer."

VO: Suzanna Crampton. Grand daughter.

"This was the orchard that my grandfather planted—I believe it was in the 1940s. When he inherited—when his father died and he got Maidenhall and the small acreage that surrounds it" (picture of extensive orchards with Suzanna and another woman identified as Lynn Venables, family friend looking at the apple trees and the latter eating an apple). "That one is the Blenheim Orange or is it this tree here. Grandpa grafted 5 different trees off this one tree and it was his pride and joy because all the grafts took." (She shows a notebook with all this written and sketched down.) "He was very proud of the King of the Tankeirs Pippis which was one of the grafts which I don't know if we are eating that now because it is delicious—really delicious. He hated driving, he was a really really bad driver—his driving habits were very erratic and he was driving slowly and peacefully and he was thinking about the gardens and the orchards but if he was driving fast and furiously and not well—he was thinking about something like Croatia which

disturbed him and infuriated him."

VO: Chris Agee.

"When an incendiary sets a match to respectability, smoulders malodorously" (from *The Invader Wore Slippers* 1950) "piety like patriotism goes off like a rocket. The jackboot was worn by the Croats themselves and used so vigorously against the Schismatic Serbs that the Germans and Italians who had established the little state were amazed. Pavelitch the regicide ruler of Croatia is himself the epitome, the personification of the extraordinary kinds of religion and crime which for four years made Croatia the model for all the satellite states for Greater Germany in Europe. He was extremely devout attending Mass every morning with his family in a private chapel built onto his house. He received expressions of devoted loyalty from the Churches including the Orthodox whose murdered Metropolitan had been replaced by a subservient nominee".

Chris Agee. Knin. Croatia.

"There is in human affairs a kind of iron (sic) full spectrum of how any society handles cultural diversity. Societies can move very quickly from what we would call multi-culturalism to" (b/w snap of women sitting in the back of carts jolting along the roads) "say a celebration and co-operation of diversity to integration to segregation to apartheid to massacre to genocide that is at least what the 20th century taught us and what the 21st century is retelling us. The NDH" (? JH) "based on cultural and religious conflicts dispatched with the first six of those options and moved directly within one month to full scale genocide." (Screen shot of man doing Hitler salute and on it is written: *Pavelitch came to Zagreb from emigration in Italy where he had stayed for twelve years, on the 15th April 1941.*)

VO: Goldstein—First name is eclipsed and underneath is written .... and Historian—an elderly man heavily accented so there is text beneath what he is saying:

"After the Germans had occupied the territory of Yugoslavia and he started to implement his programme of ethnic cleansing. His .... (sic JH) was the first killing in the village of Gudovac near the town of Bjelovar on the 27th April—12 days after he came to power.

VO: CA: (Shot of big road sign 'Jadovno')

"At the peak of the transports the surplus prisoners were kept in the camp itself" (a shot of men walking along a road with only two guards) "summarising the memory" (shot of CA reading from a book) "of the surviving camp prisoners" (shot of book *'1941 The Year That Keeps Returning'* by Slavko Goldstein) "vividly recalls that before nightfall .... (unintelligible name: JH) "would separate 8-10 people from the camp based on a list of names jotted down on a small slip of

paper. He did this for about 2-3 times for a total of 30-40 prisoners. They were taken unbound along the path that lead to the camp—whether they were tied together once they were away from the camp is unknown but an hour or an hour and a half after they departed—gunshots could be heard. It is understood that the executions were carried out in a cave" (shot of CA reading from a book after walking down stone steps and now seated in what looks like a walled field) "below Gorba's Hill as indicated by the statements of the camp survivors. The cave has not been investigated by speilologists to this day." (GA looks around in a dramatic way.)

VO:

"I imagine my father in Adovna Camp (Shot of beautiful blue mountains, trees and church with a Cross) "in evening shade as he listens to the shootings on Gorba's Hill. He had arrived in Adovna from Danivitz on July 17th or 18th. The camps were already overcrowded and the executions of the surplus prisoners had already begun. One evening did Ritz (? JH) "call out my father's name to send him off to Gorba's Hill or did my father lose his life in the final extermination of the camp? I know I will never find out but I cannot help but think of my father's last days, last moments." (Shot of CA again pausing to look around and he then closes the book.)

VO: Slavko Goldstein.

"Altogether, it is very likely that 24,000 people were killed at Jadovna and about 4,000 survived and were transported to other camps."

VO: CA:

"In English two volumes of works stand out pre-eminently for the treatment of these terrible atrocities by the independent State of Croatia. The first is Slavko Goldstein's magisterial work of History and Memoir translated from Croat *'The Year That Keeps Returning'* and the second is Hubert Butler's *'Collected Balkan Essays'*." (Shot of Church Spire—Eastern style) "Why not let bygones be bygones they say—if we rake up these things we'll surely start trouble at home and play into the hands of Communists and anyway they are always killing each other in the Balkans."

(Shot of stunning classically built Palace). *'The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue'* 1956. "I once heard an ambassador in Belgrade argue like that. And indeed I have never heard a British or American official abroad argue in any other way." (Shot of CA in a very lovely looking chamber) "when in 1946 I went to Zagreb and looked up files of the wartime's newspapers of Croatia where the whole story was to be read. It was obvious that no foreign inquirer has been there before and the library clerks regarded me with wonder and suspicion" (Shot of CA leaning in towards camera and speaking in a hushed voice).

"Here we are in the very reading room of the old library of the University of Zagreb where Hubert Butler read many of the Church newspapers published during the independent state of Croatia. He was researching as he put it" (CA looks down and reads) "What resistance if any was made by organised Christianity to the ruthless militarism of Pavelitch the Croat national leader and his German and Italian patrons? Those days in the Library of Zagreb would prove decisive days in the life of Hubert Butler." (Shot of CA greeting a smiling woman who comes into the room with a big book and they both sit down. She says and the text appears on screen)

"This is the book you are looking for—it is the basis for the system of terror" (Her first name is eclipsed but her surname is Bucin and she is the Archivist, Croatia State Archives.) "This Decree Law on the Defence of the People and the State was pronounced on the 17th April 1941 so CA says 5 days and she corrects him 7 days after. What is the essence of that? Text on screen reads: "It is very general. It says that everyone who does anything against the interests of the State and against the honour of the People will be punished and may be by punishment of death."

VO:CA:

"This is the manual of the Ustache Code that led to the suffering of so many people" (and he goes through book page by page and now he is alone and he had two books in front of him on the desk). "This book led to this book .. much larger. Reflecting on this stark juxtaposition I can say that never before have I seen the dramatic illustration" (here he opens one book) "into the power of the mind and especially into those of totalitarian societies. This book records" (shot of book's first page on which is written:

List of Names of the Victims of Jasenovac Concentration Camp.

1941-1945.

1st Edition.

"simply names, dates of life, ethnicity, date of death then where those now murdered stand at 84,000 and they are still counting.

VO: RT:

"Throughout the late 1940's Butler becomes increasingly interested in this version of the forced conversions campaign so what was the Catholic Church's role in what seemed eventually to be the slaughter of half a million Orthodox Serbs."

(shot of CA walking in a green field towards a rushing river)

VO: CA:

"The site of this camp and this .... (unintelligible JH) "was chosen very carefully. You had a Brickworks next to a train line beside a river with deep forests and marshes nearby. Trains brought the human beings—the deep forests and the marshes took their bodies. It was a big

death camp—the biggest outside Greater Germany. (Shot of CA in a boggy field with an old train with loads of transport carriages beside him and his arms outstretched pointing to both the train and whatever in on the other side) Poland and the occupied Soviet Union. The word 'Yesenvats' (? JH) "means place of the ash trees rather like the German concentration camp Buchenwald means 'Birch wood'. Auschwitz and Yesenvats—a concentration camp and a death camp. These very trees, these very old trees saw it all—leaving witnesses to the past" (Shot of trees. Music—Slav sounding).

(Shot of Jacob Agee. Researcher. He is speaking to a countryman in presumably Croat. Screen Text:

"And do you know what happened in this village in the Second World War? (Translated text reads:) "1943 is when I was born. 1943." (The man seems agitated and now a shot of white washed sheets hanging on a line near him.)

VO:JA:

"Yes, but do you know? Was your father in this village then?

(Man who is never identified replies: "My father was here—yes."

JA:

"And there was a mass killing in this village?"

Man: "Yes, the Ustache killed Serbs" (this was the text translation given but he said more and eventually opened his arms wide—not willing to say anymore but a shot of a ruined church was shown.)

(I must say that I found this to be very exploitive and thought the man was upset but the scene was cut so I really don't know what transpired later.)

VO: CA: (Shot of him sitting beside a ruined church)

"Hubert Butler wrote specifically about what happened in this Orthodox parish of Olika (?). In his 1947 essay '*Father Chok compulsory conversion*', Butler cites a typical leaflet issued by the Catholic Hierarchy urging the Orthodox to convert. Abridged the leaflet reads: "*Our Lord Jesus Christ declared that there should be one flock and one Shepard and there should be one Church and one Head of the Church...*"

(CA: reading from text '*Father Choc and Compulsory Conversions*' 1947.)

"... and the chief .... In the Church of Christ. Members of the Orthodox Church we might introduce that unity into Croatia. Jacobille has received thousands of conversions into the Catholic Church. Catholics you will be able to stay in your houses and carry on your husbandry ...In the Catholic Church you will be able to save your immortal souls according to the sacred words of our Lord Jesus Christ."

(CA is now very animated and there is a picture of text which states:

VO: Slavko Goldstein:

"Archbishop Stepinac tried to be neutral. From the beginning he greeted, even blessed the independent State of Croatia. He was a nationalist, but very soon recognised the crimes of the Government. He got the information from the local priest of the village of Glina"

(Shot of Prelate blessing people) "that 260 Serbs had been killed (extrajudicially) without a court, without a reason and he wrote to Pavelitch a letter. He wrote in the letter: "we cannot kill them and that any who is killed must go through the Courts."

VO:CA: reading from a book

"Many will say that these ----- had at worst the embarrassed connivance of the Bishops... though the concentration camps were filled with those who opposed Pavelitch's new order, there is no record of a Bishop going there for a *violent opposition* to the leader's intervention in ecclesiastical affairs....."

To be continued in next issue.

Julianne Herlihy ©

PS In last month's issue where I quoted Neal Ascherson in the *London Review of Books* regarding his review of a book '*D.S. Mirsky: A Russian-English Life 1890-1939*'. It was of course the great Mirsky that didn't want the Soviet State to know he had gone to the School of Slavonic Studies and who, when he went back to Russia, was eventually killed anyway as being a threat to the State. Butler, I have since learnt was awarded a Travelling Scholarship to Yugoslavia by the School of Slavonic Studies in London which Ascherson had no trouble outing in his review as "*a school of English intelligence*". I have had great trouble spelling the Croatian name-places and others so where there are mistakes I apologise and hope you will get in touch if you know the correct spellings. I should also add that Hubert Butler's translations carry the same health warning but that is for another article when I have finished with the DVD. JH

Part 2

## A Sniper from an Ivory Tower

I will now look at the 'political criticism' made by Dr. McNamara of the '*Catholic Predicament*' books, '*Catastrophe, 1914-68*' and '*Resurgence, 1969-2016*' in his *Irish News* review (28.7.16). It also deals with the other criticisms made by Dr. McNamara. Previous criticism, including literary criticism, was dealt with in earlier pieces.

At the outset Dr. McNamara ridicules the argument that Britain established "*an arena for communal conflict in the Six Counties that it hoped would provide leverage over the greater prize, regaining hegemony over the Twenty Six*".

If he disputes this he should outline the reasons why Britain created something so innovative and perverse in the region in Ireland it retained for the British State in 1920-1. This was no simple act of Partition.

So why did Britain construct something in the 6 Counties that no one wanted, Nationalist or Unionist, with its detachment from the rest of the island and semi-detachment from the UK? Why did it not just keep a hold of the territory it partitioned off from the rest and govern it in the normal way? Also, why did Westminster institute an unprecedented boycott of the Parties of State from its 'Northern Ireland' region? These Parties of State, fundamental to the governing of the State and its historical development, excluded members from NI and this fact has not been mentioned in a single written history.

Neither have 'political scientists' commented upon it, despite the knowledge they undoubtedly have about how states function.

What other purpose could such a unique and perverse entity, established by the greatest statesmen of the Imperial State, have had but to act as a kind of bait for the movement that Britain wished to reel in? Surely it was not "*the better government of Ireland*" or a mere recognition of reality, as is naively imagined. So why is the character of NI unmentioned upon?

The emergence of the Irish democracy in 1918, which Britain failed to repress by military means, could still be curtailed as an independent expression. Or so it was thought. So the distinct political innovation called 'Northern Ireland', with its Unionist sub-government, was created to act as a prize for Anti-Partitionism, requiring 'moderation' in the movement taking Ireland away from British control and acting as a deterrent to any enhancement of sovereignty attempted in the state conceded in the 26 Counties by the Treaty.

Having divided the National movement and provoked it into a war about the Treaty, Britain then withdrew from its pseudo-state. Control of the false front it had constructed in NI was then franchised to Unionism. This produced the Stormont era and what is the Catholic predicament in 'Northern Ireland'.

Dr. McNamara calls this: "*The central and very opaque argument, which is advanced but never properly sustained*" and says that "*Few historians would accept this*". Does the author really think that Lloyd-George in 1920 was able to foresee that the 'Troubles' in the era of Ted Heath, would allow Britain to supposedly regain influence in the Republic?"

McNamara has supposedly read and reviewed *Catastrophe* and *Resurgence* but all indications are that he did not read *Catastrophe*, the first volume which goes into great detail about the construction of 'Northern Ireland' and offers an explanation about what it is all about.

Here is something interesting about McNamara. As far as I could ascertain, he is the editor/author of only one publication on Irish history (according to his biography on the Ulster University website). It is the 2012 Irish Academic Press book *The Churchills in Ireland 1660-1965* (purchased from Amazon for 1p). McNamara is the editor of this collection and contributes an article on '*Churchill, the historian of Ireland*'. And yet, even though Churchill features prominently in the events around the Treaty, Treaty War and consequent establishment of 'Northern Ireland's' pseudo-state apparatus, and is referenced heavily in *Catastrophe* McNamara makes no comment on the area he is most expert on!

Did he not feel *The Irish News* fee sufficient enough to read two books perhaps? That would be so academic if it were so! If that is the case, it puts an entirely different complexion on his description of *Catastrophe* and *Resurgence* as "*these extraordinarily long, wearying, badly written, poorly edited and frustrating books*". The money, maybe, didn't make it worth it!

The argument that 'Northern Ireland' was established to be something it did not appear to be takes up about 200 pages of *Catastrophe*. The evidence is laid out, including the Parliamentary statements of Churchill, first drawn attention to by Henry Harrison in the 1930s, in a systematic way, and subsequent events have been shown to have demonstrated this irrefutably. If McNamara has another theory that will account for 'Northern Ireland' he should reveal it and test it against the one which he ridicules.

In the very book McNamara edited, one chapter, *Churchill and Ulster Unionists 1918-25*, written by Kevin Matthews states, in a passage about Churchill's support for the Treaty:

"While he maintained that a single Irish state would be a 'great advantage' to the empire, to Ireland, even to Ulster but,

especially to Unionists and Protestants in the South, he argued that reunification would come about only when the new Free State convinced Ulstermen of the South's 'loyal association with the British empire'. Until that day, he vowed, Britain would honour its 'complete obligation for the defence of Ulster'... Throughout, Churchill maintained that the best outcome for all concerned would be Ireland's eventual reunification, albeit as a country firmly anchored to the empire" (pp.134-5. The reference given to Churchill's speech is House of Commons Debates, 15 December 1921, vol. 149, cc.175).

In 1922, when Craig decided to defy the 1920 Act and end Proportional Representation in elections, Churchill threatened to withhold Royal Assent from the Bill. Craig indicated that, if Westminster refused Royal Assent, he would resign and take his 'Northern Ireland' government with him. Churchill conceded. It seemed to be completely understood by all that it was important, in the Imperial interest, to maintain a semi-detached entity in existence to act as an instrument on the island. Craig was so confident about this that he was prepared to call Churchill's bluff over welfare and Churchill understood the issue so clearly that he, unusually, backed down. (see p.139 of *The Churchills in Ireland 1660-1965*, Churchill and Ulster Unionists 1918-25)

In 1926 Churchill told Ulster Unionists at a speaking engagement at the Ulster Hall: "*I cherish the hope that some day all of Ireland will be loyal, and because it is loyal be united within itself and united to the British Empire*" (p.151).

I can only surmise that McNamara either does not read the books he edits or fails to comprehend what Churchill was saying in the quotations contained in the book he edited. What he is outlining—as clear as day to me—is evidence for the lever theory, that McNamara suggests few historians accept. Churchill is saying that Irish reunification will only come about within the Empire, on nationalist good behaviour—and Unionists will be the judge of that: "*And Pharaoh said you may go, but you won't go very far.*"

So now we can understand why a frontier did not appear in Ulster, why the British State reduced the 6 Counties to a semi-detached status, why the Ulster Unionists were encouraged to make "*the supreme sacrifice*" of detachment from the Union and to take a pseudo-state with a simulacrum parliament, and why the British parties of State withdrew. It was all about Ireland, not the 6 Counties, in Britain's mind and that is what had to be

implanted in the minds of those in the Treaty State who may be desiring to use the stepping stone of "*freedom to gain freedom*". It would take them away, every step, from the object of their desire, the lost Six.

By way of a digression, can I refer to what the writer says next, in McNamara's book, about the fate of the Lloyd George Government, of which Churchill was a prominent member:

"... the Coalition's final ten months were punctuated by a succession of crises, the worst of them taking place in Ireland."

Now McNamara is a "*Senior Lecturer in International History*" according to his University of Ulster biography. He edited this book and let this statement pass. Has he never heard of the Chanak Crisis, which actually brought down the Coalition? This was when Atatürk faced down the British in the Dardanelles, Churchill called for a resumption of the Great War to put down the Turks, the Colonies refused troops to implement his order and the Tory 1922 Committee pulled the plug on Lloyd George's Government.

To me that was a serious crisis that had a great effect on the British Empire, let alone on the Coalition Government, which it finished. Britain was never again the same afterwards. Ireland was a victory for Britain, in comparison.

The idea that McNamara ascribes to me that "*Lloyd-George in 1920 was able to foresee that the 'Troubles' in the era of Ted Heath, would allow Britain to supposedly regain influence in the Republic*" is preposterous and a misrepresentation to provoke derision. So let me state what I am saying.

In 1920-1 Britain established the unique and perverse political construction of 'Northern Ireland' to retain leverage on the main part of the island it was losing. Lloyd George and Churchill probably did not imagine what would happen next.

Firstly, the Empire at the height of its powers suffered a great moral defeat at the hands of the Turks, its Imperial Government "*of all the talents*" gave way to "*governments of the second XI's*" (to use Churchill's phrases). The US then whittled away British Power, particularly after England lost its second war on Germany in 1940 and had to be bailed out by the US and USSR.

Against this backdrop De Valera enhanced Irish sovereignty against the weakened Governments he faced in London, which floundered around from

crisis to crisis in the 1930s. He did what Collins always wanted to do—but in doing so DeV sidelined the North, resolutely refusing to let it interfere with the independence of the Irish State he was enhancing. In other words he sidelined the lever (and the Northern Catholics) by going for independence first and worrying about Partition later.

This was not the Irish attitude Britain encountered at the Treaty negotiations, which was desperate to maintain island unity at all costs, and which Lloyd George utilised cleverly to impose a 'Treaty' that would divide the national movement on the question of sovereignty, represented symbolically in the Oath.

It was Taoiseach Lynch, in 1970, who let Britain again regain leverage over the State which De Valera had ring-fenced against it by putting the North on the long-finger. His intervention followed by a drastic about-turn in policy, leading to the Arms Trials, led to the start of a collapse in national culture in the South and guilt feelings about the trouble in the North. Britain saw its way back and skilfully turned an unpromising situation into an opportunity, as it does so well.

'Northern Ireland' again began to function as a lever on the Southern State, as it had always been intended it should. And only Sinn Féin's recent march into the South has begun to push back at that lever.

Dr. McNamara not only criticises the literary and political merits of *Catastrophe* and *Resurgence* but also the methodology:

"The comprehensibility of these volumes is not aided by the method that the writer deploys. Long quotations from books and documents, which will put off all but the most enthusiastic reader, are often followed by what can only be described as sweeping and curious conclusions. This is combined with frequent, unhelpful and misguided digressions, which greatly inhibit any coherence and flow."

This method of letting original sources speak for themselves is very deliberate so let me explain why I use it. About a decade ago I wrote a book called *The Rise and Fall of Imperial Ireland*. It sought to explain how the Irish Parliamentary Party went from being anti-militarist and anti-Imperialist at the time of the Boer War to being British Imperial war-mongers in 1914. I saw this as a very important transformation that had major repercussions for Ireland which historians had curiously neglected. The thing that I quickly identified as a central feature of this transform-

ation was the South African War and Britain's settlement of it.

Redmondism latched on to this as a template for Irish Home Rule and British Liberals reciprocated and began to see what was achieved in relation to the Boers as being achievable in relation to Ireland. Interestingly, Winston Churchill was the most prominent exponent of applying the South African template to Ireland in order to create an Irish Imperial nationalism that would replace separatism and enhance Ireland's contribution to the British Empire—a fact that Dr. McNamara makes nothing of in the book he edited on him. And as late as 1922 the British, having lost Redmond, began to see Michael Collins as perhaps the real deal of a potential Irish Botha.

I set about reading all the main newspapers from the time—about 15 years of them—and particularly the *Freeman's Journal* and *Irish News*. I then began searching out Imperial publications, books, periodicals, pamphlets etc.

What I realised was that the world before 1914 was very different from the world after it. So I had to get into the mind of the Imperial State and that of the Irish Party to understand what was happening from 1899–1914. Much of the history written after 1914 was fatally flawed by containing the understandings coloured by the subsequent course of history. The forgotten world of expected global Imperial domination had given way to nationalisms, commonwealths and mandates. History began to be written to serve and justify the catastrophic behaviour of the British State in August 1914 because how could the victors live with themselves knowing what they had done—even to themselves—if it wasn't?

So I put full passages in the book, as I did into *Catastrophe*, to give the reader a flavour of the thought processes of the lost world. I used them as an antidote to the typical academic device of twisting the meaning of a passage by revealing only the part of a sentence. Likewise in *Resurgence*. The reader needs to appreciate what West Belfast was like in 1969–70 before it Republicanised, another lost world.

It is interesting that in McNamara's book *The Churchills in Ireland 1660–1965* Winston Churchill's dealings with Ireland are completely skipped over before 1918. Why is this when Churchill is so prominent in the Home Rule campaign? Is it that Churchill's activity is seen of no significance in relation to what happens between 1919 and 1925? What sort of judgement is that but one bereft of context?

*Resurgence* also contains sometimes

lengthy files from the Irish State archives. These vitally reveal that the story concocted around Taoiseach Lynch by our revisionist academics and Dublin media is a fraud. And the State archive itself that proves it.

As for "*the frequent, unhelpful and misguided digressions*", these are to give historical context, something which the narrow and blinkered focus of Irish academia is keen to avoid, or perhaps incapable of providing, locked as it is, within the set horizons of Britain.

The "*digressions*" McNamara refers to are usually explorations around the historic characteristics of the English/British State and its activities elsewhere. I find these most instructive in understanding things—as I presume readers will. Granted, they are not usually found in standard "*Troubles*" literature, which has its own myopic vision and seeks to pin the blame internally in 'Northern Ireland' upon the "*warring tribes*". But what is wrong with expanding our minds?

McNamara ridicules the following statement made in *Resurgence*:

"The policy of Dublin was nonsensical. If Dublin believed the cause of trouble in the North to be Partition and that trouble was incapable of being eradicated without an end to Partition and it was ruling out the use of force to achieve it, how was it to end the trouble in the North?" (p.84 of *Resurgence*).

He says:

"It is possible to argue, depending on your perspective, that this was, on the one hand, wise or prudent, or on the other, wrong or cowardly. The policy was not, however, nonsensical. The writer, almost to the point of absurdity, makes sweeping and simplistic judgments about protagonists operating in an often terrifying and complex situation."

McNamara misses the point, so it needs to be explained. The Irish State files reveal that the Lynch Government were concerned that the Northern Catholics saw their main problem in the general conditions of life they suffered in the Six Counties. This inclined them toward desiring a British reform of these conditions. The State files indicate that the Dublin Government identified all the ills in the North as being connected to Partition and they were concerned that the Northern Catholics did not see it that way. In other words, they were not Anti-Partitionist enough for the liking of Mr. Lynch's Government.

My point was that, if Lynch believed

that the problem of the North was Partition, and he ruled out the use of force to end it, how was the predicament of the Northern Catholics to be dealt with? A consistent approach was the Republican one, employing force to encourage an end to the Border or, alternatively, a campaign for reform of the mode of government of the North to alleviate the conditions faced by the Catholic community. But Lynch's position rejected both of these and amounted to "*moderation*" which is not a policy within itself. It was nonsensical and it began to be seen as such by the *Irish News* as 1970 progressed.

I can't see that Lynch was "*wise or prudent*" or "*wrong or cowardly*" except in the way that his "*moderation*" was a substitute for policy and then academia has characterised this afterwards as an actual policy which saved the 26 Counties.

I make it clear in *Resurgence* that Lynch could have had a functional policy. This would have involved recognising the national substance of Protestant Ulster and giving it formal recognition. At the same time he should have maintained his provisions for the defence of the Northern Catholics and continued to guide them toward a resolution of their predicament. He should have applied pressure on Britain where it was vulnerable, on its insistence on the perverse and aggravating governmental arrangements it had made for the North. Instead he insisted that Partition was the problem—when Britain could simply point to the million reasons why it was a problem Lynch could not overcome. So, when Lynch had to abandon his position, the only thing he could do was go into retreat—with the consequent destabilising effect this had within the Catholic community in the North. There was no Plan B, only a moderate form of Plan A.

Now, we get to the crux of the Cork academic's discomfort with *Resurgence*:

"Jack Lynch is portrayed as virtually a British puppet. In contrast, ludicrously, Charles Haughey is described as "*the only true statesman of Nationalist Ireland*" (p.338 of *Resurgence*). Haughey clearly used public office to enrich himself and his cronies. In his defence of Haughey, Walsh gives credence to John Feehan's laughable *Operation Brogue* book, which claimed that Charlie was the victim of British 'dirty tricks' in the early 1980s. The only problem with this is that when the real story of Haughey emerged in the late 1990s, the alleged stories planted by Britain barely scratched the surface of how corrupt and venal Haughey was."

First of all, Lynch was not "*a British puppet*".

After the Taoiseach made his "*won't stand (idly) by speech*" which exacerbated the situation, he adopted an activist policy with regard to the North, instructing his Government and Army to make preparations for incursions in the North, preparations which included military training at one point. He began a process of taking the Northern Catholics in hand and moulding them into something "*slightly constitutional*".

But he was rumbled by the British and lost his nerve. He ordered an about-turn, signalled by the arrest of some of those pursuing his policy, and the Arms Trials. This drastic act hung out to dry, not only those who were pursuing his policy but also negated Dublin's influence in the North. It produced a vacuum behind the barricades in a situation which had already been made a vacuum by Westminster. The Northern Catholics were abandoned, as in 1922, and left to the mercy of 'Northern Ireland'.

But this time the Northerners did something different, availing of the solidarity produced within themselves by the events of August 1969, and emerged in independent substance as never before. They reached within themselves to deal with their predicament. And the rest is history.

As for Mr. Haughey—he made no provocative speeches in 1969-70 and followed the Taoiseach's orders before the Lynch *volte face* that scapegoated him. And that is what the Irish jury at the last Arms Trial found, when it acquitted him and his fellow defendants of the charges.

Haughey is a hate figure among many in the South and you can usually locate their orientation from their attitude to him. In 1984 Sean Feehan, the former Irish Army Captain and founder of Mercier Press, compared Haughey's task as Taoiseach with that of Adenauer's as post-War Chancellor of Germany:

"In one sense the task facing Haughey is almost as great as that which faced Konrad Adenauer when he began the labours of rebuilding Germany after the Second World War... The parallel with Ireland is clear. Haughey will be faced by... the ruins of hundreds of empty factories, and hundreds more of small businesses, destroyed by politicians who were really unable to run a country and by civil servants who pontificated nonsense from their armchairs. Haughey will be faced by a public debt higher per capita than that of Germany... Perhaps, worst of all, he will be faced by an active

opposition party, spiritually aligned with the occupying power and more often than not ready to make obeisance to that power and do its bidding. Yet Adenauer built Germany into one of the greatest and most prosperous countries in Western Europe. Can Haughey do the same?" (*Operation Brogue*, p.112).

For Haughey, the issues of the Northern Insurrection, the Republic's sovereignty, and the chronic economic underdevelopment of the South were all inter-related, parts of a whole, requiring national rejuvenation. And he set out to tackle all three. Who can say he failed?

Captain Feehan alleged that Britain despised Haughey and set out to get him with dirty tricks. Is that a preposterous suggestion, something completely at variance with the way Britain operates? No one in the North will think so.

Haughey has not been given credit for his instrumental role in the Peace Process, described in *Resurgence* for the first time (although I must credit Ed Moloney for seeing it also, albeit from the opposite point of view). Without Haughey it would have got nowhere. In the beginning it was Gerry Adams/Fr. Reid/Charles Haughey and in May 1987, under Haughey's tutelage, it became a going concern with Fr. Reid's momentous letter.

In his parting shot the sniper from the Ivory Tower says:

"Dr Walsh has contempt for most other Irish historians. Indeed, he implies that Britain has re-educated them since the 1970s (p.90). He will, therefore, be reassured to know that my historical training is from the Republic of Ireland and uncontaminated by these nefarious foreign influences."

He shouldn't be too sure of his immunity. Has he asked himself who wrote his history text books from school, who taught him at University in Cork, who wrote the books he read as part of his Irish History courses? Far from "*historical training... from the Republic of Ireland*" being "*uncontaminated by these nefarious foreign influences*", it has been the main object of them and the great success story of the project.

And Dr. Robert McNamara's review of *Resurgence* reveals him as living proof of that.

Pat Walsh

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

## Brexit—*Land Grabs, Hard Borders, and NEuros*

It was somewhat ironic that Leo Varadkar started denouncing potential "land grabs" at a commemoration for Michael Collins and Arthur Griffith in Glasnevin on 21 August. In the first place because it was Collins who launched the first 'land grab' when he encouraged the Republican invasion of the North in May 1922. This helped intensify what proved to be an enduring backlash against what was then a largely anti-Sinn Fein, Hibernian-dominated northern Catholic population.

A second attempt at a 'land grab' occurred when the Cosgrave Coalition Government signed the Sunningdale Agreement in 1974 and insisted in the Irish Courts that the provisions of that Agreement, including the Council of Ireland, were not in conflict with Article 2 of the Irish Constitution. That 'land grab' was nullified by the Ulster Workers' Council General Strike of May that year and once again succeeded in intensifying, and with British help, 'Ulsterising', the sectarian nature of the conflict.

The next carefully calculated 'land grab' was launched by Garret Fitzgerald via the Anglo-Irish Agreement in 1985, by means of which the Republic first established a beachhead in the administration of affairs in the North. As Varadkar would have been barely out of nappies at the time, we can remind him that there was no talk then of "respect and consent, by accepting the identity of the minority tradition and honouring their values by finding a special place for them to thrive, not through assimilation or the crude majoritarianism in a border poll" as he spouted in Glasnevin. The talk then, as John Hume memorably put it, was about "lancing the unionist boil".

Those associated with this journal and its predecessors tried to tell the unionists at the time that, if they believed themselves to be British then, they had to stop acting Ulsterish. They had to engage with the British population and its political class who found their pseudo-British Ulsterishness repugnant and embarrassing, and demand the right as British citizens to participate in the politics of the State by which they were governed through the political parties by which it was governed. Some of them, a few, got it, some of them pretended to get it, but proceeded to use the arguments we advanced as a sort of

Harry Potter invisibility cloak for their essential Ulsterishness. It was an invisibility cloak that the Brits, particularly Labour, could and did see right through. Most of them though didn't get it at all, particularly in the mainstream unionist parties.

The Good Friday Agreement and the form of administration that has resulted from it did not take the form of a 'land grab'. That is because the people who were actually present on the ground in Northern Ireland were also represented in the negotiations which led to it. And in the end a majority of the electorate in Northern Ireland approved it, even if they could all see that it was a very odd arrangement indeed.

The government which resulted eventually from the GFA, is in essence a form of joint administration, or authority. Though under the nominal sovereignty of the UK, which duly picks up the tab and pretends to act as the guarantor for unionism, the Irish Government also participates as of right as guarantor of the position of the nationalist community, a position it has retained since the Anglo-Irish Agreement.

When the 'process' falls into crisis from time to time the two Governments step in to broker negotiations and whenever this means stumping up cash, Westminster obliges, though the Republic has also contributed for some of its pet projects. The most recent of these agreements is the Fresh Start Agreement agreed at the end of 2015. The detailed contents of the agreement need not detain us here, but we would simply draw attention to the contents page:

### A FRESH START THE STORMONT AGREEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

An agreement to consolidate the peace, secure stability enable progress and offer hope

#### Contents

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| First Minister-deputy First Minister—<br>Ministerial Introduction |         |
| Foreword from the UK Government                                   |         |
| Foreword from the Irish Government                                |         |
| Context and Respective Responsibilities                           | Page 13 |
| Section A Ending Paramilitarism and<br>Tackling Organised Crime   | Page 14 |
| Section B NI Executive Financial Reforms<br>and Context           | Page 19 |
| Section C NI Executive Welfare and Tax<br>Credits Top-Ups         | Page 22 |

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Section D UK Government Financial<br>Support  | Page 24 |
| Section E Irish Government Financial<br>Support   | Page 30 |
| Section F Implementation of other aspects   | Page 33 |
| of the Stormont House Agreement   |         |
| Appendices, setting out the NI Executive's<br>detailed proposals for specific aspects of<br>implementation for which it is<br>responsible | Page 41 |

With an Introduction from both First Ministers, Forewords from both Governments and details of their respective financial support, the nature of the joint authority mentioned above is absolutely clear. It is a quite unique set of relationships, and while one state or the other must, it would seem, in international law be sovereign, in practice sovereignty is shared. There is therefore no comparison between this system of government and the 'devolved' governments elsewhere in the UK.

The devolved governments of Scotland and Wales exist in a state of what the science of Mechanics might refer to as a 'stable equilibrium', comparable to that where a book rests flat on a table. The centre of gravity of the book is low, so if you raise it at one end or side and release it again, it will return to its original equilibrium position.

The arrangements were instituted by Labour in Westminster after a modest degree of pressure from nationalist parties, but owe their existence and the extent of their powers entirely to Westminster. While Scotland in particular makes noises about full independence, it failed to make good on this desire when given the opportunity to do so in its 2014 referendum.

Anyone remotely familiar with the development of the nationalist movement in Scotland knows that it was born out of, and developed because of, the discovery of North Sea oil in the 1970s. The 2014 referendum was held after an unusually sustained 4-year period of very high oil prices. There had never been a better time for the nationalists to hold such a referendum, and yet it failed to produce the desired result.

A substantial nationalist movement in Scotland would have to have the moral fortitude to be willing to suffer significant material loss for an indeterminate period of time to succeed, and there is no indication that this exists in Scotland or that there is an ideological basis for it to exist. The fact that oil prices are today less than half what they were in September 2014 merely serves to underscore this

fact. Scotland will remain, beholden to Westminster, in its stable equilibrium for the foreseeable future.

The case of the Northern Ireland Executive, which is also, somewhat misleadingly, described as a 'devolved' government (it is in fact something like a semi-detached government), is quite different. It came about, after a thirty year long war, through agreement with a neighbouring sovereign state and under pressure from the United States, which decided that it had better things to do with Britain's armed forces than waste them on internal policing. There was also the realisation that where a relatively small, but democratically significant, group of individuals had sufficient determination and ingenuity to intermittently wreck the nascent centre of global finance capital using mostly materials available in any local hardware store or agricultural co-op, it might be better talking to them, rather than merely targeting them, or their co-religionists, for extra-judicial execution.

However, the intricate network of international, constitutional and legal relationships, including recourse to the European Court of Human Rights where applicable, which have enabled the GFA to develop into a viable system of government also give it a 'high' centre of gravity and it is thus in a state of what Mechanics would refer to as an '*unstable equilibrium*', like a coin on a flat surface delicately balanced on its edge. In the past the threats to this inherently unstable equilibrium have been managed by the Governments and institutions involved, but Brexit has changed everything, and in a very succinct and purposeful article in the *Irish Times* on 19th August, '*Remain must mean Remain*', Martin McGuinness made that clear:

"The island of Ireland is facing the biggest constitutional crisis since partition as a result of the Brexit referendum. The negotiations in the lead-up to Easter 1998 concluded with agreement on three interdependent strands relating to: issues within the North, between the North and the Republic, and between Ireland and Britain. Like a three-legged stool, take away one leg and it collapses.

The Good Friday (or Belfast) agreement, as it became known, was endorsed by 94 per cent of the voters in the Republic and 71 per cent in the North. Bunreacht na hÉireann was amended, institutions North and South were established and 18 years of political progress proceeded on the basis of that democratic vote.

The decision by the Conservative Party to press ahead with the Brexit referendum was a snub to the agreement. The decision to press ahead with Brexit following the

referendum fundamentally undermines the Belfast Agreement and other agreements. It represents a major setback for the political process in the North.

Brexit will undermine all-Ireland bodies and co-operation created by the peace process and it will harden partition. It will have consequences for human rights legislation which, again, is specifically referred to in the Belfast and subsequent agreements.

The agreements, the Irish economy, the views of the Irish Government and the wishes of our people have been set aside by the British government.

The current economic uncertainty is already damaging trade and investment and causing currency fluctuations which impact particularly on cross-Border business and exports. But all of that will become overshadowed if we see the imposition of tariffs and the restriction of free movement of goods, services and people on the island of Ireland."

The decision by the United Kingdom to disrupt the European Union even further than it has done in the past, by launching an exit process, has destabilised Northern Ireland's 'unstable equilibrium'. That equilibrium was achieved, as Martin McGuinness points out, with the support of 71% of the NI electorate. Only 44% in NI voted in favour of Brexit. Is that overwhelming majority in favour of the 1998 settlement now to be overturned by the votes of this minority, plus those of the rest of the UK, who have no interest or stake in how NI is governed as long as it stays out of the news and, as far as possible, out of their pockets?

In July Theresa May visited Northern Ireland and declared that "*No-one wants a return to the borders of the past*", despite having stated during the referendum campaign that it was "*inconceivable*" that border arrangements with the Republic would be unchanged by a Brexit vote. In September Mr Brexit himself, David Davis MP, Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union, visited NI and stated in an article in the *Belfast Telegraph* that

"We are clear we do not want a hard border—no return to the past—and no unnecessary barriers to trade. What we will do is deliver a practical solution that will work in everyone's interests, and I look forward to opening the conversation about how that should operate with my colleagues today."

Nobody, it seems, wants a hard border, but how can this be avoided? Peter Sutherland, not someone this journal would normally have much house room for, but—as former Attorney General of Ireland, former European Commissioner, former Chairman of BP, former chairman of Goldman Sachs International and financial advisor to the

Pope no less—he might be considered a man, as your parents might say, who knows what's what. He responded to Davis, Brokenshire and the rest and told them that a hard border was exactly what they would be getting if Brexit went ahead with Northern Ireland included:

"I am absolutely mystified, not for the first time in this debate, about what is coming out of London... We have been told by a number of Conservative Party spokespeople that Britain will leave the common customs area of the EU. If this is true, the customs union, which relates to sharing a common external tariff of the EU, will have to be maintained by all other EU countries with the UK following its withdrawal. Goods will have to be checked at borders."

"I would be very fearful that they may be heading towards a negotiation that will require a hard Border between north and south in Ireland. Dismissing this as a prospect at this stage is ridiculous."

It is not often that it is possible to agree with Peter Sutherland, but in this case it is hard to disagree, with either him or Martin McGuinness. Misery acquaints a man with strange bedfellows indeed!

The 'hard border' notion however is sometimes bandied about as if it means a return to checkpoints, watchtowers and militarisation of the border. What it really means, if Brexit includes NI, is that, via EU *diktat* if necessary, but through the Irish state's own self interest above all, tax revenues will have to stop disappearing into the North through unlimited cross-border shopping, which intensifies every time Sterling lurches south.

The Single Market currently facilitates and requires this at a massive loss to the Irish exchequer and also thereby artificially flatters Northern Ireland's economic performance. Any checkpoints are therefore more likely to be on the Southern side of the border.

Customs controls on south-bound commercial traffic will also have to be reintroduced. There will once again be delays of hours for trucks carrying cargo from Larne and Belfast to the Republic as they clear customs. Why, after Brexit, should the Republic of Ireland subsidise the use of UK ports? Border towns like Newry, that have boomed since the Single Market was introduced, will become unemployment black spots again, with the social and political implications that involves.

There is only one solution if cross border trade is to remain as it is, and economic development in the North is to continue, and that is, if Northern Ireland remains part of, not only the Single Market, but of the EU itself. And that can only happen if



it is part of a sovereign state within the EU.

There is therefore an unimpeachable case that the *de facto* joint sovereignty which now exists in relation to NI should be translated into *de jure* Joint Sovereignty, with actual unity and the border poll it would require being kicked into the long grass until such times as there is a realistic possibility of it being passed—an actual legal requirement of the GFA.

A necessary part of such Joint Sovereignty being accepted by the EU as valid for retention of NI within the EU when the rest of the UK exits, and also a necessary part of rebalancing the North's economy and reducing the dislocations caused in the Republic by currency fluctuations would have to be that NI will also join the Eurozone. The Euro is already a *de facto* second currency in NI and no-one will ever refuse to sell you something if that is the only currency you happen to have on you.

There have already been moves to harmonise Corporation Tax rates between the two parts of the island, and tourism promotion is already delegated to a single authority, so there is no obvious reason why industrial development cannot also be so harmonised. There will be a Foreign Direct Investment Brexit bonus for Ireland when Britain leaves the EU, that is inevitable at this point. If the North comes under Joint Sovereignty and the Euro it can participate in that and thereby rebalance its economy away from its chronic dependency on central government spending. If it does not, its prospects, both economic and political, seem very bleak indeed.

Would all this pass the democratic test of a referendum? The Brexit referendum showed that, as expected, nationalist areas voted overwhelmingly for Remain. More interestingly, in unionist-dominated areas there was only a very narrow vote for Leave, with one, North Down, in fact voting Remain. There is thus a clear split within unionism on the matter.

Joint Sovereignty offers the possibility of the Union remaining substantially in place with non-EU related competencies such as Defence being reserved to Westminster. Westminster would also have to continue to pick up the tab for government spending until the NI economy can be rebalanced. Given the above, there is a realistic prospect of being able to obtain a democratic mandate for Joint Sovereignty (even though this would not legally be required under current agreements) with no 'land-grabbing' involved.

Sean Owens

## On the Blanks on my own lovely Lee

This book was launched on the evening of Cork Culture Night, 16th September, in the Cork City Library. It is published by Collins press with "*financial support from Cork City Libraries*".

The Editor explains that that she divided the collection into themes and that "*the prevailing mood is positive*". There is indeed a selection of many themes but there is one glaring omission—the political history of Cork. In this centenary year and "*decade of commemorations*" one would expect a gesture at least to that theme. But, as well as the War of Independence being a blank, so the Fenian period is also a blank. There is one tangential reference to the political/historical theme under "*Landmarks*", called "*The men of the South*", which is based on a contemplation of that painting in the Crawford Gallery. This ends with the following lines:

*"Their politics out-moded  
Their innocence fresh-faced, dangerous."*

This indicates that "*the prevailing mood*" of the publication is anything but "*positive*" on what that painting represents. These men's efforts led to the present day Republic. Is that out-moded as well?

With this "*dangerous*" epithet, the publication shows an odd sense of priorities. The publication contains no less than four contributions by that "*gentle, murderous poet*", Spenser, (to quote Sean Moylan). And a further two contributions on the famine-monger and the eager participant in the killing of pregnant women at the Smerwick Massacre. However, with so many contributions by him and on him he is clearly *à la mode* with the publishers.

By the way, of these four contributions, three are about courting his wife and one is a two-liner entry of his that just mentions the Lee. But that qualifies him to be the leading contributor to this publication! But the Editor had explained that "*A few poets have been naturally excluded because even though they have Cork associations they have never written about the city*". Spenser never wrote about the city either and, whoever the excluded poets are, I suspect they had more positive "*associations*" with the city and county than Spenser ever had.

The publication fits in with the idiotic rubric that Cork City Libraries has devised for the decade of commemorations:

*"History is to blame"*. It is ubiquitous around the Libraries and there could not be a more inane title for such a project. The Library authorities should have taken the advice of another Corkman, Henry Ford, gone the whole hog, and declared that "*History is bunk*". It comes to the same thing.

Then there is pure invention and naturally this is at the expense of Republicans. In an entry called "*Culture Night*" the following lines are included:

*"Culture night how are ya,  
Do you know what killed culture in Cork?  
The republicans,  
When they burned down the Opera House.  
My God, the old Opera House  
What a beautiful building"*

Maybe the author is being ironic (it could be a peculiar form of Cork city drollery) but more likely he is simply ignorant of the fact that the fire which destroyed the Opera House in the 1950s was caused by an electrical fault. But neither is an excuse for an Editor to allow such nonsense in her publication. Maybe she will '*blame*' history' rather than her own inadequacies. Don't waste your money on this book.

Jack Lane

### CONTROVERSY

There was the following correspondence in the *Irish Examiner* on the Opera House burning:

#### 1. Stoking embers on Opera House fire

"On the banks, Cork city in Poems and Songs" edited by Alannah Hopkin (Collins Press) was launched on Culture night at the City Library.

One contribution contains the following lines:

*"Culture night how are ya,  
Do you know what killed culture in Cork?  
The republicans,  
When they burned down the Opera House.  
My God, the old Opera House  
What a beautiful building"*

The Opera House was burned down because of an electrical fault. That can be verified from many sources including the files of your newspaper.

Why did the editor allow such an allegation to stand?

Jack Lane (20.9.16)

#### 2. Missing the point

Jack Lane misses the point when he refers to Culture Night in a contribution

from Colm Scully in *On the Banks—Cork City in Poems and Songs*.

The character in the poem takes the persona of a "know-all" or a bore pontificating in a pub. I think that this is the obvious meaning.

Both the author and the editor (the excellent Alannah Hopkin) are well aware I am sure that the Opera House was not burned down by republicans.

**George Harding** (23.9.16)

### 3. Opera House Fire Misrepresented

I am glad that George Harding (23.9.16) confirms that the Cork Opera House was not burned down by Republicans as stated in the recently published book "*On the banks, Cork city in Poems and Songs*" because he helps prevent this yarn acquiring legs as is wont to happen these days with such matters.

I am also glad for his assurance that the book's editor, "*the excellent Allannah Hopkin*," is well aware of the facts. I am sure therefore he, and readers, would agree that she has set a new, probably unique, standard in poetic licence in accepting a total misrepresentation of a well known historical fact in her collection. If not poetic licence maybe it should come under the rubric of Comic Opera?

**Jack Lane** (26.9.16)

### A MURDER OF CROWS

You sit in the park  
    shredding bread  
feeding the crows  
    feathered sharks  
they fight one another  
    though there's plenty  
to see all fed  
    and what about that runt  
thin in poor condition  
    a bundle of woe  
its weakening legs shunted  
    losing its place  
in the feast  
    as the crow of the plump bird grows  
you want to feed it  
    but the murder  
forms a border  
    that's called the survival  
of the fittest  
    which maintains a nation's order  
re: Darwin still in vogue  
    as the passive witness  
are we too such unreasoning animals  
    that we can't intervene in  
this society's pitilessness

**Wilson John Haire**

10 August, 2016

· Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback

Letter sent to *Irish Times* on 13th September but not published

## Neo-Redmondism

Ignoring Britain's role in the conflict between the two national communities in Ireland, as John A Murphy (September 5th) and Kevin Ryan (September 12th) do, gives a wrong focus to the debate about the long term implications for Ireland of Britain's exit from the EU.

In 1921 the British Government ordained that Northern Ireland should be governed by an unprecedented regional sub-government controlled by the representatives of the majority community. The resulting unhappy settlement was used, among other purposes, as a lever for maintaining influence over the rest of Ireland; keeping the whole of Ireland within the British sphere of influence has been a central objective of British policy ever since, coming noticeably into play in the early 1970s and again following the Good Friday Agreement.

In the circumstances arising from Brexit new possibilities have emerged, as Ronan O'Brien argued in an opinion piece, "[Why Redmond and Adams have much in common](#)" (August 30th), the article that started the present correspondence. As Britain goes its separate way it remains to be seen whether a re-configuration of political boundaries and institutions on the island of Ireland can be investigated in the context of relationships with the EU.

Exploring these possibilities represents a more realistic option than the ahistorical project of converting nationalist Ireland to neo-Redmondism counselled by Messrs Murphy and Ryan.

**Dave Alvey**

Letter published by *Sunday Independent*, 14.8.16, but omitting last paragraph

## Casement & 'Armenian Genocide'

James Mathers' letter 'Casement's full story' (7.8.16) is both unfair to Sir Roger and factually inaccurate.

The view that "Britain was fighting for democracy and human rights" in its war against Germany and the Ottomans is frankly laughable. Britain's Great War was a Balance of Power war waged to destroy an emerging commercial competitor and to absorb the strategic Ottoman territories of Mesopotamia and Palestine into its Empire.

There is no event called the "Armenian Genocide". "Genocide" is a legal term invented in the 1940s. For an event to be termed "Genocide" there needs to be a ruling by an international court. No such ruling has ever been made. Quite the reverse. European courts have recently ruled that arguing there was no "Armenian Genocide" is quite legitimate. Genocide in this case is merely an accusation with no legal basis and cannot be taken as fact. There is no telling historical evidence to support it and much evidence against it. The present Pope has no legal authority or knowledge in this sphere. The Pope of the time, Benedict XV, demanded the release of Turks Britain was attempting to put on trial for the so-called "Genocide".

The Turks did not "massacre one million Armenian Catholics" as Mr. Mathers alleges. Around 650,000 Armenians perished in the Great War from all causes, including insurrection, fighting in the ranks of the enemy, Royal Navy blockade, disease, hunger and poor conditions brought on by the Allied invasions, flight to the Russians, withdrawal with the French army in Cilicia or as victims of the mismanagement of the Erivan Republic, between 1914 and 1923. More Turks and Kurds died in the same period and the death rates in eastern Anatolia were comparable with those of the Armenians. So what we are talking about is civil war brought on by invasion.

The vast majority of Armenians were not Catholic - they were Gregorian Christians worked on by Protestant missionaries to change their faith.

Mr. Mathers mentions the Blockade of Germany. If Casement is guilty by association with the events in Anatolia, on Mr. Mathers' logic how much more guilty are John Redmond and the Irish who served in the Royal Navy, which subjected Europe to a 4 year blockade that killed over a million civilians, mostly women and children?

**Dr. Pat Walsh** (author of '*Britain's Great War on Turkey*')

Does  
It  
Up

Stack  
?

#### AUDITORS AND ACCOUNTANTS

In the September issue of the *Irish Political Review*, I outlined the history of accountancy as an organised profession in the Anglophone world. As I noted, accountancy activity was to do with the recording of financial transactions and the preparation of accounting records in the form of Profit and Loss Accounts and Balance Sheets on a periodic basis—most usually recording Assets and Liabilities as on a fixed date each year and showing in a Profit and Loss Account the profit or loss for the year ended on the date of the Annual Balance Sheet. A social and professional distinction was established by the formation of the various Institutes because these sought to place accountants on a higher status than 'mere' bookkeepers.

And the Institutes succeeded in this by requiring their members to exhibit in their examinations a high degree of knowledge of subjects other than book-keeping. Subjects such as economics, commercial law, company law, bankruptcy law and, in recent decades, taxation law and use of information technology (IT).

However, if we go back to 1807 we see in *The Accountant's Guide or a complete system of Mercantile Arithmetic adapted to the Commerce of Great Britain and Ireland* by Donal McSweeney (author also of *Practical Book-keeping*) published in Cork in 1807 that the contents of the book consist of an extensive exposition of multiplication and division as applied to a wide range of commercial activities, concluding with chapters on Partnerships, Joint Venture, divisions of profits, design of shop-bills and even a section entitled *"Promiscuous Questions to Exercise"* (not what you might think!).

So the word *"Accounting"* did not always have the meaning it has today. This question of the meaning of the word *"Accounting"* is important to an understanding of what the Institutes were aiming to represent, because in fact from around 1880 onwards the public perception of an *"Accountant in practice"* was of an Auditor and it was as Auditors of Limited Liability Companies and of Industrial and Provident Societies that the Accountancy profession grew into substantial respectability in the

eyes of legislators and the public generally. And yet in the Anglophone world of the USA, Britain and Ireland, the Auditors are still referred to in the names of the various Institutes.

This is not at all the case in many other countries. In Germany, for example, Auditors are known and identified as *Wirtschaftsprüfer* and their basic expertise is in the law and they normally qualify first as lawyers. Furthermore, in Germany the law does not permit *Wirtschaftsprüfer* to provide services other than auditing to their clients whereas in Ireland, the USA and Britain, the Auditors to a company can be Partners in a firm which also provides Management Consulting and Human Resources Services to the same client—which results in a substantial conflict of interest.

To be continued next month.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Massive interference in Ireland's referenda is now occurring again as we see huge propaganda for holding a referendum to change the Eight Amendment of the Constitution. There is no widespread demand for such a change. But a wave of propaganda is being generated in the media by a minority—a very small minority of like-minding groups which are very obviously funded from somewhere other than the people. In the run-up to the gay marriage referendum last year, there was a similar wave of propaganda which, it emerged, was funded by tens of millions of dollars from so-called *"charitable foundations"* in the USA whose agenda is to disrupt further society in Ireland i.e. in effect to further what in effect seems to be an agenda of chaos. George Soros, the billionaire financier is reported to have said in a leaked email:

"If we can bring in total abortion on demand in Ireland which is seen world wide as a Catholic country, then we can move on to do it in Poland next and then on to other countries."

Billionaire Chuck Feeney poured millions of dollars into the gay/lesbian marriage referendum last year. Is he doing it again with the campaign to legalise total abortion in Ireland by abolishing the Eight Amendment to the Constitution of Ireland which was approved and passed by the people only a few short years ago. The recent campaigns do not stack up at all and does it not seem there should be a law enacted to make unlawful the funding from abroad of campaigns to alter our Constitution?

Michael Stack ©

#### Brendan Howlin Press Statement

## Apple And Tax Justice

There is only one party in Ireland that has held a consistent and enduring commitment to the principle of international tax justice—that is the Labour Party.

In Government, we insisted on bringing to an end loopholes such as the 'double Irish' that allowed large corporations to become stateless, and to avoid paying tax anywhere in the world. Similarly, at our insistence, Ireland has been at the centre of a project led by the OECD to improve tax transparency worldwide. In part because of policies such as this, the corporation tax take in Ireland rose from €4.6bn in 2014 to almost €6.9bn in 2015.

The Labour Party has always argued for tax justice, and for every person and every company to pay their fair share. It is tax income that funds our roads, our schools, our hospitals, our welfare system —of all parties we are the one most committed to retaining a strong, well-funded and activist state. In advance of the Budget, Labour will be unveiling further proposals to improve the degree to which we collect taxes from corporations that can well afford to pay them.

Earlier this week, the European Commission published their ruling which suggested that Apple owed €13bn plus interest to the Irish state. The figures involved are staggering, and I know that every member of the Labour Party has plenty of ideas as to how that money could be used to invest in public services.

But I am surprised when I hear suggestions that the European Commission represents a significant left-wing force in politics. I worked with the commission in my time in government, and far from being left-leaning, it was always in my view an organisation minded to serve the interests of the larger countries rather than countries like Ireland. The Commission has a vested interest in building their own power base in Brussels, and I believe their ruling on this matter (regardless of what the Commissioner may say in public) is an effort to gain European control over Irish tax policy—one of the few remaining economic levers that remains entirely a matter for Ireland, and a lever that has supported the long-term presence of many big employers in Ireland for many years.

It is for that reason that the Labour Party believes that this ruling should be appealed. Not because we don't want the money, or don't believe corporations should make a fair contribution, but because we fundamentally believe that efforts to exert European control over Irish tax policy will benefit only the largest EU countries. Even if this appeal is not successful, the Commission has taken the extraordinary step of inviting any country that feels they should have a share of this tax to come and knock on our door for it—effectively they are asking the Irish Revenue Commissioners to become a global tax collector.

## The Refugee Crisis and the real villains of the piece

Motion 67, from Branch 733, which was passed at this year's NIPSA [Northern Ireland Public Servants' Alliance] Annual Conference, called *"on the incoming General Council to support the refugees in their plight through lobbying, highlighting and raising awareness through the Global Solidarity Committee"*.

In the debate, we noted the failure of the media to properly define and differentiate between people falling within the various legal categories and statuses, who seek to enter the country. People, regardless of circumstances, are too often simply referred to, generically—as *"migrants"*. Caught up in this definition, are 'asylum seekers', 'refugees', 'economic migrants' and European citizens openly availing of the free movement of people, goods and services, guaranteed by the EU.

Despite the negative public perceptions generated by certain right-wing newspapers and the assertion that *"these people are a drain on the economy"*, the reality of the latter group is outlined in a report titled *"Challenging Racism: Ending Hate"*, by Dr. Richard Montague and Prof. Peter Shirlow. In this they point out that *"recent European immigrants in the UK have paid £8.8 billion more in tax than they have consumed in public services"*.

*What then is a refugee?*

A refugee is a person, defined within the UN *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees 1951*, who—

"owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality, and is unable to or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country..."

Because of the well founded fear of persecution, Article 31 of the Convention prohibits states from—*"penalising a refugee for illegal entry when the purpose of their entry is to claim asylum"*.

That legal provision is unfortunately no barrier to some of the media manipulating public opinion, by suggesting that the *"refugee crisis"* is a phenomenon created by the attempted illegal entry to Europe and Britain in particular, of people apparently 'lured' by the promise of economic betterment, who are facilitated by a black market, run by people smugglers. That way the public can subliminally hear the word "bogus" every time the term 'asylum seeker' is

mentioned. Just as they have been encouraged to do with welfare claimants.

And yet, an asylum seeker is someone who has lodged an application for protection on the basis of the 1951 Refugee Convention or Article 3 of the ECHR. In other words, they are not 'economic migrants', but rather people seeking to avail of the international protections, afforded only to people in danger of persecution in their own country.

*The real origin of the Refugee crisis*

But people smugglers are not the only villains of the piece when it comes to the "causes of refugees". There are others in respectable society and the recently published Chilcott Inquiry has exposed some of them—most notably Tony Blair, who was the most vocal cheer leader for the United States' *"Global War on Terror"*. That *"asymmetric"* war against an abstract noun, continues without end. The majority of the world's refugees are the victims of pre-planned interventions made by the US/UK in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, and other conflicts, which have led to the slaughter and displacement of millions of people.

*British Ambassador view of Tony Blair.*

Christopher Meyer, the former British Ambassador to Washington, commented on Tony Blair's support for the Iraq invasion, in an article in the *Daily Mail* on 15th June 2014, stating amongst other things—

"Last year,.... Tony Blair sought to justify his decision to go to war by arguing that Iraq was a far better place for the removal of Saddam Hussein. 'Think', he said 'of the consequences of leaving that regime in power.'

But today,—

"Iraq is descending into such violence and disorder that its very existence as a sovereign country is under threat."†

"So, we are reaping what we sowed in 2003. This is not hindsight. We knew in the run-up to war that the overthrow of Saddam Hussein would seriously destabilise Iraq after 24 years of his iron rule."

"For all his evil, he kept a lid on sectarian violence. Bush and Blair were repeatedly warned by their advisers and diplomats to make dispositions accordingly."

Of course much the same thing could be said today about the situation in Syria and the position of President Assad, but our media and politics is not in a rational place at present.

Christopher Meyer closed his article stating—

"In 1999, in a speech in Chicago, Blair proclaimed his doctrine of intervention abroad in the name of liberal values. It became the philosophical underpinning for Britain's invasion of Iraq.

The time has surely come to consign the Blair doctrine to the dustbin of history."

*The Blair Doctrine—22 April 1999*

The Blair Doctrine, was announced in at the Economic Club in Chicago on 22nd April 1999. It was a speech in which Blair effectively laid out the role Britain would play in the service of the United States and its global interests. He reflected—*"At the end of this century the US has emerged as by far the strongest state"*.

He then challenged the principle of non-intervention in other countries, other than for the purposes of immediate self-defence, stating—

"The most pressing foreign policy problem we face is to identify the circumstances in which we should get actively involved in other people's conflicts. Non-interference has long been considered an important principle of international order. And it is not one we would want to jettison too readily. One state should not feel it has the right to change the political system of another or foment subversion or seize pieces of territory to which it feels it should have some claim. But the principle of non-interference must be qualified in important respects...."

"I say to you: never fall again for the doctrine of isolationism. The world cannot afford it. Stay a country, outward-looking, with the vision and imagination that is in your nature. And realise that in Britain you have a friend and an ally that will stand with you, work with you, fashion with you the design of a future built on peace and prosperity for all, which is the only dream that makes humanity worth preserving...."

*The Project for a New American Century*

Blair's words chimed perfectly with the *"vision and imagination"* outlined in the *Statement of Principles of the Project for a New American Century*, issued on 3rd June 1997. In these, the Neo-Cons, who would go on to senior positions in several US administrations, described the United States as the *"world's pre-eminent power"*, and asserted that the nation faced a challenge to *"shape a new century favourable to American principles and interests"*. This would of course require significant increases in spending on defence and for the promotion of *"political and economic freedom abroad"*.

The group stated that the United States should strengthen ties with its democratic allies, "challenge regimes hostile to our interests and values", and preserve and extend "an international order friendly to our security, our prosperity and our principles".

Singing from the same hymn sheet, Blair had asserted in Chicago—

" Globalisation has transformed our economies and our working practices. But globalisation is not just economic. It is also a political and security phenomenon."

"The same is true of trade. Protectionism is the swiftest road to poverty. Only by competing internationally can our companies and our economics grow and succeed... And it means using the new trade round to be launched at Seattle to extend free trade".

#### *The British American Project (BAP) and New Labour*

Unfortunately Blair was not alone in his "Atlanticist" worldview. An article in the *Guardian* in November 2004, exposed the role of the British American Project within New Labour. This group was founded in 1985 by the US Republican administration of Ronald Reagan, with a mission "to perpetuate the close relationship between the United States and Britain". On the election of the New Labour Government in 1997, the Project 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."

One of the key figures in this cabal was Peter Mandelson, who masterminded Tony Blair's Labour leadership election in 1994. Subsequently Blair had him appointed as European Commissioner for Trade (2004-2008). In this role, he served as a bridgehead for the interests of the Project in promoting Free Trade, Deregulation and the expansion of the EU relentlessly towards the borders of Russia.

Another member, George Robertson, was Blair's Defence Secretary. He became NATO Secretary General from 1999 to 2004 and was able to advocate for NATO membership for the former Soviet, accession states to the EU. NATO describes itself as "A unique and essential partner to the EU" and there is a deliberate overlap in membership of both.

The *Guardian* revealed that BAP included a number of prominent UK and US journalists and broadcasters among its

membership.

The 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.'"

President Obama's "impertinent" intrusion into the Brexit vote in the UK, where he cautioned the electorate against Leaving the EU, is a little less surprising in this light.

#### General Wesley Clarke—Reveals the Neo Con Plans

"And so a British Labour Government had committed the future of the country to an agenda directed from the United States, with its support already guaranteed for any and all military and economic interventions thought necessary by them."

And the Neo-Cons had a plan, of sorts. In a candid interview with Amy Goodman on the US TV programme *Democracy Now*, on 2nd March 2007, General Wesley Clark, a retired four-star general, who was Supreme Allied Commander of NATO during the Kosovo War, recounted a conversation he had in the Pentagon in September 2001—

"About ten days after 9/11, I went through the Pentagon and I saw Secretary Rumsfeld and Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz. I went downstairs just to say hello to some of the people on the Joint Staff who used to work for me, and one of the generals called me in.

He said "Sir you've got to come in and talk to me a second". I said "Well you're too busy". He said "No, no". He says, "We've made the decision we're going to war with Iraq". This was on or about the 20th of September.

I said, "We're going to war with Iraq? Why?" He said, "I don't know". He said "I guess they don't know what else to do". So I said, "Well did they find some information connecting Saddam to al-Qaeda?" He said "No, no". He says, "There's nothing new that way. They just made the decision to go to war with Iraq". He said, "I guess it's like we don't know what to do about terrorists but we've got a good military and we can take down governments." And he said "I guess if the only tool you have is hammer, every problem has to look like a nail."

So I came back to see him a few weeks later, and by that time we were bombing in Afghanistan. I said "Are we still going to war with Iraq?" And he said "Oh, it's

worse than that." He reached over on his desk. He picked up a piece of paper. And he said, "I just got this down from upstairs"—meaning the Secretary of Defense's office—"today". And he said "This is a memo that describes how we're going to take out seven countries in five years, starting with Iraq, and then Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and finishing off Iran." I said "Is it classified?" He said, "Yes, sir." I said, "Well don't show it to me"...

General Clarke was interviewed again by Amy Goodman on 10th March 2007, in which he recounted a conversation with Paul Wolfowitz in 1991:-

"I said to Paul and this is 1991, I said Mr Secretary you must be pretty happy with the performance of the troops in Desert Storm. And he said, well yeah, he said but not really, he said because the truth is we should have gotten rid of Saddam Hussein and we didn't. And this was just after the Shia uprising in March of 1991, which we had provoked and then we kept our troops on the sidelines and didn't intervene. And he said, but one thing we did learn, he said, we learned that we can use our military in the region in the Middle East and the Soviets won't stop us. He said, and we have got about five or ten years to clean up all those Soviet client regimes; Syria, Iran, Iraq—before the next great super power comes on to challenge us. [Ö]"

"This country was taken over by a group of people with a policy coup, Wolfowitz and Cheney and Rumsfeld and you could name a half dozen other collaborators from the Project for a New American Century. They wanted us to destabilize the Middle East, turn it upside down, make it under our control. It went back to those comments in 1991."

#### **The Global War on Terror and its prosecution**

##### *Afghanistan—RAMBO unmasked*

The first intervention of the "Global War on Terror", was against Afghanistan, which was invaded in 2001. The mood for this was prepared by, amongst other things, changing the closing credit of *Rambo 3* which had until then stated—"This film is dedicated to the brave Mujahideen fighters of Afghanistan", to then read "to the gallant people of Afghanistan", in the re-releases after the 9/11 attacks in the USA, as many Mujahideen fighters formed allegiance with Al Qaeda during the civil war following the Soviet withdrawal.

The current Afghan war continues to rage, with the Taliban making major advances in Helmand Province, formerly 'held' by British troops. The US Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, has stated in his recent report

that *"the US-led intervention in Afghanistan led to large-scale internal displacement"*. The report also states that there remain *"at least 948,000 people displaced as a result of conflict and violence"* and over 2 million Afghans cannot return to the country because it is too dangerous for them to live there.

#### *Iraq*

Iraq is in chaos. As Christopher Meyer has described above.

#### *Libya*

Libya has not fared very well since Hilary Clinton joked of Muammar Gaddafi's murder on 20th October 2011—*"We came. We saw. He died."*

ISIS has set up a Caliphate stretching 125 miles along the coast, with its headquarters in Sirte, the birthplace of Muammar Gaddafi. It is now under challenge from rival militia groups. *Le Figaro* has reported that Sirte has become *"a hell on the Mediterranean"*. More than two-thirds of its residents have fled. Shops, schools and hospitals have closed. The Hisbah (religious police) patrol the streets, punishing those who smoke, listen to music or dress immodestly. Residents are made to watch executions in the public square. Alleged spies are shot and then left strung up in crucifixion poses. Two rival governments are battling for control of a country that was once prosperous and at relative peace.

#### *Syria—latest Humanitarian Intervention?*

In Syria, the analysis made by then *Daily Telegraph* Political Editor, Peter Osborne, in his column on 5th June 2013, is playing out before our eyes—

".... Mr Cameron made a statement that dealt principally with the civil war in Syria....."

"When I see the official Syrian opposition... I do not see purely a religious grouping; I see a group of people who have declared that they are in favour of democracy, human rights and a future for minorities, including Christians, in Syria. That is the fact of the matter."

".....the Prime Minister has got it wrong from the start. He massively underestimated Assad's support and staying power. He was absurdly contemptuous of the Russians (who have outmanoeuvred us all along). Above all, he has failed to understand the rebels.

".....Mr Cameron has made the mistake of taking the Syrian National Coalition seriously. They are intelligent, educated, well-intentioned men in suits—hotel guerrillas—and as such irrelevant to what is now happening in Syria.

"The Prime Minister would do well to read the mea culpa published last week in *Al-Monitor*, by a pseudonymous writer from Aleppo who calls himself Edward Dark.

"So what went wrong?" asks Mr Dark. "Or, to be more accurate, where did we go wrong? How did a once inspirational and noble popular uprising calling for freedom and basic human rights degenerate into an orgy of bloodthirsty sectarian violence, with depravity unfit for even animals?"

"Mr Dark describes how the revolution has been captured by a collection of gangsters and fanatics. "This wasn't what we revolted for", he says in despair at the dreadful fate that has overcome the country he loves, "to replace one group of criminals with another". Mr Dark now says he has given up on the revolution. He says that he has seen that the only way forward is "through reconciliation and a renunciation of violence".

"But armed elements funded and supplied by interested parties in Saudi Arabia and Qatar were also present from the start. Their fundamental aim was nothing to do with human rights and the protection of minorities. It was to destabilise and destroy President Assad, Iran's closest ally in the region, and therefore assert Saudi dominance.

"To what extent have Britain and America been complicit? It is hard to judge. What can be said with certainty is that over the past decade the Middle East, and to some extent the Islamic world, has broken down into two armed camps. On the one side are Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States, backed by the United States and (quietly) Israel. To everyone's enormous embarrassment, al-Qaeda is very firmly in this camp.

On the other side are Iran, Hizbollah and post-bellum Iraq, strongly backed by Russia and China.

Viewed from this wider perspective, Mr Cameron's claim to be on the side of democracy and human rights, and against dictatorship, is not merely fraudulent—it is patently ridiculous."

Unfortunately UK foreign policy has not much improved with the recent change of Prime Minister.

#### *Lebanon*

Lebanon is paying a heavy price for the proxy wars in its region, and not just with the sacrifice of its Hizbollah fighters in the battle in Syria against the murderous fanatics of ISIS. Lebanon, which has a total population of just over 4 million citizens, is housing 1.2 million Syrian refugees from a conflict it did not start, as well as over 450,000 "stateless" Palestinians. That's a refugee crisis.

#### **A future built on peace and prosperity for all?**

We haven't seen the *"future built on peace and prosperity for all"*, which Tony Blair told us in Chicago, *"is the only dream that makes humanity worth preserving"*.

What we have seen is ongoing Western intervention in the Middle East, each built up carefully with its own lead in and pretext—in Syria "red lines" crossed in chemical warfare, and various other 'false flag' operations. Each prefigured by the use of Special Forces, like with the SAS in Libya, the use of which at home or abroad, is conveniently not allowed to be disclosed to the UK Parliament. When these are *"joint covert operations"* between UK and US forces, these are again, conveniently placed outside of democratic scrutiny in the USA too. We have seen *"extraordinary renditions"*, with a disgraceful misuse of Shannon Airport, secret CIA detention and interrogation camps across the world, the massive increase in the use of *"hunter killer"* Reaper Drones and a region awash with military vehicles and ordinance left over or newly provided, for the use of the latest ally amongst the various rebel groups.

These alliances change so quickly that the *LA Times* had a headline in March 2016 stating—*"In Syria, militias armed by the Pentagon, fight those armed by the CIA."*

#### **"Tell them they are being attacked."**

The relative political ease with which we can remain at war in successive conflicts, without resolution in sight, whilst blaming the victims for their plight, is somewhat explained by Hermann Goering. This phenomenon is possible, because, as he ventured in his evidence to the Nuremberg Trials—

"Naturally the common people don't want war: Neither in Russia, nor in England, nor for that matter in Germany. That is understood. But, after all, it is the leaders of the country who determine the policy and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy, or a fascist dictatorship, or a parliament, or a communist dictatorship. Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the peacemakers for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country."

#### **Jeremy Corbyn- an aside.**

Whatever your views on Jeremy Corbyn, you'd have to acknowledge, he has been constantly attacked for a *"lack of patriotism and exposing the country to*

danger". This is even though he agreed with the advice given at the time, by the Intelligence Services, that invading Iraq would make Britain and the world less safe and he duly opposed the war on quite sensible grounds, supported of course by many of "the common people".

### Media 'misdirection' on the origins of the current refugees

Despite claims in some of the media that most asylum seekers trying to get into Europe are economic migrants from Africa, the truth of the situation is in the statistics outlined in the most recent *Asylum Quarterly Report*, published by Eurostat in June 2016, (dealing with the EU alone) which confirms that —

"Citizens of 150 countries sought asylum for the first time in the EU in the first quarter of 2016. Syrians, Iraqis and Afghans were the top 3 citizenships of asylum seekers, lodging 102,400, 35,000 and 34,800 applications respectively."

The main destination countries:

"The highest number of first time asylum applicants in the first quarter of 2016 was registered in Germany (with almost 175,000 applicants, or 61% of total applicants in the EU Member States), followed by Italy (22,300, or 8%), France (18,000, or 6%), Austria (13,900, or 5%) and the United Kingdom (10,100, or 4%). These 5 Member States together account for 83% of all first time applicants in the EU."

### Conclusion

The current refugee crisis and the horrors faced by those fleeing persecution, are a consequence of deliberate US/UK interventions that are largely hidden from public scrutiny.

Refugees and Asylum seekers are deserving of our support and sympathy, not our suspicion.

The UK is not awash with refugees and we can and should do much more to help them in their immediate crisis.

Public opinion and our politicians can be won over to the truth and we should note that all of the Northern Ireland MPs voted against David Cameron's proposals for military action against Syria in 2013.

Finally, we should be proud that the 2016 Northern Ireland Civil Service— Working in Partnership Award was won by the Syrian Refugees Operational Planning Group, Department for Communities—for their work in managing the arrival and integration of Syrian refugees into Northern Ireland. Peace be upon them.

**Michael Robinson**

*NIPSA Global Solidarity Committee*

September 2016

## Press Release

### Foreign Affairs Refuse to Reveal Details of US Military Use of Shannon

Shannonwatch are gravely concerned by the ongoing refusal of the Department of Foreign Affairs to provide access to information about US military flights through Shannon. Citing the creation and maintenance of trust and confidence between governments the department have said they will not provide records requested under freedom of information (FOI) because it would hamper the international relations of the State.

*"It's impossible to see how making aircraft details public could affect our relations with the US, or any other state, if what they tell us about the planes not being engaged in military operations is true"* said Clare Daly TD who made the FOI requests. *"Since Ireland claims to be a neutral State we should not be allowing foreign military within our territory on the scale that is happening today. And we should certainly not be doing it without informing the Irish people of the details."* Clare Daly continued

"The refusal to provide a list of the US military planes that passed through Shannon or Irish airspace amounts to a cover-up of Irish support for a foreign military power and an attempt to deny our involvement in ongoing wars of aggression in the Middle East. It is in direct contravention of our obligations as a neutral state, and it makes us complicit in the displacement of millions of refugees from their homes."

A Red C poll earlier this year found that 57% of the Irish people oppose the United States use of Shannon Airport for military transit purposes. The figure excludes the 'Don't Knows' which were at 4%.

The poll, which was commissioned by TDs Mick Wallace and Clare Daly last March, also found that 6 out of 10 Irish people want neutrality to be enshrined in the Constitution. At present, Irish Neutrality is a policy choice, decided on by the Government of the day.

*"Having access to details of the scale of foreign military use of Shannon is a matter of public interest"* said John Lannon of Shannonwatch.

"The covert nature of the US military use of the airport since 2002 demonstrates that Fine Gael, Fianna Fail and Labour have no interest in protecting Irish

neutrality. In fact the opposite is the case; they have gone against the will of the Irish people by giving a militarised super-power unrestricted access to Shannon and Irish airspace."

"There is a clear lack of accountability in relation to the US military use of Shannon. The Department of Foreign Affairs' refusal to reveal what military planes has landed follows years of denials about rendition planes that also landed at Shannon. We cannot believe government claims that the US Air Force planes we see coming and going are unarmed and not engaged in military operations, especially when the Department refuse to tell us why they are there."

In total four freedom of information requests were refused by Department of Foreign Affairs. The requests sought lists of flights by foreign military aircraft that landed at Shannon between Jan 1st 2015 and June 30th 2016. Copies of statistical reports received by the Department in relation to US military aircraft that flew through Irish airspace were also requested.

In his response to an appeal of the original decision to refuse the FOI request last August, the Deputy Director of the International Security Policy Section of the Department of Foreign Affairs, Robert Jackson, claimed that the public interest in maintaining the *"mutuality of trust with regard to communications between States"* outweighed the public interest in disclosing information about the military flights.

*"Our foreign policy is now being dictated by the US and its NATO allies"* said John Lannon.

"The US has been invading, bombing, and supplying weapons to groups fighting in the Middle East for the last 15 years, and has been using Shannon as a covert operating base for its operations. It is most certainly a matter of public interest, not just in terms of foreign policy but also from a security and safety point of view. Every US military plane that passes through Shannon increases the risk of terrorist attack on our shores."

There were a total of 1,109 requests by foreign military aircraft to land in the State between Jan 1st 2015 and June 30th 2016. Of these, a staggering 947 (93%) were from the US.

Shannonwatch  
23.9.2016

For more information contact Shannonwatch on 087 8225087 or email [shannonwatch@gmail.com](mailto:shannonwatch@gmail.com).

Visit website:  
[www.shannonwatch.org](http://www.shannonwatch.org).



**LABOUR**

# Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 34 No. 10

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

## Thomas Johnson and the 1916 Rising

The Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the Irish Trade Union Congress and Labour Party opened in Sligo Town Hall on Monday, 7th August, 1916. President of Congress, Thomas Johnson took the chair to deliver his address. He said:

"Before proceeding with the business of the Congress, I feel that it is my sad duty to say a word or two regarding the loss we and the working-class movement have sustained through the death of those of our comrades whose lives were sacrificed in the recent rebellion {*here, here*}. As a trade-union movement we are of varied minds on matters of history and political development, and consequently this is not the place to enter into a discussion as to the right or folly of the revolt, but this we may say—that those amongst the rebels who have been associated with us in the past, who have led and inspired some of us with the love of their country and their class, resolved to act as they did with no selfish thought, but purely with a passion for freedom and a hatred of oppression {*applause*}" (*Thomas Johnson-1872-1963, First Leader of the Labour Party in Dail Eireann*, J. Anthony Gaughan-Kingdom Books, 1980).

"He then paid tribute to James Connolly, Richard O'Carroll and Peter Macken, three well-known men in the Irish labour movement who lost their lives as a result of the Rising. Johnson said that he had known Connolly intimately for several years since his arrival in Belfast and had made a careful study of his public speeches, his private conversation and his written work, and considered that there was never a man more thoroughly saturated with the hopes, the aspirations, and the sufferings of the working class. By his death, the working class of Ireland lost a champion

they could ill afford to lose. We had looked forward, Johnson said, to seeing him take a very active part in directing the labour movement in the civil life of the country under a new regime but Connolly conceived that his duty lay in another direction and 'we honour his work, we mourn his death, we revere his memory'.

"Johnson then made reference to the many others, some of whom had attended previous Congresses, who laid down their lives in another field for what they believed to be the cause of liberty and democracy and for love of their country. In the spirit of Connolly preparing for execution who said to the priest: 'I pray for all men who do their duty according to their lights', he asked those present, whatever their views on the war or the rebellion, to rise for a moment as a token of respect for all their comrades who were brave enough to give their lives for the cause they believed in" (*ibid.*).

\*\*\*\*\*

*Richard O'Carroll*, who succeeded Larkin as Leader of the Labour Group on

Dublin City Council was Secretary of the Ancient Guild of Incorporated Brick and Stonelayers, he was a member of the IRB, and took part in the Rising in Dublin with the Irish Citizen Army. He was disarmed by British soldiers who then fatally wounded him.

*Peter (Peader) Macken* was a member of the Amalgamated Society of House and Ship Painters and Vice-President of the Dublin Trades Council. A member of the IRB, he took part in the Rising in Dublin with the Irish Volunteers and was killed in the fighting.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Cork Employers' Federation on the 1916 Rising

(*Irish Times*, 9 May, 2016)

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 4th inst.:—

"Resolved:— That the Council of the Cork Employers' Federation view with indignation and horror the shameful outrages which have been committed in Dublin and certain other parts of Ireland by a misguided and irresponsible section of the community, unable to distinguish between liberty and license, and without any conceivable grievance whatever. The Council desire to humbly convey to His Most Gracious Majesty the King the expression of their unflinching loyalty."

Copies of this resolution to be sent to:— His Majesty's Private Secretary, His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Prime Minister, and Sir J. G. Maxwell, Commander-in-Chief in Ireland.

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>