

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

June 2017

Vol.32, No.6 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.31 No.6 ISSN 954-5891

A Pointless Election

Every British General Election points up the fact that the Northern Ireland variant of the British state exists only for the purpose of mischief making. The Election is held in Northern Ireland, as in all other regions of the UK, but the voters in Northern Ireland can play no part in deciding who wins it.

Scotland and Wales have devolved Governments just as the Six Counties has. Electors in those regions have the choice of voting in the party conflict to determine whether the Government of the state is to be Labour or Tory, or of voting for a party whose object is to bring about a national secession from the United Kingdom state.

Welsh voters choose between Tories, Labour and Plaid Cymru, and the Scots between Tory, Labour and SNP. Voters in Northern Ireland choose between three small Six County parties and an All-Ireland national party. They can play no part in deciding whether it is the Tories or the Socialists who govern the state, because these parties do not contest, and have never contested, seats in the Northern Ireland region of the state. (In recent years there has been a small Tory showing in elections, but it is a belated and meaningless gesture—more to do with unionist politics than governing the state.)

The normal object of a democratic political party is to govern a state. Where that object is missing, political normality cannot develop.

Normality is a function of system. The normal democratic system operates through the conflict of parties which aim to govern the state, and that produces what is generally considered to be political normality.

The political system established in the Six Counties 95 years ago, as the means of enacting Partition, was cut off at birth from the democratic political system of the state, and therefore in its functioning it produces its own unique normality.

The "*sectarian*" jibe that is thrown at Northern Ireland from Dublin and London has no foundation. The Northern political division is not an aberration. It is the necessary product of the abnormal system imposed by Westminster in 1921, and supported by Dublin in recent times.

continued on page 2

Ireland and Britain must be 'shoulder to shoulder' on Brexit—

Edwina Currie

A revealing discussion took place on Marion Finucane's radio programme on Brexit and the UK election (Sunday 23 April). Among other hot topics an assumption that Ireland will act to help the UK's case in the Brexit talks came to the fore, as did the overly close engagement between top Irish and British officials.

The participants were: Fr. Vincent Twomey, former Professor of Moral Theology at Maynooth; David Mc Williams of the *Sunday Business Post* and *Irish Independent*; Professor David McConnell; a retired Professor of Genetics at Trinity (defender of the Protestant ethos of the Adelaide Hospital); Niamh Randall, Simon Community spokesperson; Edwina Currie, former Tory MP; and Conor Ryan, a Dublin-born former advisor to Tony Blair and David Blunkett.

The podcast for this discussion (UK election) can be found at: http://www.rte.ie/radio1/podcast/podcast_marianfinucane.xml

To page 2, column 3

Zionists And The First Eugenics Congress: London 1912

The First International Eugenics Congress was convened at Europe's largest hotel, the Hotel Cecil in London, on 24th July 1912. There are some rather startling facts that emerge from this forgotten event. This Inaugural Banquet was presided over by Arthur Balfour, former Prime Minister and creator of the Committee of Imperial Defence. Balfour, later to be author of the

Balfour Declaration, delivered the opening speech at the First International Congress of Eugenics in London saying: "*the study of eugenics is one of the greatest and most pressing necessities of our day*". (This speech is discussed in the June issue of *Irish Foreign Affairs*.)

Its work took place over 6 days at the Great Hall, Imperial College, University

of London. On the 25th it heard papers on the subject of '*Biology and Eugenics*'; on 26th, '*Practical Eugenics*'; on 27th, '*Education and Eugenics*'; on 29th and 30th, '*Sociology and Eugenics*'; on 30th, '*Medicine and Eugenics*'.

This great Congress was not a fringe event of right wingers. It was supported by the most prominent Establishment figures in Britain in politics, law, religion, science, medicine, academia and education. Members of the General Committee included High Clergy, Professors, Doctors and senior military figures.

continued on page 8

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
A Pointless Election. Editorial	1
Ireland and Britain must be 'shoulder to shoulder' on Brexit —Edwina Currie. Dave Alvey	1
Zionists And The First Eugenics Congress: London 1912. Pat Walsh	1
Readers' Letters: Syria's Alleged Chemical Attack On Civilians: can we be sure that Assad was responsible?. David Morrison	3
The Remaking of Hubert Butler. Julianne Herlihy (Part 2).	5
Unbalanced History. Tom Cooper	7
A Tribute To Peter Hart!. Jack Lane	7
Satire?. Brendan Clifford	9
Martin McGuinness And Some Irish And Third Reich Comparisons. Manus O'Riordan	12
Getting Casement backwards. Tim O'Sullivan	18
Brexit: Recent developments are all good. Dave Alvey	19
War Games In WW2 Northern Ireland. Wilson John Haire	22
Biteback: Nigel Farage and Irish EU membership. Dave Alvey	
Brexit and a snap election. Dave Alvey. Fianna Fáil, Sinn Féin and Abstentionism. Micheál Mac Donncha. Dublin, Monaghan bombings. Derek Davis. National Identity And The EU. Dave Alvey	21,23
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Leslie Price, Bean de Barra)	24

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

Karl Marx On The Fenians

(back page)

Three of the four Six Counties parties go and sit in Westminster, with their handful of members—as onlookers. In a rare appearance on the 'national' (i.e., state) electoral stage (BBC's *Newsnight*) on May 17th, those three criticised the fourth, Sinn Féin, for refusing to accompany them to the Westminster back-benches (taking the Oath of Loyalty to the British state on the way) as observers of the marvel of Parliamentary Government.

The Sinn Feiner asked them what difference their presence on the Westminster back-benches had ever made to the doings of Westminster. They were at a loss for an answer.

The SDLP might have pointed to the great difference it made to the conduct of the state in 1979. It held the balance of power—a very rare thing for a very small party in an Assembly of 650. It was keeping Callaghan's Labour Government in Office. But they abstained on a vote of confidence, bringing down the Government and bringing forward the Election which Margaret Thatcher won.

But the SDLP does not now care to remember the difference that it did make.

The *Newsnight* discussion of the Northern Ireland parties had nothing to do with state affairs. It centred on devolved affairs. SDLP, UUP and DUP declared themselves eager to have Stormont up and going again and complained that Sinn Féin was preventing it.

The interviewer did not remind the SDLP

and UUP that they had broken with the devolved system, as established under the 1998 Agreement, and had gone into opposition to it. She had probably forgotten it—if this British-based broadcaster had ever known it—and who could blame her?

The SDLP was getting ready to condemn Sinn Féin for being in the pocket of the DUP if it did not insist on holding Arlene Foster to account over the Renewable Energy scheme and make it a condition that she stand aside while the matter was investigated.

Is the SDLP now willing to return to the consensual Agreement system and sort out the Arlene Foster matter in the spirit of it?

That is not a matter for the state Election—though, in the absence of the state parties from the Six County region of the state of the state Election, it must remain the irrelevant issue.

Sinn Féin is the nearest thing to a normal party in the Six County Election. It is the only Party with the normal aim of governing the state. It functions as a normal party in the Republic. And in the North it shares the normality of the SNP, having the object of withdrawing the region from the UK state and taking part in governing it in another state.

If the SDLP ever held that object in earnest, it gave it up a long time ago, and now only hopes to hold onto a few seats, with Unionist votes, as an anti-Sinn Féin party. ■

'Shoulder to Shoulder' With Britain

continued

I am taking up the discussion at a point where Professor Twomey asks Edwina Currie about the importance of national identity in the context of Brexit. He prefaces his remarks by referring to an article in the *Sunday Independent* by Bruce Arnold, an English eurosceptic who has written for Independent Newspapers for many years. Twomey was of the opinion that Brussels had no respect for national identity. Nationalism, he said, had become a bad word so he used the word, 'patriotism'.

Twomey: The strength of England precisely because of its wonderful history is that it can stand alone. It can stand up to the world.

Finucane: You could say it colonised the world (sarcastic tone)

Currie: It wasn't a big issue for my family who were immigrants but national identity matters to an awful lot of people. The message on the doorsteps during the Brexit referendum was that Britain is a sovereign country. You have to understand that the last time we were successfully invaded was in 1066.

McConnell: What about William of Orange?

Currie: He was invited and had cash in hand. If I had time I would explain that in 1688 we put Parliament at the heart of things way before anywhere else. This aspect of things matters to older voters.

Finucane: Traditional values."

The discussion then moved on to whether Theresa May was right to refuse to participate in TV debates. After a while Professor Twomey returned to the subject of Brexit.

Twomey: Bruce Arnold refers to young British workers being unable to read or do basic maths. The negative side of Brexit is populism. Is May stoking up British football louts?

Currie: I love it! The same sort of thing was said by the Patricians in ancient Greece. The people, the mob must not be consulted!

McConnell: I have observed the standard of education in Ireland rising and that in the UK declining over the last 30 years to the point where I now prefer the Irish broadcast media to those in the UK.

Finucane: All very unpleasant!

McConnell: I was utterly devastated by the Brexit result. I have been an admirer of Britain and all it stands for over time. I hope that some connection

can be maintained between the UK and Europe but I am pessimistic about the Brexit talks. What I would like to ask Edwina is: what sort of deal is Britain hoping for?

Finucane: Edwina?

Currie: If you compare education in England and Ireland all I can say is: you have higher unemployment. By golly we are providing our young people with jobs. [noises from other panellists that sounded like: but what sort of jobs!]

Finucane: Steady on, steady on.

Currie: We will want as much free trade as possible and services trade is more important to Britain these days. We will want the lowest possible prices especially in food products. A problem with WTO (World Trade Organisation) prices is that they entail high tariffs on food products. I would like to see free movement of people but I respect the fact that many people on the lower end of the economic ladder are anxious about competition for jobs from immigrants. Opposition to immigration is not a problem in places like London which are already mixed. It is much greater in places like East Anglia.

Randall: Eilish O'Hanlon has a good article in the *Sunday Independent* describing the scary prospect that we will be on our own as a result of Brexit. On foot of a point from David I would ask Edwina: what kind of relationship should there be between Ireland and the UK under the Conservatives?

[The key paragraph in Eilis O'Hanlon's article is: "Deep down, we thought the Brits would pull back from the brink, thereby saving us in the process. If they don't, and the calling of a snap election suggests that they have no intention of putting on the handbrake, then we're on our own. That's what's scary." SI 23 April 2017.]

Currie: I would say that the British Government and the Irish Government need to work so closely together, shoulder to shoulder, not least because Ireland is in a good position to push Brussels into a realistic view of British intentions. Britain doesn't want to do down the EU. Britain doesn't want to do down Ireland. Britain needs to get the best possible deal and that will entail getting concessions from Brussels.

Randall: So Ireland has to fight the case for the UK?

Currie: If you don't you seriously disadvantage yourselves, don't you?

McWilliams: That is a very interesting point because at a certain level we are sitting on the wrong side of the table [in the Brexit negotiations]. There are

Syria's Alleged Chemical Attack On Civilians: *can we be sure that Assad was responsible?*

On 30th April 2017, the US dropped its long-term demand that 'Assad must go' and prioritised the defeat of ISIS over the removal of President Assad from power.

Five days later on 4th April 2017, if we are to believe the US, President Assad took the extraordinary decision to mount an aerial attack using chemical weapons against civilians in Khan Sheikhoun, a town held by the armed opposition in Idlib province, leading to the deaths of around 100 people including many women and children. Predictably, this brought down the wrath of the US and its allies on his head and on 6 April 2017, for the first time, the US took military action against the assets of the Syrian regime itself.

At that point President Assad was in a much weaker position now than before 4th April 2017, when he allegedly launched the chemical attack—his removal from power seemed to be back on the US agenda and there at least a possibility appeared that the US would put its military weight behind overthrowing him.

All this was the predictable outcome of President Assad allegedly deciding to launch a chemical weapons attack against civilians. He would have to be insane to take such a decision—and he is not insane.

However, the situation remains fluid. The extract below from a *Wall Street Journal* article (quoted by Moon of Alabama) is very significant, indicating, as it does, a form of co-operation between the US and the Syrian Government against ISIS and an apparent recognition by the US that territory liberated from ISIS will come under the authority of the Syrian Government:

"The Kurd-dominated Syrian Democratic Forces captured Tabqa Wednesday, a day after the U.S. pledged to arm the fighters. On Monday, the Damascus government for the first time **endorsed the group's battle** against Islamic State, with **Syrian Foreign Minister Walid al-Moallem complimenting the SDF's fight against Islamic State at a press conference in Damascus, describing the force as legitimate.**

"The SDF is now the only ground force **with both U.S. and Syrian government approval** in the fight against Islamic State as the offensive on Raqqa draws near. The group has long co-existed with the Syrian government, unlike U.S.-backed factions that Damascus deems terrorists in light of their goal to oust President Bashar al-Assad's regime. ...

"On Thursday, Russia's Deputy Foreign Minister Mikhail Bogdanov said **Moscow supports the formation of local councils to administer territory taken from Islamic State** but said **they must not circumvent the Syrian government's authority**, in comments carried by Interfax news agency.

"The U.S. military will be going in [to Raqqa] and trying to figure out who the tribal leaders are', **said an American official** involved in the anti-Islamic State campaign. **'The regime knows these details. They have a natural home-field advantage and have a way of slowly getting back in. We won't be in Raqqa in 2020, but the regime will be there' ...**" (*Wall Street Journal: Kurd-Led Force Homes In on ISIS Bastion With Assent of U.S. and Syria Alike*, 11 May 2017, at: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/kurd-led-force-homes-in-on-isis-bastion-with-assent-of-u-s-and-syria-alike-1494522632>; the *Moon of Alabama* article is **"The regime will be there" - U.S. Concedes Raqqa ... And The Syrian East**: it is dated 12 May 2017 and can be found at <http://www.moonofalabama.org/2017/05/syria-the-regime-will-be-there-us-to-concede-raqqa-and-the-syrian-east-.html>).

David Morrison

many politicians in Europe who want to punish the Brits (*Finucane:* Yeah), the extent to which that becomes the dominant voice in the negotiations I don't know, but if it did it would be an absolute tragedy. [He spoke for some minutes about how the Irish media was anti-British and that this was 'totally ridiculous as we do one billion of trade with Britain every week'.] My fear and it is a deep fear is not so much that our negotiators will be bullied but that they will feel that they have to toe an EU-27

line. [*Finucane:* Yeah]

McConnell: There's an article, David, in the *Sunday Independent* by Ruth Dudley Edwards on the good relationship that has existed for 30 years between the top civil servants in Britain and Ireland. That relationship remains. That there are references to Ireland in both Theresa May's letter and the EU guidelines says a lot about the professionalism ...

[The relevant section from the article

by Dudley Edwards is: "It's a priceless asset that British and Irish politicians, civil servants and diplomats have such a history of cooperation over Northern Ireland and more importantly, in the EU, where they've been allies. Trust matters, and both governments know that when it comes to the deal to be got from the EU, their job is to informally agree mutually beneficial solutions to the problems faced by the island of Ireland. The EU isn't going to punish the UK if the result would be to devastate the well-liked Irish republic." SI 23.04.17.]

McWilliams: There's a profound difference between mentioning Ireland and executing a deal that will benefit Ireland. There is a massive gap in expectations between the high bureaucrats and the people. One of the lessons of Brexit is that when the Establishment loses touch with the people things fall apart.

Twomey: I just want to refer to another point made by Bruce Arnold on whether we should reconsider our identity regarding Europe. He says that Ireland was never at the heart of Europe.

[This is an extract from the Bruce Arnold article that Vincent Twomey kept referring to: "The vexed issue of Ireland heading away from Britain, instead of co-operating, is a key problem. Brexit will force this state to take a long hard look at itself, where its interests lie and it is going. The realisation, since the referendum in the UK, that the rhetoric of the last 40 years won't pass muster after Brexit explains much of the outpourings of an overwrought establishment. It is a worrying sight to see. We have to be clear: Ireland was never at the heart of Europe. (The good folk running this society are not familiar with maps.) As long as the UK was in the EU they could get away with misplacing our geographical location." SI 23.04.2017.]

McWilliams: That is very true.

Finucane: Ireland was more engaged with Europe than the British, even if only at the level of emotion.

McWilliams: Yes, PR spin. As a child I can remember the mantra of *Ireland at the heart of Europe and Europe means jobs*. When you go to Europe you realise that geographically, intellectually, socially, politically we are not similar with Europe.

Twomey: One of the great developments in my lifetime has been the *rapprochement* between Ireland and England symbolised by the visits of our President and of the Queen.

Finucane: Yes they were very successful trips.

Conclusions that might be drawn from these exchanges include:

- o • The British (as represented by Edwina Currie) are both confident and expectant that Ireland will act as their proxy in Brussels

- o • The close links between top Irish and British officials are crucial to this (from the contributions of David McConnell, David McWilliams and the article by Ruth Dudley Edwards)

- o • Niamh Randall, the only panellist not a member of any Anglophile coterie and therefore more likely to be representative of mainstream opinion, was surprised when presented with the notion that Ireland is expected to fight the UK's case

- o • David McWilliams clearly believes that Ireland should side with Britain in the negotiations

- o • David McWilliams moved in very quickly to muddy the water when David McConnell referred to the close engagement between top British and Irish officials—he tried to make out that official Ireland is anti-British in contrast to ordinary Irish people

These conclusions confirm that the point made in a recently published letter from the *Irish Political Review Group* (Irish Times, 19 April 2017 <http://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/letters/brexit-and-a-snap-election-1.3053016>) about close engagement between Irish and British officials over Brexit being inappropriate, is directly pertinent to the current Irish debate.

For me this radio discussion threw up other insights:

- o • Professor Twomey, a representative figure from the upper echelons of the Irish Catholic Church, seems guided by a confused notion of national identity

centred on *rapprochement* with England, a sad spectacle

- o • Judging by the Eilish O'Hanlon article and the contribution of David Mc Connell, the Anglophile constituency in Ireland, inside the media and in society generally, are either in denial about Brexit or devastated by it—the extent of this phenomenon may have been underestimated to date

- o • As part of the phoney war before the negotiations British representatives have been adamant that, in Edwina Currie's words, "*they don't wish to do down the EU*". That claim lacks credibility: it is very much in the UK's interest, now that it is leaving, that the EU stagnates or flounders or slowly disintegrates

These are, of course, the conclusions of one writer. As the story of Brexit unfolds, the big questions relate to the thought processes that are stirring in the Irish collective mind. Are people happy that Ireland should become the instrument of British efforts to disrupt EU solidarity? Are the silent majority who, in truth, pay only a sleepy attention to the chatter of media pundits, aware of the extent of British bias in the Irish media? Who is more representative of Irish public opinion, Ruth Dudley Edwards—who openly prizes the closeness of the Anglo-Irish relationship—or David McWilliams—who wants us to believe that the Irish bureaucracy is anti-British? Is there really no grouping in the upper echelons of society with an understanding of what the authentic voice of independent Ireland sounds like?

As evidenced by the Marian Finucane programme, since at least January of this year the Brexit debate hosted by the Irish broadcast media is hopelessly one-sided. That is a factor holding back the debate that is actually needed.

Dave Alvey

Aubane Historical Society The forged "Irish Bulletin"

5 Euro, 4 Pounds from:

jacklaneaubane@hotmail.com

The "Irish Bulletin" was the daily paper of the Irish Government established on the basis of the 1918 General election, the first Dáil Éireann. It was a hugely influential publication and played a crucial role in winning the War of Independence.

The highest compliment possible was paid to it by the British Government when it set out to discredit it by forging a run of the paper. It was an audacious and desperate project and is proof of how concerned the Government had become about its effect on political opinion in Britain itself and internationally.

This pamphlet is a collection of all the extant copies of the forgery and we are pretty sure that it is the complete run of what was published.

athol-st@atholbooks.org

The Remaking of Hubert Butler

"They make slaughter and they call it peace."

Tacitus.

"We thought we were dying for the fatherland. We realised quickly it was for the bank vaults"

Anatole France.

"The world is nearly all parcelled out, and what is left of it is being divided up, conquered and colonised. To think of these stars that you see overhead at night, these vast worlds which we can never reach. I would annex the planets if I could: I often think of that. It makes me sad to see them so clear and yet so far."

Cecil Rhodes.

"We do not lack communication, on the contrary, we have too much of it. We lack creation. We lack resistance to the present."

Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari.

In last month's issue of the *Irish Political Review* (April) I wrote about how I found out that Hubert Butler (HB) had written in his essay *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*:

"It was difficult for me to return... to a society which I myself founded, so I never after attended a meeting..." (p.280 in his book *Escape from the Anthill*, The Lilliput Press, Mullingar, Co. Westmeath. 1985).

And I reported that Olivia O'Leary—in the DVD, 'Hubert Butler: Witness to the Future..'—had stated that he had in fact never been ejected from the Kilkenny Archaeological Society (KAS) and she knew this because her own grandfather John O'Leary was the President of the Society. While such a motion was put, following on from the international furore over the Papal Nuncio Affair, "the motion was defeated. People forget that—it was defeated".

Olivia O'Leary, who spoke under the important titles "Author and Broadcaster", seemed physically—almost troubled—about having to demolish this particular myth as she grimaced and writhed in front of the camera, and in my opinion would never have testified but that her family connection was somehow found out, and so she had the onerous and quite obviously distasteful task of standing up for KAS and the historical truth.

I remember reading her contribution to the book *Untold Stories: Protestants in the Republic of Ireland 1922-2002*. (The Liffey Press. Dublin 2002, pp 162-166). And what struck me then was her awfully weak and sentimental *story* of a friend of her mother's who was a Protestant woman who sang: "*And the green fields of Antrim are calling me home*". As O'Leary concluded:

"It brought tears to my eyes then. It still does."

Indeed!

So those of us present in Kilkenny for *The Hubert Butler Centenary Celebration—20th 22nd October 2000* where Mayor of Kilkenny Paul Cuddihy, Fine Gael, gave a full public apologia for having turfed poor HB out of the KAS were all misled. So too obviously was the hapless Mayor. I cannot help but think that this mischief making—and make no mistake that was what it was at the very least—somehow had to come from someone involved in the setting up of the celebration, which was funded by *The Irish Times* and The British Council. Both before and after the Conference *The Irish Times* flagged up stories about the Mayor's *apologia* and it received widespread prominence in other media too including *The Kilkenny People* (see the latter's half page spread under the title *Apologia accepted by Hubert's daughter* Friday, October 27th 2000). In the article there is the following Mayoral statement:

"Hubert Butler wasn't dragged through the streets or sent to Devil's Island, he wasn't put to death, however, he was badly treated and he and his family were ostracised here in Kilkenny for a period of time."

To use today's description, according to none other than the US President Donald J. Trump himself on another matter, this is *fake news* and probably worse—fake history for a rather sinister agenda. In good faith, similarly to the Mayor, we wrote up the whole controversy in the December 2000 issue of the *Irish Political Review* and wholly accepted that HB was forced to resign from the KAS. One of our writers, Pat Muldowney who grew up in Bennettsbridge, the village where Maidenhall, Butler's Big House was situated, admitted he had never heard of Butler while growing up there or how they had

"wronged him". Nevertheless, even Pat accepted as he wrote in a letter to *The Kilkenny People* (also reproduced in the *Irish Political Review* November 2000 issue) of "*the spineless conduct of some of the members of KAS*" who had "*mistreated one of their most active and capable office holders*". So, if someone like him could be misled about this—in effect *lie*—what chance had the rest of us to understand the *intrigues* that underlay this whole *imbroglio*?

What Pat Muldowney also addressed in that letter was what he saw as the unacceptable account given by Professor Roy Foster at the opening of the Conference on the instance of two young local Sinn Féin members and their call to Maidenhall for some support in 1920. It is true to say that Roy Foster made much *dramatic flourish* about this encounter but this is only to be expected from Foster, as we well know from all our meetings with him down through the years (See back issues of *Irish Political Review* on our webpage www.atholbooks.org). Foster insisted on quoting the mother of HB—Peggy—as saying:

"I know who you are, Jim Connell, and take that cigarette out of your mouth when you are talking to me".

Pat Muldowney felt that Foster overegged the rebuke as the latter went on to say this had such effect that the two young local fund-raisers "*slunk away*". Thus were relations delineated in the new state between "*natives*" and Big-House owners, despite the diplomatic initiatives of the former. The Yeatsian cabin was still the "*Irish cabin*" and therein lay the rub. In fact, and this might be hard to believe, Foster actually *down-played* the incident if anything. In *Divided Loyalties* HB wrote in that essay further to his mother's withering reproof to the young man that—as they stood in the porch "*she danced about in fury*"! The very idea of being asked to contribute anything to the newly-emergent state was beyond her toleration. And the only reason that HB scolded his mother was, not that he disagreed with her, but—

"it was only the second time I had seen a Republican, and when I went back to Oxford I wanted at least to say what they were like and what their plans were."

And this was in 1920! So the neighbouring people, who had voted overwhelmingly in support of Sinn Féin in the 1918 General Election, were unknown to the Butlers if we are to believe

Hubert's story and this from someone who made a living from teaching us all about what *locality* and *neighbourliness* was. Really? Again and again in the DVD Rev. Rob Tobin told us that Butler's *mantra* was: "*Act locally. Think Globally.*" And, however glib that *mantra* was—however oxymoronic—in a strange way it did fit HB's philosophy, because that way he was always able to bypass the national way of looking at things and that really was grist to his mill!

But back to the Mayor's *apologia*—if it had stayed local and particular to the media in 2000, then perhaps it wouldn't bother me so much.

But, having being duped myself and finding out only through extensive research in the last few months that the whole story was a lie, I am rather furious that people in the know not only let this happen but actively contributed to it and did injury to people's reputations that never deserved it. And, because none of these reacted publicly and demanded a retraction—I am utterly convinced that these people were intimidated. The Catholic majority has everything to fear from being tarred and feathered by the likes of *The Irish Times*, RTE *et al.* How else to account for the silence for the past 17 years?

This started in 2000 at that Butler centenary celebration, even though the latter had written about it in his book in 1985 '*Escape from the Anthill*' but obviously no-one had read it: so there it lay till it was excavated in 2000. How galling is it to think that someone as well up on all things political/historical as the local man Pat Muldowney could fall for such a false narrative and be complicit in denouncing his neighbours after being taken in by the Butlerites?

I also own up to falling afoul of this affair. I believed those academics and journalists present at the event. The Chair of the celebration was the Literary Editor of *The Irish Times*, Caroline Walsh (since deceased) and she gave a talk before introducing her panel—which included Professor Terence Browne, Professor of Modern English in TCD; Professor Enda Longley, Professor of English at Queens, Belfast; Fintan O'Toole (who was on the motorway as she spoke but who never turned up); John Banville; Neal Ascherson; Chris Agee; Rob Tobin; Judge Peter Smithwick (another no-show) though someone read his paper if memory serves me—and the other attendees included Butler's publisher, Anthony Farrell, of Lilliput Press; the critic Maurice Craig; and others.

Professor Roy Foster opened proceed-

ings the previous evening and then came Mayor Paul Cuddihy, Fine Gael, with his *apologia*. The *Irish Times* had an article on 12th October 2000 indicating an "*Apology for writer ostracised in 1952*". So they were well-versed even before the Conference on the 20th—22nd October 2000.

Then came the book '*Unfinished Ireland: Essays on Hubert Butler*' Edited by Chris Agee. Published by *Irish Pages*, The Linen Hall, Belfast. 2003.

There is a chapter titled:

"An Overdue Apology". Paul Cuddihy, Mayor of Kilkenny.

This *apologia* on behalf of the people of Kilkenny followed the opening remarks of Julia Crampton.

(She is HB's daughter and only child.)

On 5th July 2003 *The Irish Times* in its *Weekend Review* devoted a lot of space to a review of '*Unfinished Ireland...*' by the brilliant American scholar Vera Kreilkamp under the banner headline: "*Cultural Icon and Secular Saint*". I was truly gob-smacked. Vera Kreilkamp is that unusual creature in university life—she is a genuine scholar but then that is America. She wrote one of the finest books on the Anglo-Irish called '*The Anglo-Irish Novel and The Big House*' (Syracuse University Press. New York. 1998). As I wrote then and it is well to use my quotation:

"Kreilkamp is alive to the dangers of rewriting the past, and questions.... whether such an activity "represents a mode of forgetting" in order to perpetrate "new kinds of elisions and divisions. The revisionist Big House novel reinscribes and simultaneously undermines the political, social, and economic divisions of the past through its depiction of the sensitive protagonist as new victim.... No matter how conscious it is of the national past, *revisionist fiction acts to neutralize history*" ("The Anglo-Irish Novel and the Big House" (p.197—italics JH).

As for Kreilkamp herself: what she found most astonishing in the book was "*the most astounding contribution to 'Unfinished Ireland' ... is the text of a solemn public apology delivered by Kilkenny's Mayor*". Well, how much more astounded would she be if it was revealed as a complete farcical exercise in false history? And Kreilkamp is right to see the whole objective of the book as serving to "*rescue*" and commemorate "*a once neglected writer*", a "*marginalised critic*", "*a moral gadfly*". She spots that this is not a critical work of scholarship:

"The reminiscences of local friends, family, editor, biographer and devoted admirers in '*Unfinished Ireland*' create, virtually a *Butler hagiography*."

What Kreilkamp was not to know that the book was also an exercise in censorship, as the lively Q&A sessions with the contributions especially of Jack Lane and Brendan Clifford—those sole voices of dissent at the Conference—had been comprehensively excised and excluded. In the summation of her review, Kreilkamp shrewdly identifies Roy Foster and Enda Longley as using Butler and his writings—

"to defend their own agendas of revising Ireland's nationalist narrative, on occasion appropriating his voice directly into local culture wars."

It is obvious now to me that what the book didn't achieve in 2003, nor the Conference in 2000, in 2016 the release of the DVD—with the extraordinary title: "Hubert Butler. Witness to the Future ... but silenced in his own country" by Johnny Gogan with its sterling array of contributors—was going to finally attempt to come up with the goods.

In it, Professor Roy Foster, Dr Michael Kennedy, Royal Irish Academy (one of the Editors on the very prestigious multi-volume publications '*Documents of Irish Foreign Policy*'), Fintan O'Toole, John Banville, Lara Marlowe, Olivia O'Leary, Chris Agee, Rev. Robert Tobin and others make a huge push to get us to acknowledge that Butler was "*the greatest essayist*" of his generation with completely unblushing comparisons to George Orwell, Alexander Solzhenitsyn and Jonathan Swift! But what seems strange to me is that these people don't seem to understand that, if you are going to make such extraordinary claims, surely some viewer is going to investigate said claims and see them for the utter *raméís* that they are! If as Rev. Rob Tobin—Butler's biographer—states:

"Hubert Butler had a sort of epiphany going through Dublin in 1916 ... the buildings were still smoking ... and he was enamoured with the possibility of becoming an Irish nationalist"

—then be sure of this—on looking at the DVD, *I too had an epiphany* and it was to hunt down any material I could find to try and discover who Hubert Butler really was and why there is still so much effort being put into making this "*market gardener*" into something he most definitely was not.

Julianne Herlihy ©

To be continued

West Cork is inaugurating a historical festival/summer school. The list of speakers resembles a Who's Who of those devoted to distorting Irish history in the British interest. The following letter has been submitted to the *Irish Examiner* and other papers.

Unbalanced History

I am pleased that West Cork is to have its first history festival in July. However, I am saddened that the speakers chosen to discuss the War of Independence period express a narrow range of opinions. It might more accurately be renamed the West Brit History Festival. Eoghan Harris and Kevin Myers require little introduction. They have expended acres of newspaper print extolling the merits of a historian who claimed he spoke to a participant in the November 1920 Kilmichael Ambush, six days after the last (97-year-old) veteran died. I refer to the late Peter Hart. Another participant, Eve Morrison, supported Hart's claim and stated she was on the trail of the mystery man. That was five years ago. Appropriately, Ms Morrison is speaking on 'Cork Ghosts of the Irish Revolution'.

The combined efforts of these four to undermine the standing of ambush commander Tom Barry, and of the IRA generally, reduced academic history (and 'historical' journalism) to a laughing stock for a considerable period. Roy Foster, who spoke for himself when he said in 1986 'We are all revisionists now', is giving the introductory lecture. He presumably will set the tone at this cosy get together. The festival will resuscitate the sectarian theory that the IRA was sectarian during the War. Eoghan Harris will show his incompetent 2012 documentary, *An Tost Fada*. I hope festival-goers will be informed of at least one serious error, admitted by RTE after I complained.

The programme stated that two Protestant farmers Matthew Connell and William Sweetman were killed in a sectarian attack in April 1922 after the Truce and Treaty, whereas they were actually killed beforehand, in February 1921, for reasons that were not sectarian. There are other howlers in the programme which contemporary Protestants would have recognised as propaganda.

The decade of remembrance needs broad discussion and a fair representation of opinion. This event is one sided, with one partial exception: Andy Bielenberg. He was subject to a Harris/Myers mauling when his analysis, and that of John Borgonovo, on conflict deaths, did not reproduce their imaginative views. I hope he is not subject to more trumped-up fake-history

claims. I suggest that the organisers broaden out the discussion, even at this late stage, so that more historical and less hysterical analysis is advanced.

Tom Cooper

A Tribute To Peter Hart!

The first 'West Cork history festival' will be held on 28-30 July and festival organiser Simon Kingston says that: "*We are going to be deliberately wide-ranging in the topics and periods we cover. In the first year, there will be contributions that range from the history of the Knights Templar to the Second World War. We will be discussing the piracy off the coast of Cork and the Fenian Rising 1847. We will be considering the tower houses of West Cork and how they relate to those in other parts of Europe and we will be learning about the Great Earl of Cork and the doings of his children.*"

Also, "*the Irish revolutionary period in West Cork included, as well as archaeology, political, literary, and military history [will be] up for discussion and debate*" (*Southern Star*, 26.2.17).

The speakers will be the cream of the revisionist historians in academia, led off by the Emeritus doyen, Roy Foster. But, despite the wide ranging topics for a history conference in West Cork, there is an elephant in the room. An elephant that should be on the agenda.

The modern interest in West Cork's history is down to Peter Hart's writings on the subject. Everybody knows this. He and his work should therefore surely be a subject for discussion at such an event. His was a '*seminal*' work and often described as such and a couple of decades later there should surely be an assessment of how his work has developed.

In fact much of his work still begs development as there are many continuing unanswered questions to be dealt with, *inter alia*: the identity of his anonymous sources and interviewees needs to be confirmed; the person he interviewed who showed him around the Kilmichael Ambush site and claimed to have been a

participant—after all known participants were dead at the time—needs to be identified.

The speakers include Hart's mentor, David Fitzpatrick, and long-time defenders such as Roy Foster, Eve Morrison, Kevin Myers, Eoghan Harris, etc. etc., and it is surely incumbent on them to settle these issues two decades on. But Peter has become a non-person in these circles nowadays. They have '*moved on*'. But there would not be such a Festival without him.

There is a distinct air about this event of dealing with everything else *except* Peter Hart's legacy and swamping/burying his distinctive contribution with discussions on anything else but that. But the fact remains that there would not be such intense interest in West Cork or in the War of Independence if it were not for him and his industriousness.

Like many others, I had put such issues to the far recesses of my mind until Hart came along. And now we are all the better for his efforts. Would the speakers not agree? His former defenders may not want to acknowledge his achievements but we do and they should. But the academic herd moves on and some members are abandoned for its own survival. Poor Peter.

But to be positive: may we suggest that the Festival adds an entertainment session by the speakers for the delectation of the participants and that is it led off by David Fitzpatrick with a rendition of his own creation:

'A New Revenge for Skibbereen'

'Twas in the month of April in the year of '22

We took it out on the Protestants, we could only catch a few

In Bandon and Dunmanway, Kinsale and Skibbereen

Their colour it was Orange and they trampled on the Green

Old Buttimer came down quaking

'What do you want', says he

'Come out or we'll make ye, we want your drapery'

The missus tried to argue

'Go to bed old women', says we

We sprayed his brains with bullets that Ireland might be free

We visited Tom Bradfield, we dressed up in Khaki

Says he, 'You're welcome officers'

A fine snug farm had he

We gave him a grand court martial

And sentenced Tom for to die

We tied a note around his neck

It read 'convicted spy'

Farewell to all ye Protestants, so prim
and dry and tight
Ye thought ye owned old Ireland
Yet ye fled without a fight
From Bandon and Dunmanway,
Kinsale and Skibbereen
Ye scuttled out of the County Cork and
never since was seen
'Twas revenge for Skibbereen

(Composed by Professor David Fitzpatrick and sung by him to the tune of *The Galtee Mountain Boy* to introduce his lecture on *The Spectre of Ethnic Cleansing in Revolutionary Ireland* at the 2013 Magdalene College Cambridge Parnell Lecture, on 11 February 2013.)

Jack Lane

Eugenics Congress:

continued

The Eugenics Congress had delegates from the Board of Education, many local Councils, the Royal College of Medicine, the Royal College of Surgeons, Universities such as Oxford, Edinburgh, Glasgow, St. Andrews, London and Bristol, Cheltenham Ladies College, along with feminist organisations like *The Women's Freedom League* and even the *Jewish Free School* of London.

The *Jewish Chronicle's* editorial column (2.8.1912) entitled "In the *Communal Armchair*", signed by "Mentor", aligned the Jewish/Zionist experience with the objectives of the Congress:

"For the Jewish race is, among the races of the world, as Dr. Lindsay in the course of his paper at the Eugenics Congress pointed out, a remarkable testimony to the value of Eugenics. Our survival to this day is living proof to the truths which eugenicists are enforcing... That the Pentateuch raised Eugenics into a matter of religion goes to show only either that thousands of years ago the Jewish people regarded Eugenics as a supreme value to man, or that it was feared that only as a series of Divine commands would Eugenics be practised. We note it in every direction; in the laws of segregation as in the connubial prohibitions the Jew was taught Eugenics as his religion.

The much despised Shadchan or marriage broker as an institution had many obvious faults. Yet, in a quiet, unscientific manner he has been the means of curing mere sentiment and passion in the mating of sons and daughters of Israel. The Shadchan, when he was conscientious

—and who will say he never was?—made it his business to bring about marital unions that should be happy in the sense of being fit, proper and healthy. His reputation was at stake if his 'introductions' did not show a clean bill of family health. His art consisted in 'matching.... those who were to be joined in matrimony', so that he became an agent in multiplying marriages of the fit. We have laughed consumedly at the Shadchan's vagaries, and have been shocked at his turning what we instinctively feel out to be a matter of love and affection into one of barter and bargain. But the Shadchan is distinctly on the side of Eugenics, in 'regulating.... the union of men and women, and he must have contributed a trifle to the preservation of the race. If Eugenics has its way, the Shadchan in every land which cares for the preservation of its race looks like being nationalised into a state department."

Major Leonard Darwin, the son of Charles Darwin, was President of the 1912 Congress and the Vice Presidents included Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty; Reginald McKenna, Liberal Home Secretary; the British Lord Chief Justice; the Presidents of Royal College of Physicians, the Royal Society, Harvard University, the Lord Mayor of London, the Bishop of Oxford, Andrew Graham Bell, and the President of the German Society for Racial Hygiene.

One of the prominent members of the German Society for Racial Hygiene (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene*) was the Jewish physician and anthropologist, Heinrich Wilhelm Poll (1877-1939).

The Society's finances were held with the Goldschmidt-Rothschild Bank

The Congress had a strong international element with Consultation Committees and academics attending from the US, Belgium, France, Italy and Germany. An accompanying Exhibition was included in the event: "*Professor von Gruber has sent over from the International Race Hygiene Congress held in Dresden in 1911 a collection of exhibits representative of German work*" (Invitational Circular).

The Eugenics Education Society organised the 1912 Inaugural Congress and dedicated it to Francis Galton, cousin of Charles Darwin, who was the originator of the science of Eugenics and who had died the year before. Galton had pioneered Eugenics, partly to justify Anglo-Saxon world domination, by popularising the idea of race hierarchy, with the Anglo-Saxons at the top and the "*lesser races*" beneath. It was made explicit that the

lesser specimens of humanity in Britain and Greater Britain needed reduction and strong ruling.

The Eugenics Education Society that organised the inaugural Congress was carrying on Galton's work by introducing Eugenics into the national consciousness like a new religion. It was described as an infant science leading to the betterment of humanity, in the spirit of Liberal Imperialism's *efficiency*.

The Eugenics Education Society was founded in Britain in 1907 to campaign for sterilisation and marriage restrictions for the weak, to prevent the degeneration of the British race. A year later, Sir James Crichton-Brown, who was prominent at the Congress, gave evidence before the 1908 *Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-Minded*, and recommended the compulsory sterilisation of those with learning disabilities and mental conditions, describing them as "*our social rubbish*" which should be "*swept up and garnered and utilised as far as possible*". He argued that,

"We pay much attention to the breeding of our horses, our cattle, our dogs and poultry, even our flowers and vegetables; surely it's not too much to ask that a little care be bestowed upon the breeding and rearing of our race".

In a memo to Prime Minister Asquith in 1910, Winston Churchill cautioned, "*The multiplication of the feeble-minded is a very terrible danger to the race*".

Over four hundred people from all over the world attended the Eugenics Conference. The Master of Ceremonies for the Inaugural Banquet at the Hotel Cecil was Major Leonard Darwin, who introduced the notables and international speakers from science, medicine and academia. The main thrust of the Eugenics Congress was that race improvement must be instituted as an imperative because the feeble-minded were outbreeding the educated, the non-Aryan was outbreeding the Nordic Aryan, and the Negro was outbreeding the white race.

Darwin's opening speech made it clear that Natural Selection is not Eugenics because fortunately or unfortunately modern society was caring for the poor, enabling them to breed in abundance and live. In the past disease, poverty etc. would have controlled their breeding in a natural way and decimated the surplus (as it did in Ireland!). But Social Imperialism had interfered with this process, for good or ill, in Britain, and the well-off couldn't breed sufficiently to counteract it. The point of Eugenics was to

reverse this demographic disaster by preventing the breeding of the poor, along with that of the non-Aryan and black races. Otherwise there would be race suicide.

Major Darwin's Presidential Address contained the following explanation of what the Eugenics movement sought to accomplish and why it differed from support for pure Natural Selection:

"There is... certainly one agency which has had a great influence in the past and of which much is now known, and that is natural selection, or Nature playing the part of the breeder of cattle in refusing to breed from inferior stocks. This progressive agency, by continually weeding out the unfit, has always tended to make living beings more and more able to seize the opportunities offered to them by their environments. And it seems as if this forward movement had gone on during all the long ages since life first appeared on earth until recent times, when by our social methods we have been doing our best to prevent further progress being made by this same means. The unfit amongst men are now no longer necessarily killed off by hunger and disease, but are cherished with care, thus being enabled to reproduce their kind, however bad that kind may be. It is true that we cannot but glory in this saving of suffering; for the spirit which leads to the protection of the weak and afflicted is of all things that which is the best worth preserving on earth; and we can therefore never voluntarily go back to the crude methods of natural selection. But we must not blind ourselves to the danger of interfering with Nature's ways, and we must proclaim aloud that to give ourselves the satisfaction of succouring our neighbours in distress without at the same time considering the effects likely to be produced by our charity on future generations is, to say the least, but weakness and folly...

"We must have a bridge to unite the domain of science with the domain of human action, and such a bridge forms an essential part of the structure of Eugenics. Both national societies and international co-operation are needed for the purpose of spreading the light, and the efforts already made in these directions will, it is hoped, be furthered by the holding of this Congress.

"We may thus conclude that though for the moment the most crying need as regards heredity is for more knowledge, yet we must look forward to a time when the difficulties to be encountered will be moral rather than intellectual; and against moral reform the demons of ignorance, prejudice and fear are certain to raise their heads. But the end we have in view, an improvement in the racial qualities of future generations, is noble enough to give us courage for the fight. Our first effort must be to establish such a moral code as will ensure that the welfare of the

unborn shall be held in view in connection with all questions concerning both the marriage of the individual and the organisation of the state. As an agency making for progress conscious selection must replace the blind forces of natural selection; and men must utilise all the knowledge acquired by studying the process of evolution in the past in order to promote moral and physical progress in the future. The nation which first takes this great work thoroughly in hand will surely not only win in all matters of international competition, but will be given a place of honour in the history of the world. And the more nations there are who set out on this path, the more chance there is that some one of them will run this course to the end. The struggle may be long and the disappointments may be

many, but we have seen how the long fight against ignorance ended with the triumphant acceptance of the principle of evolution in the nineteenth century. Eugenics is but the practical application of that principle, and may we not hope that the twentieth century will, in like manner, be *known in future as the century when the Eugenic ideal was accepted as part of the creed of civilisation? It is with the object of ensuring the realisation of this hope that this Congress is assembled here to-day.*"

The position papers delivered to it and the Zionist interest in eugenics will be examined in future editions of Church & State. beginning with the Summer issue.

Pat Walsh

Satire?

God is dead. He was executed in England about a century and a quarter ago by Charles Bradlaugh, acting for the middle class and Robert Blatchford, acting for the working class. Bradlaugh de-Christianised Parliament by gaining entry to it without taking an Oath. And Blatchford repudiated Christianity on behalf of the working class with his mass-circulation pamphlet *Not Guilty*, which shrugged off the burden of guilt imposed on the masses by Christianity to help with their exploitation.

Progressive England had been imposing its God on the world right up to the moment when it discarded him.

It sickened of its God and did away with him, thereby releasing itself from the nightmare of history about which Joyce complained; and it entered on an existence in which there was nothing but Enlightenment.

The Tories did not repudiate God. They remained lodged in obscurantism and history. And they are still running the country. Blatchford has not been heard of for generations. Bradlaugh has been forgotten by everybody, except perhaps Seamus Mallon. It does not seem that Enlightenment is utilitarian or that human life is a suitable subject to be grasped by social science.

Ireland is now collapsing into Enlightenment, having discarded its history under revisionist tutelage by Oxbridge during the past generation. The moment of total public emancipation was the radio show put on by Stephen Fry and Pat Kenny about what an evil bastard God was. The way is now open to *progress*, unrestricted by superstition.

Unfortunately, *progress* is a Christian idea. The word is only intelligible as a general idea meaning moving along a line towards an objectively pre-determined End. The End is a Christian postulate particularly associated with the Protestant reform of the Roman system. It was injected into world culture by the English Reformation, which was an element in the development of English Imperialism, and one of its functions has been to justify wholesale plunder and exterminations.

In English public life it was Toryism—Jacobitism—that resisted the millenarian enthusiasm that was implicit in the pared-down Christianity of the Reformation. And it was Toryism that tried to curb *progress*. And it was Tories who developed historical understanding in place of Biblicalist revelation. And it was Tories who tried to feed the Irish when the potatoes failed, and prevent the Famine, until they were replaced in Office by the *progressive* Liberals, who saw that the potato-blight was a Providential event that must not be thwarted by wanton feeding of the improvident.

Dean Swift's Tory/Jacobite political colleague, Bolingbroke, came to conclusions that were something like atheism, but he kept them to himself—or kept them within a very close circle. In the onslaught of *progress*, on the death of Queen Anne in 1714, he escaped with his life by fleeing to France in the guise of a woman.

It is not at all clear what his friend Swift, the clergyman, believed. Swift was a satirist of a kind far removed from the vulgar ridicule of the Greeks and of the present-day. With regard to Christianity his satire was incisively delicate, leaving

one doubtful whether it was subversive or preservative.

He was a friend of Voltaire, but his satire was utterly different from Voltaire's, which was schoolboyish. Stephen Fry's satire is sub-Voltairean.

English society was in substance, for more than two centuries, a kind of Biblicalist bigotry. It must be described as bigoted because of the sustained effort it made to impose itself on others, who did not want it—the main others being the Irish.

That mass of bigotry in the substance of English society came under the management in 1660, following the collapse of the Cromwellian fiasco, of a ruling class that neither participated in mass belief nor tried to undermine it—while maintaining in its outward forms and culture. It let it wreak havoc around the world but kept it out of the corridors of political power at home.

Then, around 1900, English Biblicalist Christianity sickened of itself. It became Enlightened. But its conduct towards others did not get any better. Its main achievement has been two World Wars, each of which was fought for a vacuous ideal that was unrealisable, and each involved a degree of destructiveness never before seen in the world.

Swift was not a professional satirist. He was a clergyman by profession. And he was for a few years a political writer in the Tory interest. As a political pamphleteer he enabled a Tory Government to bring a negotiated end to the first of Britain's Great Wars, which the Whigs/Liberals had started and were intent on prosecuting to the complete destruction of the enemy. He demonstrated the folly of the *progressive* belief that destruction of the enemy would be good for Britain or for the world. The Peace of Utrecht (1712) was very advantageous to Britain—it brought it, amongst other things, a monopoly of the slave trade to the Americas—an it left the state structure of Europe intact.

Two centuries later post-Christian Britain launched the Fourth Great War in an Enlightened secular state of mind, which was convinced that total destruction of the chosen enemy would lead to an era of perpetual peace under British hegemony. Negotiated settlement was ruled out of the question from the moment war was declared. And Europe is still searching for a viable system of states to replace what was destroyed then, with Britain doing its best to prevent it.

Was Swift Irish or English? Corkery,

as far as I recall, said he was English. Swift regarded himself as English. He was a member of the English colony in Ireland, resentful of being exiled to Ireland despite his considerable service to the state.

He was the pride of Anglo-Ireland, which saw it as being very small-minded on Corkery's part to insist on regarding him as English. But Anglo-Ireland itself never became sufficiently part of the Irish order of things as to be capable of bringing him into it. And of course the revisionism that berates the small-mindedness of the movement that made a state in Ireland is not even Anglo-Irish.

My understanding, which I picked up in Slieve Luacra, is that Swift was of the English colony, but was good-hearted and went native amongst it to a considerable extent as a Jacobite.

*

Two years after the Peace of Utrecht the Queen died and the Whigs seized power as the new German monarchy was being bedded in and they charged the Tory Ministry with treason, alleging that it had conspired to put the Papist Pretender on the throne—the Pretender being the legitimate monarch if sectarian considerations are set aside.

Swift had not been part of the Tory Ministry, and had not been adequately rewarded by it for his services, but rumours reached him in his exile in Dublin that he was under investigation. He commented in a letter:

"A Whig of this Country now in England has writ to his friends, that the Leaders there talk of sending for me to be examined upon these Impeachments... I went yesterday to the Courts on purpose to shew I was not run away. I had warning given me to beware of a fellow that stood by while some of us were talking—It seems there is a trade going of carrying stories to the Government, and many honest folks turn the penny by it... The Report of the Secret Committee is published... I do not believe or see one word is offered to prove their old slander of bringing in the Pretender. The Treason lies wholly in making the Peace..." (28 June 1715).

The Tory Prime Minister responsible for the Peace, Robert Harley, was imprisoned. Bolingbroke, who had been active in the peacemaking, had escaped to France but wanted to make terms with the new regime. Swift wrote to his Bishop, the Glorious Revolutionist Archbishop King of Dublin:

"I should be very sorry to see my Lord Bolingbroke following the trade of Informer, because he is a person for whom

I always had and still continue a very great love and esteem. For I think as the rest of Mankind do, that Informers are a detestable race of people, though they may be sometimes necessary. Besides I do not see whom his Lordship can inform against, except himself. He was 3 or 4 days at the Court in France, and it is barely possible he might have entered into deep negotiations with the Pretender, though I would not believe if he should swear it."

Swift was let be. Harley was held in prison for two years while Walpole carried out the *coup d'etat* and established the new regime—the present one—and was then released without trial. Swift had intended to write his biography but was obstructed. Harley was consigned to historical obscurity. England has not cared to dwell on the event by which its actual Constitution was forged.

*

Europe has been Christian, in one way and another, for about a millennium and a half. It has been other things as well as Christian over that time. Much of the reflective meditative aspects of life were connected with the formal Christian medium, and certain ideas and moods and expectations, which were developed within that medium, persisted after Christian belief came to be regarded as childish fables.

The most striking of these is the millenarianism of Biblicalist Christianity. Biblicalism is scarcely possible without the Millennium—the thousands years of perfectly Christian living which would lead to the end of the created world and its re-absorption into the eternal harmony of heaven. This was believed in profoundly by reformed English Christians who had retrieved the Bible from the clutches of Rome and restored it to its primitive condition. And this primitive Biblicalism was intimately connected with the development of material science. Isaac Newton did not only work out the mathematics of the relationships of physical forces, he also read the future in the Book of Revelation.

Millenarianism, Biblicalism, was excluded from political power in England after 1660 by the post-Cromwellian aristocracy, but it flourished in the culture of the middle class of the developing capitalism at home and throughout the expanding Empire. It forced its way pack into the political power-structure with the 1832 Reform, consolidated its beachhead with subsequent Reforms, and was the dominant force in the Liberal Party by the end of the century.

It had put its absolute belief in the Bible to the test of science and had run into difficulties. This, combined with the disillusioning influence of close contract with the old ruling class in the corridors of power, led to the collapse of the belief that had motivated it.

Christianity was set aside by the Liberal generation preceding 1916. Then Liberalism went to war—and fought it as Armageddon. The War was fought in the Millenarian spirit that Swift had warded off in 1712.

It was proudly proclaimed at the time as England's first middle-class war. It was also its first post-Christian War. And its first Millenarian War. The pamphlet that gave it its tone was written by the great atheist of the time, H.G. Wells: "*The War That Will End War*". Biblicalist Millenarianism was secularised into rationalist-Utopian *Progress*. (And the recently Enlightened middle-class officers of the Army that was conquering Mesopotamia were half-inclined to believe it all again, and to take the discarded fundamentalism of the Bible, and see its story as being completed as they took military possession of Jerusalem.)

England now holds nothing sacred. That is to say that nothing religious is held sacred by it. A residue of its official Christianity is maintained on a state pension, and its main use seems to be that it can be blasphemed against by satirists who don't have much going on in their heads.

But let anybody in public life dissent from the Churchill myth Churchill's War and it becomes evident that England still holds sacred beliefs which must not be reasoned upon.

Until English Protestantism sickened of itself, it was a major instrument in the colonising of Ireland and the suppression of Catholicism. Catholicism was condemned on two grounds that contradicted each other: that it was an international religion which prevented the Irish from paying due allegiance to their Sovereign; and that it was nationalist, which no Christian religion based on eternal truth should be, and this got in the way of due allegiance. England thought it could have it both ways, and for a while it had.

And then there was criticism of Catholicism both for being conservative to the point of being reactionary, and for being recklessly revolutionary. Roman priestcraft inculcated passive obedience in the populace, and the Protestant Bible released them. But passive obedience to existing authority was the doctrine of the Protestant

State, once it achieved stability, and was particularly so in Ireland.

Bishop Berkeley preached it as an upholder of the Penal Laws. This was part and parcel of English Protestantism as a strictly statist nationalism, but it was also what was preached by Luther. But Catholicism, as the universal religion of the Roman state which outlived that state by more than a thousand years, set limits to the unquestionable authority of the state. It was therefore at various times denounced as being subversive in principle, and not just subversive of English Protestant authority, by propagandists of English totalitarianism, the English fusion of Church and State in which no functional distinction could be made between State policy and morality.

The Nazi revolution in Germany, with which Britain collaborated actively for five years before suddenly deciding in March 1939 to make war on it, could be seen as an attempt to bring about in Germany the absolute nationalism that was achieved in England after the Glorious Revolution.

(Post-Christian Anglican improvers of Irish history—revisionists—have searched for the Millenarianism of Irish national development in order to discredit it. They claimed to have found traces of it amongst the peasantry in the 1820s and in the War of Independence. Some verses were written, looking towards a time when the foreign, Protestant, landlord caste imposed on the populace by the Glorious Revolution would be shrugged off. They indicated a will to do it—and it was done. And, as to the War of Independence: I grew up amongst people who had been involved in it, and I have never come across anything less Millenarian than their attitude to life. The revisionist commentators seem unable to distinguish between strong-minded purpose and groundless Millenarian expectation.

Rome discourages the Millenarian mentality. It is in the Bible, but it tones it down. For Alexander Pope, the Papist sceptic who lived amongst English Protestants, it becomes a civilised fancy. Late in life he wrote to Swift:

"I have often imagined to myself that if ever all of us met, after so many varieties and changes... that we should meet like the Righteous in the Millennium, quite in peace, divested of all our former passion, smiling at all our own designs, and content to enjoy the Kingdom of the Just in tranquillity. But I find you would rather be employed as an Avenging Angel... to break your vial of Wrath over the heads of the wretched pitiful creatures of this world...")

France, to the English mind, is Voltaire and Rousseau. William Blake, surprisingly, knew no better than to say "*Mock on, mock on, Voltaire and Rousseau*". But the mocker was Voltaire, the Anglophile, the friend of benevolent despotism. Rousseau, the Genevan Calvinist who escaped around the corner to Savoy and took the Catholic soup, was very much not a mocker. He is therefore classified as a romanticist—meaning that he engaged with the populace, with which Voltaire had little patience.

Heidegger made the nasty remark that, when the French try to think, they become German. But one of the sources of the German philosophy that did the thinking for the world in the 19th century was Rousseau. Kant got to grips with things under Rousseau's influence. Rousseau and Kant remain a continuing presence in the world. But Rousseau was travestied and repudiated by Conor Cruise O'Brien, and by the Official IRA (Eoghan Harris and Lord Bew), and by the Ulster Unionist Party under Official IRA tutelage. (See Lord Trimble's acceptance speech at Oslo.)

England rejected Rousseau and embraced Voltaire. And what is Voltaire's heritage? Stephen Fry.

It seems that the Irish blasphemy law taken on by Fry and Pat Kenny was introduced for the purpose of restricting the craze for mocking Mohammed that was set off by *Charlie Hebdo*. That craze was essentially Voltairean. Voltaire's *Mohammed* was given an elaborate public performance a few years ago on the shores of Lake Geneva as a gesture of defiance of the ignorant Muslim masses who don't know their place. The play, as far as I recall it, is little more than infantile mockery of Mahomet, The Imposter.

Swift wrote his satire within Christianity. Voltaire was amazed by this. If he had emulated Swift he would have written his satire within the Enlightenment—and the Enlightenment could have done with it.

Ireland is now a country of the vacuous Enlightenment. The substance of the Enlightenment was the destruction of religion. *Ecrase l'infame*—that was the slogan given it by Voltaire. Wipe out the infamous thing! Where does that leave the Enlightenment? What is there for it to do. It has emptied itself of content and made itself redundant by succeeding. It has destroyed what it opposed, and it is nothing in itself. Charles Haughey predicted that this would be the case, in his philosophical dispute with Conor Cruise O'Brien.

In other countries, where there was critical popular engagement with religious authority, there was also national cultural development. That process began in Ireland in the fifties. It is evident in some novels by Frances McManus and Walter Macken. I remember particularly *Brown Land Of The Mountain*. But they were swept aside as worthless in the seventies. (And it was evident in the novels of Canon Sheehan, which were thrust aside by the Jesuits in 1917, but survived long enough in the backwardness of North Cork for me to read, leaving me with the feeling, which just won't go away, that Sheehan was the only first-rate Irish intellectual on a European scale in the 20th century.)

There was plenty in the culture of 19th century Ireland, both national and religious, and the combination of the two, which would have sustained Irish national cultural development in the late 20th century: there was Cox, and the Rev. O'Connor (Columbanus); and Moore (*Travels Of A Gentleman In Search Of A Religion, Capt. Rock*); Mangan (Poems and articles on German Philosophy); Gavan Duffy; the other Moore, George, (*Autobiography Of A Young Man*); and Sheehan's political colleague, William O'Brien, with his vivid description of the Cullenite deluge that sought to overwhelm the nation in the late 19th century.

That was all consigned to the waste-bin of history as dangerous dynamite when Jack Lynch could only respond to the unexpected turn of events in the North by abolishing Irish history and putting a pretentious substitute in its place.

We were given Fintan O'Toole as the replacement. And Gene Kerrigan, who declared around 1980 that there was no need for engagement with the Church and its culture, which might involve a degree of unpopularity for a while. He assured readers that monopoly capitalism would take over and cut it down to size without any effort on our part. And so it did, in conjunction with Lynch's Nihilism—of which the University of Lynch's native city, Cork, is now a plutocratic fortress, apparently able to buy everything but Slieve Luacra.

And that is how it has come about that Ireland is a present with no past, and is in despair about what it can do if the destroyer of its past and the sustainer of its present deserts it, leaving it alone in the European Union with the problem of making something of itself which would be viable amongst the actual nations in Europe.

Brendan Clifford

Kim Bielenberg has condemned Martin McGuinness for his republican past, but fails to remark on that of his own grandfather who was executed for his role in the attempted assassination of Hitler, but who was an active Nazi functionary before that, staying silent on the details of his wartime record

Martin McGuinness And Some Irish And Third Reich Comparisons

Known as "*the Blacksmith of Ballinalee*", General Sean MacEoin had been rightly acclaimed as a heroic War of Independence IRA commander in his native Longford. On being nominated by Fine Gael to stand against Eamon de Valera for the Office of President of Ireland in 1959, MacEoin proclaimed in his electoral address: "*Our liberties were achieved not only by the use of arms but by the combined effort in many spheres of a great variety of people*". But he also maintained:

"In 1921, having seen at close quarters the armed struggle with its sacrifices and anxieties for the Irish people, I made up my mind to support the majority decision of Dáil Éireann and to see that the electorate would have an opportunity to decide on all national issues. I helped to establish constructional democratic Government here and as a very young soldier I was deeply conscious that the army should be subject to legitimate parliamentary authority. I have never wavered in that attitude."

MacEoin conveniently forgot his few years as an Irish Fascist glamour boy, under its various nomenclatures from "*White Army*" to *Army Comrades' Association to Blueshirts*, when, of course, the Blueshirt Fascist General Eoin O' Duffy, became the first leader of Fine Gael in 1933. On 22nd August 1932, the *Irish Times* reported on a speech by President de Valera from the previous night: "*Speaking of the A. C. A. body that had recently been established, Mr. de Valera asked what was the need for it.*" Under the sub-heading of "*White Army*", it quoted Dev: "*There is no reason here for any force except the forces that are at this moment at the disposal of the Government.*"

In the same issue, a similar speech made in General MacEoin's own County of Longford by Minister for Lands P. J. Rutledge was summed up in the heading: "**MINISTER AND 'WHITE ARMY'. NO HITLERITE OR NAZI FORCE WANTED**". The *Irish Times* again reported on 7th December 1932:

"A meeting of the Army Comrades' Association and Volunteer Division was held last night in the Mansion House, Dublin. There was a large attendance... General Sean MacEoin, who was received with applause, said ... (he was) probably the most rabid Free Stater in the country."

John A. Costello, the Fine Gael Taoiseach under whom MacEoin would later serve as a Minister in the Governments of 1948-51 and 1954-57, would menacingly proclaim to Dáil Éireann on 28th February 1934:

"The Minister (Justice Minister P.J. Rutledge) gave extracts from various laws on the Continent, but he carefully refrained from drawing attention to the fact that the Blackshirts were victorious in Italy and that the Hitler Shirts were victorious in Germany, as assuredly, in spite of this Bill and in spite of the Public Safety Act, the Blueshirts will be victorious in the Irish Free State."

And, under the heading of "**BLUE SHIRT PARADES**", the *Irish Times* reported on 24th March 1934:

"The National Festival was marked by many parades of Blue Shirts in many counties of the Free State. At all of them General O'Duffy's message was read and the proceedings were marked by great enthusiasm. In Longford more than two hundred Blue Shirts and thirty girls, in blue blouses, took part in a parade... The salute was taken by Major-General Sean MacEoin, T.D.... General O'Duffy's message was acknowledged by the salute (i.e. the Fascist salute—MO'R) and cheered by the crowd. Major-General MacEoin expressed his admiration for the excellent discipline and order of the parade."

If today's Fine Gael is incapable of dealing with the Fascist past of MacEoin and its other pioneers, it is also no more capable of dealing with his heroic War of Independence record. During the 2011 Presidential campaign, Fine Gael sanctimoniously pronounced on how "*inappropriate*" a candidate for that office Sinn Féin's Martin McGuinness was. This prompted me to declare my public support for McGuinness, as I also pointed out, in a letter to the *Irish Times* on 26th September 2011:

"I am somewhat bemused at the statements by Fine Gael Ministers Alan Shatter and Phil Hogan, respectively, that Martin McGuinness is an 'inappropriate' person to become President of Ireland, because of 'his exotic background' and for 'carrying too much baggage from his past'. At the time of his death at 23, Phil Kelleher had been a top class rugby player, scheduled to wear the green jersey in the next International match. He was, of course, also a police officer, when shot in

the back by IRA gunmen in a provincial hostelry shortly after chatting with the charming hostess behind the bar. The local IRA General who had ordered that 1920 Halloween killing, also saw to the execution of two young Protestants, named Elliot and Chartres, on charges of identifying and informing on Kelleher's killers. The charming Longford hostess had been Kitty Kiernan, fiancée of Michael Collins, while the local IRA General was Seán Mac Eoin who, in his memoirs entitled *With the IRA in the Fight for Freedom*, went on to dismiss Kelleher as 'a young ex-army officer who was given orders to take action against the IRA and clean up the area'. Fine Gael, also styling itself the United Ireland Party, was so proud of Gen. Seán Mac Eoin's 'exotic background', that it deemed him a most appropriate person to become President of Ireland, running him as the Fine Gael candidate in both 1945 and 1959."

This March, on the occasion the death of Martin McGuinness, the Fine Gael Taoiseach and his Ministers did behave with some decorum, much to the chagrin of the British press. But the anti-McGuinness bile coming from the *Irish Independent* Newspaper Group was no less venomous, with the usual suspects being singled out for particular praise in letters to the *Sunday Independent* on April 2nd. One John Kenny wrote:

"The official response to the death of Martin McGuinness was an insult to the victims of the terror campaign of the Provisional IRA. The *Sunday Independent* thankfully tried to address that last week. Articles by Eoghan Harris and Brendan O'Connor represented the views of the silent majority in Ireland."

While one Brian McDevitt wrote:

"Please may I congratulate five of your regular columnists, Eoghan Harris, Brendan O'Connor, Eilis O'Hanlon, Fergal Keane and Ruth Dudley Edwards on their excellent and honest articles. One quote from the start of Brendan's article: 'There were certain reactions permitted last week. Others were not allowed.' Well, let me tell you, all five of your columnists, in one way or another, put that particular scenario to bed."

Since when were anti-Republican diatribes "*not allowed*"? Indeed, what was particularly notable about the Independent Newspapers response to McGuinness's death, was how the usual suspects did not stand alone, but were enthusiastically joined by some others among that Group's correspondents, who do not normally pronounce on such matters. In the *Irish Independent* of March 26th, and under the heading of "*The remarkable transformation of McGuinness: From ruthless paramilitary to cuddly peacemaker*", Kim Bielenberg wrote, *inter alia*:

"In the eulogies to Martin McGuinness this week, there was little mention of the incendiary bomb in the La Mon hotel that killed 12 civilians, and propelled him to the top in the IRA. The IRA planted a blast bomb attached to a can of petrol on a windowsill in the hotel near Belfast in February 1978. After inadequate warnings, the bomb went off, showering the function room with a cascade of flaming petrol, and incinerating the hotel. The victims, seven of whom were women, were all Protestants, and all were attending the annual dinner dance of the Irish Collie Club. There is common agreement among historians of the Troubles that Gerry Adams was chief of staff of the IRA at the time of the La Mon attack—and Mc Guinness head of Northern Command. But the arrest of Adams in the wake of the attack on a charge of membership of the IRA led to his replacement as chief of staff by McGuinness (Adams was eventually released without charge)... Incidents such as the La Mon bombing showed that by the second half of the decade, the IRA's armed campaign was descending into nihilistic barbarism. The tough face presented by McGuinness during the 1970s was in stark contrast to that of the cuddly smiling elder statesman, chuckling with Ian Paisley in later years. He seemed to dismiss casually concerns about civilian casualties, telling an American journalist earlier in the decade: 'We've always given ample warnings. Anybody hurt was hurt through their own fault: being too nosy, sticking around the place where the bomb was after they were told to get clear.' It is this ruthless insensitivity that makes his later transformation into a peacemaker all the more remarkable. McGuinness is believed to have served as IRA chief of staff for four years from February 1978. During that period, the IRA killed over 300 people... The path to peace appears to have been a long one rather than a Road to Damascus conversion."

What prompted the bile in Bielenberg? Undoubtedly a statistically well-researched charge sheet of deaths, but why such a dedication to demonisation? A decade ago, I met Kim Bielenberg on two occasions—at the first and second Holocaust Memorial Day (HMD) commemorations held in Dublin in January 2003 and 2004. HMD in Ireland involves a candle lighting ceremony in memory of, not only the six million Jewish victims, but also the Roma/Sinti victims, Poles, other Slavs and other ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, homosexual victims, Jehovah's Witnesses and Christian victims, and political victims. In the case of the latter, the citation reads:

"In memory of the political victims of the Holocaust: Communists, Socialists, Trade Unionists, and other opponents of the Nazi regime who were persecuted and murdered by the Nazis."

I had been asked to light a candle in my then capacity as a Trade Union official, while Kim Bielenberg was representing the memory of his maternal grandfather, executed in the wake of his involvement in the failed July 1944 assassination plot against Hitler.

Bielenberg's Anglo-Irish paternal grandmother Christabel, became best known for her 1968 memoirs, *The Past Is Myself*, where she wrote of the arrest of her husband Peter, on account of his friendship with the plotters. Reading Kim Bielenberg's hatchet job on McGuinness, however, made me wonder how he might have approached the story of his maternal grandfather. And tell it, he did, in an article in the *Irish Independent* of 24th January 2009, entitled "*How my grandfather tried to assassinate Hitler*", with the following editorial scene-setting:

"Both of his grandfathers were arrested after the 1944 plot to topple the Nazi regime. One was executed. The other survived and moved to Wicklow to become a farmer. As *Valkyrie*, the new Tom Cruise film about the plot, opens in cinemas, Kim tells the story of his family's involvement in the German Resistance."

Bielenberg related:

"Soon after noon on July 20 1944, a bomb exploded in the Wolf's Lair, Adolf Hitler's military headquarters in East Prussia. The intended target was the Fuehrer. If the plan to kill Hitler and launch a coup had been successful, Carl Goerdeler would have taken over as leader of the new Germany. Colonel Claus Von Stauffenberg, a dashing war hero who had placed the bomb in an attaché case in Hitler's briefing room, was to be Minister for War. And my grandfather, Fritz-Dietlof von der Schulenburg, was set to become Minister of the Interior... As the historian Ian Kershaw put it: 'What could go wrong for the plotters on that day did go wrong.' ... Hitler staggered out of the hut with nothing worse than splinters, minor cuts, and burst eardrums. In the grand scheme of things, the failure of the coup meant that the war continued for another 10 months. On a personal level, *Valkyrie* shaped the destiny of all four of my grandparents, and brought about the eventual meeting of my parents in Ireland. Both Fritz and my other grandfather, Peter Bielenberg, were arrested. Fritz, a Prussian count, had been a relentless plotter against Hitler, involved in several assassination plots before *Valkyrie*... Early on in his career, Fritz had been an enthusiastic Nazi. He hoped the National Socialists would restore the pride of a country humiliated in the First World War. But he was soon disillusioned by the corruption of the new regime... Fritz and Stauffenberg became friends in the 1930s; they shared an aristocratic background, and a certain reckless streak..."

Stauffenberg was arrested and summarily shot, shouting to his executioners: 'Long live sacred Germany!' ... Fritz was convicted at a show trial in the People's Court. To the fury of the judge, he said: 'We have accepted the necessity to do our deed in order to save Germany. I expect to be hanged for this and I hope that someone else, in luckier circumstances, will succeed.' Fritz was duly hanged from a meat hook in Plotzensee prison on August 10. My mother's family were kept under house arrest in their home in the countryside. My grandmother and her six children later fled the advancing Russian army on a horse and cart."

There can be no doubting Schulenburg's courage in the face of the notorious Nazi prosecutor Roland Freisler, and in the face of death itself. But his grandson's narrative raised more questions than it answered. Why the complete absence of any mention of his role in the preceding years of the World War itself? Further unease with a soft touch narrative arose from reading a couple of bizarrely-penned obituaries of Kim's mother, Charlotte O'Connell—"formerly Bielenberg"—née von der Schulenburg. I had also met Charlotte herself on HMD in the January of both 2003 and 2004, before her passing later that year. We reminisced about a mutual friend, the left-wing activist Phyllis McGhee, and about Phyllis's 1990 wake, when Charlotte was in the company of her fellow party member Cathal Goulding, former Chief-of-Staff of the Official IRA for the course of its war. Although present with his then partner, Dr. Moira Woods, Cathal flirted shamelessly but good humouredly with Charlotte, and his hearty laughter and conviviality undoubtedly enhanced the merriment and celebration of life at that particular wake. On the obituary page of the UK *Independent* of 5th September 2004, W.J. McCormack was to write of that strikingly beautiful and charming woman who had tragically lost her fight against cancer:

"Charlotte von der Schulenburg, writer: born Breslau, Germany, 22 February 1940; married first Nicholas Bielenberg (three sons, one daughter; marriage dissolved), second Thomas O'Connell; died Prosperous, Co Kildare, 14 July 2004. The daughter of a participant in the July Plot of 1944 to assassinate Adolf Hitler, Charlotte Bielenberg spent most of her adult life in Ireland... She also associated with an emergent radical leadership in the republican movement. Like Cathal Goulding, IRA chief of staff at the time, she possessed charm, intelligence and a realistic understanding of the futility inherent in traditional militarism. Though Goulding's Official position was overthrown by the Provisional IRA ... the legacy has borne fruit, most recently in

the merger of Democratic Left with the Irish Labour Party... These ponderous political reflections are not foreign to her German inheritance. Born Charlotte von der Schulenburg in 1940, the daughter of an aristocratic member of the Nazi Party, she was hardly old enough to remember the execution of her father, Fritz-Dietlof Graf von der Schulenburg, for his part in the plot of 1944. A Londoner by birth and a jurist by training, the Graf had joined the party in 1932, the year before the Nazis came to power, and became an unlikely associate of the socialist Gregor Strasser (murdered in prison during the 'night of the long knives', 30 June 1934). Despite this flirtation with the anti-capitalist element in Nazism, von der Schulenburg, like others of his class, chose the black boot over the red vote. After Strasser's death, he participated in the administration of the Reich in a number of significant capacities, both in Berlin (where he was deputy chief of police from 1937 until the outbreak of war) and later in occupied Paris. At the time of his daughter's birth, von der Schulenburg was Deputy President of Silesia. After the plot against Hitler was discovered, he was executed on 10 August 1944 in Berlin."

The fact that Goulding remained loyal to the Workers' Party and despised the Democratic Left splitters (its initials DL might more accurately be summed up as *Destroy Labour!*) is the least of the problems with McCormack's narrative. But, then, McCormack has form. In 2006 he faced an impending libel action from the anti-Nazi Ruairi Brugha—an action narrowly avoided, solely due to the death in January of that year of Brugha himself—a Republican whom McCormack had shamefully slandered as a "*fascist sympathiser*". The bitter irony lies in the fact that McCormack has served as a life-long apologist for Nazi Germany's radio propagandist Francis Stuart, becoming his chief acolyte in 1972 as editor of *A Festschrift For Francis Stuart*. See http://free-magazines.atholbooks.org/ipr/2006/IPR_April_2006.pdf for details in my article "*On Fascism: Fact and Fiction*", *Irish Political Review*, April 2006.

But, to return to McCormack's September 2004 obituary, perhaps the Stickey apologetics bar had been set too high for him by the "*Irishman's Diary*" already published by the *Irish Times* on 27th July 2004, where the "*historical creativity*" of Kevin Myers burst forth.

"With an almost symphonic grace, Charlotte O'Connell, born Charlotte von der Schulenburg, daughter of Fritz-Dietlof Graf (Graf is the German for Count—MOR) von der Schulenburg, died as the 60th anniversary of the July plot against Hitler drew near, writes Kevin Myers"—

—was how that column opened, as Myers continued:

"Her father was eminent within the plot, and its failure meant abominable death for all those within the circle of conspirators, including him. But of course, in the lunatic despotism of Nazi Germany, murder moved in concentric rings from the first stone, and her family were lucky not to have been caught in a later wave and despatched to the guillotine at Dachau or Sachsenhausen. Charlotte's father had initially been an enthusiastic Nazi. He was deputy president of the criminal police (not the Gestapo) for Berlin. He was a true paradox: an aristocratic count with duelling scars, a socialist, an officer in the German army, and a loving father. His socialism initially drew him to national socialism, and then caused him to reject it. From 1940 on, he was ceaselessly engaged in conspiracies against Hitler's life, and all came to nothing—until the final conspiracy, his final blow for freedom, and his own terrible end. The knowledge of her father's sacrifice in the noblest cause filled Charlotte's life. After his death, she was raised in Germany, but there was a confraternity among the survivors of the plot, and contacts remained within the peer group of plotters' children, a trans-national kindergarten of freedom. In time this became a kind of caste, a mark of nobility borne by those Germans who had been through the furnace of the Third Reich. Thus she came to marry her first husband, Nick Bielenberg, son of Peter and Christabel Bielenberg, the Anglo-German-Irish survivors of the plot... Charlotte became a spirited member of the Dublin leftie scene in the 1970s, associating with what used to be called Official Sinn Féin, which was steeped in all the Marxist mumbo-jumbo and Stalinist doggerel of the Moscow left. Why did she align herself with such a preposterous party? Like father, like daughter: had he not enthusiastically joined the Nazi Party? In later years she was very frank and entertaining about this time in her life. Anyway, even if the politics of Official Sinn Féin might have been eccentric, they killed no one, and their hearts were good, as they pursued an agenda which still, in part, has merit as they tried to save Georgian buildings and worried about poverty and unemployment."

Pull the other one! So, according to Myers, Official Sinn Féin / IRA "*killed no one*"! Go tell it in Aldershot! In their 2009 history, *The Lost Revolution: The Story of the Official IRA and the Workers' Party*, Brian Hanley and Scott Millar related:

"In Lurgan (in 1972) the Officials raided the home of a former Unionist mayor of the town and shot him while he was in his bath. He was dragged outside while his house was burnt down. The Army Council gave the go-ahead for an attack on the headquarters of the Paras at

Aldershot ... on the morning of Tuesday, 22 February 1972... At 12.45 p. m. the bomb exploded, flattening the front of the building and killing five women cleaners, a gardener and an army padre. The Officials initially claimed they had killed at least twelve officers... In Dublin the Gardai moved quickly, arresting Goulding (*et al*, but later released—MO'R)... Mistakes, such as Aldershot, could not be dwelt upon, a volunteer recalls: 'You couldn't step back. It was a dangerous thing to introduce doubt; if you introduce doubt then where the fuck do you end up?' ... Anne Harris (the then wife of Eoghan Harris, and subsequently his boss as *Sunday Independent* editor—MO'R), writing in *Hibernia* two weeks after Aldershot, described the negative reaction to the bomb in the South as the 'most nauseating show of hypocrisy from the Irish middle class to date.' 'It was quite clear that it took courage and determination to enter the headquarters of the technological savages who are maintained for colonial repression by the Crown... There is always the refined gentleman standing at the bar of the officers' mess in Aldershot. (Problem for Harris: Not a single officer was hit in Aldershot—MO'R)... Although I'm depressed about the deaths of the five waitresses (sic; the five women were cleaners—MO'R), I am also sickened by the hypocrisy of the establishment reaction.' ... Just three days after Aldershot, John Taylor, the Unionist Minister for Home Affairs, was shot six times in the head and body as he sat in his car in Armagh; miraculously he survived... Goulding later reflected that Prime Minister Brian Faulkner might have been an even more enticing target, but that 'availability of target matters too.' ... At the end of the month the Official IRA shot dead Police Sergeant Thomas Morrow in Newry after he responded to a hoax call" (pp 175-6 and 220).

Neither Eoghan Harris nor W.J. McCormack nor Kevin Myers nor, still less, Kim Bielenberg, has ever penned a profile of Cathal Goulding with a heading such as: "*From ruthless paramilitary to jovial man of peace*". But what of Bielenberg's heroic grandfather, further canonised by McCormack and Myers alike?

See <https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=iHyRb3ctnx0> for *Bendzin: A Small Town Near Auschwitz* by Mary Fulbrook, Professor of German History at University College London, which video complements her book *A Small Town Near Auschwitz: Ordinary Nazis and the Holocaust*. (2012). She writes of Schulenburg's early association with that town, and of how he ensured the appointment of his good friend Udo Klausas as *landrat* (district administrator) of Bendzin, following the German invasion and occupation of Poland. Udo Klausas's wife, Alex-

andra, had been the best friend of Fulbrook's German mother, and would become the infant Mary's godmother. Klausas's World War commenced with the elite Potsdam Infantry Regiment No. 9, as Fulbrook relates:

"Here rubbing shoulders with the sons of aristocratic families ... he made valuable contacts in high places, including Fritz-Dietlof Graf von der Schulenburg. The Potsdam I. R. 9 later gained fame as providing a significant number of participants in the July 1944 plot against Hitler; but even those eventually put to death for their courageous (if belated) resistance were for a long period of time high-ranking NSDAP (Nazi Party) members and active pillars of the regime, coming to the view that the fatherland must be saved from its Fuehrer only when the war was clearly being irredeemably lost. One of the eventual members of this plot, von der Schulenburg, was in the meantime a senior figure in Hitler's regime, in 1939-40 holding the role of Vice President of the Upper Presidium of the expanded state of Upper and Lower Silesia in which the county of Bendzin was located" (p 73).

"Above Klausas in the immediate hierarchy was his immediate superior, Walter Springorum, President of the Regional Government based in Kattowitz... Springorum was in turn subordinate to the *Gauleiter* and *Oberpraesident* of Upper Silesia, a dual position as head of the state province and the party district or *Gau*... Josef Wagner held the triple role of civilian *Oberpraesident*, party political *Gauleiter*, and immediate representative of Heinrich Himmler as Reich Commissar for the Strengthening of German Nationhood. The Deputy of the *Oberpraesident* from August 1939 was Fritz-Deitlof Graf von der Schulenburg, who had been instrumental in Klausas's appointment in early 1940. Despite his later role in the July Plot 1944, von der Schulenburg was still at this stage a supporter of Nazi policies, if already critical of some aspects of practice; he had not as yet evolved into an active member of the resistance, despite some of the post-war self-serving testimonies of former Nazis who had worked with him at this time and later hoped to gain a degree of 'Innocence by association'. Von der Schulenburg in fact came into contact with the oppositional circles of the *Kreisauer Kreis* only in late 1942 at the earliest, possibly only in 1943. In the meantime, he was concerned to ensure that the new province should be staffed by young, highly qualified, intelligent officials who were also committed Nazis, including Walter Springorum, the President of the Regional Government, and his team of young and ambitious *landraete*." (pp 90-91).

Fulbrook takes issue in a footnote with what she terms "*Schulenburg hagio-*

graphy" (p365). For Schulenburg had taken up high office in Silesia a month in advance of, and in preparation for, the invasion of Poland. The Nazi German pogrom in Bendzin on 8th September 1939—in the very first week of the War, and just four days after the *Wehrmacht* (German Army) had seized Bendzin—happened on his watch. Approximately 170 Jews were summarily shot on the street, while the Great Synagogue was burnt to the ground, with, at the very least, more than 100 other Jews perishing inside. (Some accounts put the figure at 200.) In other words, in the area for which Schulenburg bore administrative responsibility, as many Jewish civilians were murdered in a single night as the 300 deaths with which Schulenburg's grandson charges Martin McGuinness for the four year period of his tenure as IRA Chief-of-Staff.

Yet such a murderous pogrom was not the Holocaust itself. What, however, Schulenburg bore further administrative responsibility for was the July 1940 transformation of Bendzin into a Jewish Ghetto, where its 20,000 Jews were joined by 10,000 others who had been herded in there following their expulsion from other locations. Beginning in October 1940, and continuing until May 1942, some 4,000 Jews were deported from Bendzin to work as slave labour in German military factories. The Holocaust came to Bendzin in May 1942, when the first of the mass deportations began—and which were not completed until Autumn 1943—on the 25 km rail journey for extermination in Auschwitz. Of the 30,000 Jews in the Bendzin Ghetto in 1940, just 2,000 survived the War.

Schulenburg was not responsible for this Holocaust, for he was elsewhere. Just as he had volunteered for Nazi Germany's invasion of Poland in September 1939, so also did he volunteer for the invasion of the USSR in June 1941. Schulenburg shared with Hitler a commitment to a Third Reich based on the concepts of *Lebensraum* ("living space") and *Drang nach Osten* ("Drive to the East"). But he was opposed to Hitler's Holocaust. For Schulenburg, German Third Reich rule over its captive nations should be one of benevolent despotism which would allow for their cultural self-expression. But in the meantime, what do we know of his war against the Soviet Union? *Kalkulierte Morde* (literally, "*Murders Calculated*") is the title of a book published in 2009 by Christian Gerlach, Professor of Modern History at the University of Bern and Associate Editor of the *Journal of Genocide Research*. "**The Annihilation**

of Soviet Prisoners of War on Belorussian Soil: Crimes of German Front Line Units on the Battlefield in the Summer of 1941" was the subject addressed by Gerlach on page 774:

"Mass crimes against members of the Red Army did not only begin in the prisoner of war camps, but already during the fighting and soon thereafter. These were murders and violations of the laws of war and international law... From the first days of the war onwards, many units of Army Group Center shot Soviet soldiers who had surrendered with their hands up, or wanted to defect, who had been put out of action or already taken prisoner... The diary of First Lieutenant Fritz-Dietlof Graf von der Schulenburg makes it possible to reconstruct the considerations among the officer corps:

28 June: 'Doubtlessly ... there is a danger to discipline if our people start to bump off on their own initiative. If we permit this we descend to the level of the SS. Doubtlessly the Russian deserves no more quarter due to the way he fights. But then they must be shot in battle or *only upon the order of an officer*. Anything else simply removes all holds in such a way as to no longer allow for controlling loose instincts!... "

On 29th June he wrote the following about the new instructions: "*Only one who fights with a weapon in hand, who shoots from the rear or who as a prisoner disobeys or flees may be shot. Otherwise (!) shooting may only be carried out at the order of an officer responsible.*"

"Shooting without a reason thus continued to be allowed, though in a disciplined manner, at the order of an officer, which also shows that such measures were by no means taken only on account of Soviet violations of rules – apart from the fact that the possible justifications (for instance 'disobedience') were rather elastic... The mass murder of Soviet prisoners of war and the merciless persecution of scattered soldiers were a consequent continuation of the shooting on the field of battle of Red Army soldiers who had surrendered. This was also begun by front line units, lower officer ranks seemingly having played a major part. Besides commissars, the troops also shot Jewish soldiers and officers taken prisoner. Initiative from the top and bottom met. Thus a company of the 23rd Infantry Division shot a Soviet officer on 26 June 1941 not spontaneously, but only after consultation with the division command post. The more such murders occurred upon orders and the higher the level issuing such orders, the more the executing units and individuals must be seen as tools of a directed policy, even if their actions corresponded to their inner conviction."

Schulenburg viewed indiscriminate and

unauthorised mass killings of Soviet POWs as debasing the *Wehrmacht* and undermining it as a disciplined fighting force. But the "*disciplined*" executions of Soviet POWs, that he and his fellow officers authorised, were themselves war crimes. I will not, however, opt for a cheap, garish headline along the lines of "*The remarkable transformation of Schulenburg: From Nazi war criminal to revered Holocaust martyr*", That would be at odds with principles of natural justice, skipping over the complexities of Schulenburg's biography, and not least the integrity of his courageous final stand. But neither should there be any whitewash. Evidence should not be withheld, but clearly presented and honestly evaluated.

Alternatives to Hitler: German Resistance Under the Third Reich (2003), was the title of a book by German historian Hans Mommsen. An internet review by Kevin P. Spicer provided the following summary, giving the reader an insight into the ideological perspectives of Schulenburg and his co-conspirators, including Carl Goerdeler, the designated Chancellor under whom Schulenburg would have served as Minister of the Interior in the off-chance of the plot succeeding:

"In chapters 5 through 10, Mommsen highlights the significant differences among the July 20 resisters.... In his study of Schulenburg, Mommsen reveals how entrenched this individual was in authoritarian thinking. Though Schulenburg had declined Heinrich Himmler's offer of a senior rank in the SS, he had by that time 'given his almost unreserved support to the National Socialist regime' (p. 152), and, earlier, had even given his support to the radical wing of the Nazi Party that desired a 'second revolution'. The fear of Bolshevism incited this support. Schulenburg firmly trusted that National Socialism would destroy Bolshevism and implement its concept of Lebensraum in order to allow Germany to rule harmoniously over the peoples of Eastern Europe. For that reason he argued that Germany must not take away the 'national character' of the peoples over whom they ruled nor 'their freedom to pursue their own cultural and political development' (p. 160). Ultimately, Mommsen finds that although Schulenburg agreed with many aspects of National Socialism, he could not accept the corruption inherent in its governmental system and for that reason chose a more radical course of reform through the resistance movement..."

"The final two chapters in Mommsen's study are the most insightful and important. Chapter 11 addresses resistance among the military and chapter 12 examines anti-semitism among the resisters in the context of the Holocaust.

Not surprisingly, Mommsen alludes to the fact that many of the conservative-nationalist resisters would have never contemplated resistance had not the war taken a turn for the worse for Germany. He also attributes *Operation Barbarossa* (Hitler's invasion of the USSR on 21st June 1941) as an aggravating factor. He notes, for example, that 'anti-Bolshevism was particularly strong among the officer corps and was further invigorated by the slogans of the war of racial extermination' (p. 269). Though many resisters looked at the crimes of the regime with disgust, Mommsen argues that military considerations outweighed them. This also allows Mommsen correctly to conclude that 'a considerable number of those who played an active part in the July Plot ... had previously participated in the war of racial extermination, or had at least approved of it for quite a time and in some cases had actively promoted it' (p. 250). Not surprisingly, then, Mommsen notes that the 'Nazi persecution of the Jews was a minor factor in their decision to commit high treason' (p. 254). Convincingly, Mommsen reveals how deeply ingrained anti-semitism was among members of the resistance and even among those who had 'dissociated themselves from the regime' (p. 256)... For example, though Carl Goerdeler, as mayor of Leipzig until 1936, attempted to oppose violence against Jews, he did little to limit the effect of the 1933 coordination on Jewish personnel in the civil service. In his 1941 memorandum, 'The Goal', Goerdeler even advocated 'the creation of a Jewish state in Canada or South America' and, for that reason, agreed to treat 'all Jews living in Germany as registered aliens and to deprive them of citizenship' (p. 259)."

See also www.richardjevans.com/lectures/ordinary-germans-final-solution/ for the lecture—"*Ordinary Germans and the 'Final Solution'*" by Richard J. Evans, former Professor of History at Cambridge University, where he offers his own assessment of Schulenburg. This lecture is essentially drawn from Evans's book, *The Third Reich At War* (2009), but as the book also proceeds to an evaluation of the July 1944 plot itself, it is from its text that I quote hereunder, in the chapter simply entitled "*Resistance*":

"One of the factors motivating the German resistance was undoubtedly outrage and shame at the regime's treatment of the Jews... 'Hundreds of thousands of people have been systematically killed just because of their Jewish descent', noted an outraged memorandum penned by Goerdeler and others on the postwar future of Germany in November 1942. After the fall of Nazism, the authors promised that the Nuremberg Laws and all laws specially affecting the Jews would be abolished. Yet the reason they gave was not that they were unjust, but that they were

unnecessary because the very small number of Jewish survivors would no longer constitute a 'danger for the German race'. Nor, significantly, did this prevent the resisters from drawing up plans to classify the surviving Jews on the basis of their race as much as their religion. Moreover, a number of the military participants in the conspiracy had themselves ordered actions against the Jews... As the senior official in Regional Leader Wagner's Silesia, Fritz-Dietlof von der Schulenburg had implemented antisemitic and anti-Polish policies with enthusiasm, including the forced labour conscription or deportation of Poles and Jews. It was above all the German military defeat at Stalingrad, which he took as evidence of Hitler's military incompetence, that drove Schulenburg into the opposition; and indeed for many of the military figures among the resisters, the belief that Hitler was responsible for the worsening situation of Germany in the war was also crucial... Some of the conspirators, including Johannes Popitz, disapproved of the methods used by the Nazis to deal with 'the Jewish question' because they were too extreme, not because the idea of discriminating against the Jews was wrong in itself. As this suggests, it was not surprising that many of them had initially supported the Nazis for their racial policies as well as for other reasons. Well before 1944, however, such views had been all but obliterated by the view that, as Goerdeler put it, 'the Jewish persecution ... has taken the most inhuman, merciless and deeply shaming forms, for which no recompense can be adequate'...

"Goerdeler and the military conspirators were determined to avoid the party-political animosities that had so undermined the Weimar Republic, so open electoral campaigning was not supposed to take place in the state they hoped to found... The vision of Goerdeler and his group, of a Germany in which class antagonisms would be overcome by the creation of a true national community dominated by the traditional aristocracy (the 'stratum that carries the state', as Schulenburg put it), was never likely to be accepted by the working-class followers of the Social Democrats. The hostility of the military-conservative resistance to a parliamentary constitution and a pluralist, open society demonstrated its backward-looking character and its lack of potential appeal to the masses... Those who backed the coup attempt were always in a small minority... As the most clear-headed among them already recognized in June 1944, the assassination attempt was more a moral gesture than a political act... The Allies had no intention of negotiating with them, and indeed, when the news of the attempt reached London and New York (sic; Evans surely meant Washington—MO'R), it was quickly dismissed as a meaningless squabble within the Nazi hierarchy. Some of the conspirators had hoped that a coup

would enable them to make a separate peace with the Western Allies, but the British and Americans were aware of this, and were concerned about the damage it would do to their alliance with the Soviet Union if they gave any kind of positive response to the conspiracy. A separate peace would have raised the alarming prospect of a conflict with the Soviet Union, and this was something that Churchill and Roosevelt were not prepared to contemplate... Yet the death of Hitler might well have hastened the disintegration of the regime, loosened the bonds of loyalty that tied so many Germans to it still in mid-1944, and shortened the war by some months, saving millions of lives on all sides by doing so. This alone was more than enough justification for the undertaking. It was not easy for the conspirators to reach the conclusions they reached or take the actions they took. In the end, however, they acted..."

A "courageous, if belated, resistance" is how Mary Fulbrook described it. Yet there was only one Fritz-Dietlof Graf von der Schulenburg. Just as there was only one Martin McGuinness. The IRA Chief-of-Staff who risked death in fighting a war against British Forces was the one and the same McGuinness who risked death from threatened assassination in fighting for peace, until it was illness that proved to be the Grim Reaper that would take him. A realistic "warts and all" narrative is indeed required to encompass the whole man, but any meaningful understanding of the history of Northern Ireland is ill-served by Kim Bielenberg's self-serving demonisation of McGuinness.

See www.jacobinmag.com/2017/03/martin-mcguinness-ireland-ira-sinn-fein-republican/ for an obituary of McGuinness by the Republican "dissenter" Tommy McKearney, in which, while McKearney's

own critical perspective is clearly present, it is not superimposed on his narrative of McGuinness's life, which is a model of objective presentation, and from which, of course, different conclusions will be drawn by its various readers, depending on the political perspectives of each.

In one respect, however, Kim Bielenberg's hatchet job was correct in saying of McGuinness: "The path to peace appears to have been a long one rather than a Road to Damascus conversion." For those no longer familiar with the *New Testament*, the allusion is to St. Luke's *Acts of the Apostles*, and the story of Saul of Tarsus, a fanatical Pharisee who had participated in the murder of St. Stephen, the first Christian martyr, by stoning him to death. On the road to Damascus, to persecute yet more Christian secessionists from Judaism, Saul is thrown from his horse, to be confronted by the Risen Christ, and becomes St. Paul the Apostle, the great codifier of Christianity and a Christian martyr in his own right, destined to be beheaded by the Romans. McGuinness was certainly no St. Paul. Nor did Schulenburg—who had been responsible for murderous war crimes in both Poland and the USSR, but who would later sacrifice his own life in the plot to assassinate Hitler—experience any miraculous Road to Damascus conversion. The catalyst for the assassination attempt was more firmly grounded in harsh, historical materialist, reality—the Road Back from Stalingrad, and the advancing Red Army's likely defeat of Nazi Germany. I am, therefore, also firmly of the opinion that a meaningful understanding of the history of Nazi Germany was particularly ill-served by the Bielenberg-McCormack-Myers canonisation of Count Fritz-Dietlof von der Schulenburg.

Manus O'Riordan

ATHOL BOOKS

Launch by
Pat Walsh

Friday 9th June

7.30

**at Belfast Unemployed
Resource Centre
4-6 Donegall Street
Place,
Belfast BT1 2FN**

Roger Casement on the Great War:

a commentary by

*Pat Walsh on Casement's article
"Sir Roger Casement on Sir Edward
Grey"*

and

"A pacific blockade"

**5 Euro, £4 post free
athol-st@atholbooks.org**

Meeting to be introduced by Jack Lane on the treasure hunt for the 'Unknown Casement': how *Irish Foreign Affairs* magazine is finding and publishing unknown Casement articles

Getting Casement backwards

As already mentioned, a panel discussion, *Body of Evidence*, was held at Kilkenny Castle on 6th August 2016 as one of the *Casement Project* events.

The individual driving the project, the choreographer Fearghus Ó Conchúir, shared a platform with historian Prof. Roy Foster and Director of the Hugh Lane Gallery Barbara Dawson. In discussing the project with the moderator, Fintan O' Toole, Ó Conchúir explained that he was in the business of "*remembering, reflecting and re-imagining*". The "*re-imagining*", was what especially fell to the role of the creative artist, such as himself.

He went on to say that we can not have "*a national flourishing without thinking of people who live beyond our national borders*". Ireland, he hoped, a century after the Rising, would become "*porous, and vulnerable and permeable and responsible to people who live beyond our borders*". He went on to mention that the participative dance event at Banna Strand, Co. Kerry, some weeks previously, that had involved thousands, had been called "*Welcoming the Stranger*". It had involved diverse participants, including Syrian refugees. Behind it was the notion of cherishing and welcoming a variety of people from different backgrounds. Casement, conceived as a gay man of his time and so excluded and marginalised, especially embodied "*the stranger*" who ought to be welcomed.

So, the idea of Casement arriving at Banna strand in a small row boat with two accomplices, in the early hours of Good Friday 1916, became attached to the notion of migrants, from various parts of the wide world, arriving in Ireland seeking refuge or improved circumstances or even good fortune. Ireland was to become "*porous*" and "*permeable*". Or, at least, this was what was hoped for, in respect of Ireland's borders.

PETER SUTHERLAND

The idea that borders should become more like revolving doors, that with a push they could be got through, has been getting a lot of airing of late. Peter Sutherland, until March 2017, UN Special representative for International Migration, a man described as "*the father of globalisation*" and from 1995 to 2015 Chairman of Goldman Sachs International has had a lot to say on the matter.

Sutherland, connected with the secretive international organisations, the

Bilderberg Group and the Trilateral Commission, has been described as an insider's insider. Asked by the UN News Centre "*What is your message to governments?*" on 8th October 2015, Sutherland responded:

"I will ask the governments to cooperate, to recognise that sovereignty is an illusion—that sovereignty is an absolute illusion that has to be put behind us. The days of hiding behind borders and fences are long gone. We have to work together and cooperate together to make a better world. And that means taking on some of the old shibboleths, taking on some of the old historic memories and images of our own country and recognising that we're part of humankind."

The above is coded language supportive of an open borders policy.

In February 2015 he was elected President of the International Catholic Migration Commission. At a meeting with commission staff at Geneva he presented his views on the future role of the organisation. He emphasised his rejection of nationalism and his support for EU integration (Irish Times, Feb 10, 2015). In June 2012 he told a House of Lords committee on migration that the EU "*should do its best to undermine*" the "*homogeneity*" of its member states (Brian Wheeler, BBC News, 21, June 2012).

Given his distinguished career, which at one time or another featured him as EU Competition Commissioner, Director General of GATT and Chairman of BP amongst other elevated positions, along with the odd few knighthoods and decorations, should we not just sit back and defer to his superior wisdom?

IMI CONFERENCE 2008

An address given at the Irish Management Institute annual conference on 4th April 2008 provides a pointer. Then Sutherland was able to reassure the gathering of business leaders, entrepreneurs and academics about how "*The achievements made in the Irish economy are real. They are not a bubble*", and how it was possible to "*confidently look forward to continuing growth above the EU average for the next five years and beyond ...*"

It was only a few months later that the property bubble burst and the Irish economy fell into its darkest crisis since the founding of the state.

Sutherland is a skilled diplomat and an

immaculately polished promoter on behalf of whatever interests are willing to underwrite his gilded lifestyle—itsself a reflection of his undoubted gifts and imposing list of worldwide contacts. He is a deft and astute spokesman for international finance. This is the interest he serves. Any allegiance to an ideal of abstract truth must, of necessity, remain overshadowed and subsidiary.

GOLDMAN SACHS

The firm he has been most associated with is Goldman Sachs International, being Chairman for 20 years from 1995. With the great worldwide economic downturn of a decade ago, there was an outpouring of anger against firms associated with the business sharp practice which brought it about. No firm was more culpable than Goldman Sachs. It was a byword for reckless speculative investment. Some of this anger even made its way into what might be described as the pseudo-alternative media. A case in point is a long article which appeared in *Rolling Stone* magazine by Matt Taibbi during April 2010 called *The Great American Bubble Machine*. The piece contained its fair share of much repeated quotations:

"The first thing you need to know about Goldman Sachs is that it's everywhere. The world's most powerful investment bank is a great vampire squid wrapped around the face of humanity, relentlessly jamming its blood funnel into anything that smells like money. In fact, the history of the recent financial crisis, which doubles as a history of the rapid decline and fall of the suddenly swindled dry American empire, reads like a Who's Who of Goldman Sachs graduates... All that money that you're losing, it's going somewhere, and in both a literal and a figurative sense, Goldman Sachs is where it's going: The bank is a huge, highly sophisticated engine for converting the useful, deployed wealth of society into the least useful, most wasteful and insoluble substance on Earth—pure profit for rich individuals."

Many may find it surprising, then, that a significant financial sponsor of the *Casement Project* was one Dr. R Martin Chávez, who just happens to be a Goldman Sachs partner, Management Committee member and is listed as the firm's Chief Information Officer. His name is mentioned in connection with the *Casement Project* online though the Goldman connection is omitted.

This is not to assert that the politics of the *Casement Project* was adopted at the behest of Dr. Chávez or Goldman Sachs or indeed any other supporter. It is rather to outline how there was a certain overlapping of perspective and worldview.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

Should this be surprising?

The promotion of open borders, diversity, so-called, and unrestricted migration all work to the advantage of corporate financial interests. The legendary speculator and multi-billionaire George Soros is also an energetic supporter of migration northwards to Europe and North America. This support is not only moral but includes substantial financial underpinning of NGOs engaged in ferrying migrants across the Mediterranean, as an Italian parliamentary investigative committee has heard from the Chief Prosecutor of Catania, Sicily. (*NGOs partly funded by George Soros are engaged in People-Smuggling* – William Engdahl.)

From the point of view of the international financier, nationalism, as an ideology, tends to get in the way. For international finance, nation-states are like squares on a roulette

table where money, goods and people ideally can be moved freely in and out. Nations are not so much organic historical communities as brand names defined by geography. From the financier's point of view it is good when he is free to create as much debt as he believes he can profitably get away with. It is preferable when there are opportunities to privatise public services which can bring in profits in a variety of ways. It is preferable when there are multiple opportunities to speculate on property or commodities.

COHERENT NATIONAL COMMUNITIES

However, a rooted population which is part of a society which is coherent and has a sense of itself and its past is one which has the potential to cause difficulties for the international moneymen. On the other hand, a fragmented society, a society made up of various religious and ethnic segments poses less danger. A society which is rootless, Americanised, fragmented and dumbed

down is so much more pleasant, so much easier to handle, from the point of view of the international financial community.

Coherent national communities with a sense of their roots in the distant past and of their heritage which can be read in the very landscape of a country, have a better potential to resist financial depredation because they have a greater potential to become politically organised.

The *Casement Project* co-opted the image of Casement on behalf of an agenda which is internationalist rather than nationalist when he himself had been unreservedly nationalist. It co-opted his image on behalf of an agenda with its roots in the machinations of rampant capitalism when he himself had been an opponent of the rampant capitalism of his day. It got Casement the wrong way round. It got him backwards.

Tim O'Sullivan

Brexit: Recent developments are all good

For a brief moment in December of last year it looked possible that Ireland would make itself Britain's closest ally in the EU and in the process become part of a UK push to splinter the European project; but the moment passed; the Government rejected a British offer of a bilateral treaty on the grounds that it breached EU rules; and a movement commenced inside the Irish State machine to create distance between it and the UK. Since then various efforts to retrieve the situation from a pro-British perspective have all ended in failure. The stage is now set for the Brexit negotiations proper and Ireland is firmly in the EU camp.

This outturn has important implications on a number of fronts. If Anglicisation—the State-supported drive to build an ahistorical attachment to Britain in Ireland through media hyping of royal visits and the like—is dead, then the related phenomenon, historical revisionism, has lost its main prop. These reverses may take time to work through the political, bureaucratic, academic, and cultural mills but Brexit has put the kybosh on that entire project. There have already been indications that Fianna Fail may cease the practice of disavowing its own tradition and begin moving back towards it. Similar stirrings have manifested in Fine Gael and the new leader (either Varadkar or Coveney) will very likely distance the party from neo-

Redmondism. Siding with the EU over Brexit has created a need within the Irish State for an ideological mindset more in line with traditional policies.

In addition to the above changes in the South, Brexit is acting as a catalyst for welcome changes North of the border and on the Continent. In the North, Catholics who have traditionally withheld their support for a united Ireland are baulking at the prospect of remaining in an isolationist UK while the Republic embraces Europe, and the traditional antipathy of unionists to joining with the South may lessen now that it is the only means of remaining in the EU. Purely as a result of Brexit, the prospect of a united Ireland has appeared on the distant horizon.

On the Continent the predicted triumph of anti-EU populists in the Netherlands, France and Germany has failed to materialise and commitment to the EU has solidified. While still an EU member the UK was the mainstay of Thatcherism inside the bloc; now that the British are leaving, increased impetus has been added to the search for an alternative to free market economics.

Opposition to neo-liberalism is now so widespread in Europe that German conservatives have been sounding alarm bells. Yet Germany, taken as a collective whole, is adjusting rapidly to the reality of

Brexit: when, on April 27th, Angela Merkel announced in the Bundestag that the EU could ill afford to waste time dealing with British illusions, she was loudly applauded; some weeks later her party achieved a 10 per cent lead over the Social Democrats in elections in North Rhein Westphalia. It also appears that Merkel has found a French leader she can work with in Emmanuel Macron and the British nightmare of a solid alliance between France and Germany at the EU's helm is now well on the way to realisation. (This was described by Chris Johns in an *Irish Times* article on May 12th, '*A resurgent Franco-German led EU is Britain's nightmare*'.)

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW INTERVENTIONS

The pace of change coming in the wake of Brexit provides a challenge for political groupings across the Irish political spectrum. Uniquely, *Irish Political Review* (IPR) has provided detailed coverage of both EU developments and the Anglicisation/revisionism phenomenon for at least twenty-five years and by dint of that record it now enjoys numerous advantages in making sense of the various developments that are arising from Brexit.

An editorial in the February edition proposed that, rather than whinging about the economic threat to Irish interests posed by Brexit, the Government should address practical matters like upgrading the ports so that dependence on the UK landbridge to Continental Europe would diminish. It stated:

"The near-universal use of the British

land/sea route to the Continent for freight and passengers is symbolic of Ireland's over-reliance on the British connection. It is so much taken for granted that it is taken to be axiomatic. But, if Ireland is to develop an integrated relationship with Europe, this assumption will have to change.

However, Ireland cannot develop direct Continental sea and air links for freight and passengers on its own. Europe must establish direct links with Ireland too. Active assistance must come from the European Commission, in terms of substantial subsidy and regulatory change. All around Europe all the main infrastructure developments have been developed over the decades by direct State intervention before the EU came into being. If Ireland is to develop a whole new sea and air freight industry, EU regulations on State aid and budgetary prudence will have to be eased."

These proposals quickly found their way into the mainstream debate and were recently endorsed in an *Irish Times* article by Professor Brigid Laffan (*Irish Times* 17 May), a long term academic expert on Ireland's relationship with the EU with whom this journal would have many differences.

In conformity with the editorial policy developed in IPR, the *Irish Political Review Group* (IPRG) has issued seven statements on Brexit since December 2015, mainly in the form of letters to the papers. The latest published letter, a reply to the former leader of UKIP, Nigel Farage, is reproduced in this edition. In different ways these statements have highlighted the disruptive role played by UK Governments in the EU and made the case why Ireland belongs with Europe rather than Britain. Being the only coherent pro-EU voice in the Irish Brexit debate the IPRG statements have been influential.

When, in response to an IPRG letter last year, *Irish Independent* columnist Brendan Keenan described the group as 'Europhile', he used a misnomer. *Irish Political Review* advocated a 'No' vote in the referenda on the Nice and Lisbon Treaties. Having supported the main thrust of the Delors reforms in the late eighties and early nineties, IPR has consistently criticised the neo-liberal track followed by the EU elite since that time. While holding to the view that the basic idea behind European integration is sound and refusing to give up hope that the neo-liberal mindset will at some stage be abandoned, *Irish Political Review* is far from being a Europhile publication.

WEST BRITISH MACHINATIONS

After the Government's refusal to agree a bilateral deal with the UK in December,

other ploys were tried by pro-British elements in both the media and the civil service. On the first day of 2017 the *Sunday Business Post* published a staunchly pro-British article by the recently-retired Irish Ambassador to Canada, Ray Bassett, in which the Government was exhorted to threaten to leave the EU as a bargaining ploy in the Brexit talks. Throughout January and beyond support for Bassett became an indicator of the extensive British bias in the Irish media as numerous columnists and broadcasters gave his articles favourable mentions or invited Bassett on their shows.

The real action, however, was taking place in the upper echelons of the civil service, especially in some quarters of the Department of Foreign Affairs. Referring to the question of contact between Irish officials and the British Government, Pat Leahy of the *Irish Times* stated:

"Despite the clear position—they sound at times like instructions—emerging from Brussels (repeated again last week by visiting economic affairs commissioner Pierre Moscovici) that there should be no negotiations with the British until article 50 is triggered, Irish Government officials are involved in pretty much a rolling conversation with their British counterparts" (30 Jan, *Irish Times*).

Clearly there was tension between Dublin and Brussels about the level of continuing contact between Irish and British officials. Two and a half months later the Irish official with overall responsibility for Brexit, John Callinan, stated at a seminar jointly organised by the SIPTU and IMPACT Trade Unions on April 13th, that he was "unrepentant" about the level of close engagement with the British. Callinan's speech at the seminar was reported in the following day's *Irish Times* and a letter from the Irish Political Review Group questioning the purpose of the close engagement and highlighting the danger that Ireland would be perceived as "the UK's proxy in Brussels" was published on the 19th of April. In all likelihood Ruth Dudley Edwards had that point in mind when she described in the *Sunday Independent* (23 April) the relationship between Irish and British diplomats following the Good Friday Agreement as a "priceless asset". It's hard to judge but the likelihood is that the Anglophile predisposition of many "high bureaucrats", as David McWilliams calls them, is rapidly waning.

One of the persistent demands emanating from Ray Bassett and various Irish media pundits was that the Government should initiate an alliance among EU

member states with a common interest in getting Britain a good deal. In mid April it appeared as though this was on the cards when it was announced that a mini summit was to take place on April 21st in the Hague between the Prime Ministers of Ireland, Denmark and the Netherlands. Judging by the low coverage that this meeting received in the Dutch and Danish media, it is likely that it was an Irish initiative. It is also likely that the mini-summit was the subject of behind the scenes exchanges between the three Governments on the one hand and Brussels on the other. In the event the meeting turned out to be the dampest of damp squibs. The following is from an *Irish Times* article by Mary Minihan published on the day the Hague mini-summit took place:

"However, Mr Kenny was keen to stress that the three countries should "not be seen as some sort of breakaway group" within the Europe.

"You're not talking about the birth of a new subsidiary of the European Council," he added.

Along with Mr Rutte and Mr Rasmussen, Mr Kenny said European states had to act as one. "It is of most importance that we stick together, the remaining 27 countries," the Taoiseach said" (21 April, *Irish Times*)

Why hold a mini-summit the week before the important April 29th meeting of the European Council (the meeting that formally agreed the EU's Brexit guidelines in response to Theresa May's triggering of Article 50) if the unity of the 27 is the priority? As part of the pre-negotiation dealings between the two sides in late April, the UK Government gave an undertaking to Donald Tusk that divide and rule tactics would not be used. So, the idea that Ireland would prevent the bad Europeans from punishing the Brits by organising a mini-group of EU states came to very little in the end.

Another attempt at getting Ireland to rally to the British cause should be mentioned. An *Irish Times* opinion piece headed, 'Ireland should remember who its real friends are when Brexit comes' by Nigel Farage was published on May 5th. UKIP, Farage's party, intervened in the Irish referenda on the Lisbon Treaty and may have a minuscule amount of support here, so the Farage article was probably worth a shot from the Eurosceptic viewpoint. For the most part the article was a rant against the Irish political class and their alleged subservience to Brussels. It was answered by a letter from the *Irish Political Review Group*, reproduced in this edition, and that is all that needs to be said about it.

THE FINE GAEL CHANGE OF GUARD

Enda Kenny will stand down as Taoiseach in early June. When Leo Varadkar, who at time of writing seems certain to win the leadership contest, appoints his Cabinet, he will not appoint Charlie Flanagan as Minister for Foreign Affairs. The exit of these two politicians from the key posts in relation to Brexit is another positive development.

There are some who will make a case that Kenny leaned more to the EU than the UK side as the Brexit story unfolded and certainly the journalist who has been closest to him in recent times, Stephen Collins, has argued that case; but anyone actively involved on the nationalist side in the culture war that surrounded the 1916 centenary will know that both Kenny and Flanagan were dangerously open to British influence. The key phrase that Kenny was careful to repeat in his many speeches was that, "*all who died*" should be remembered. In that way the commemoration was de-politicised and the ground prepared for the calculated insult to republicanism that is the Glasnevin memorial wall. Both Kenny and his Minister for Foreign Affairs were avowed Redmondites; that they failed to advance their cause very far while holding high office testifies to the weak foundations of Redmondism and the lightweight nature of their abilities.

THE BREXIT WIND

When the Brexit referendum result became known and its implications began to sink home, it was plain that the close relationship between Britain and Ireland that had been contrived following the Good Friday Agreement would have to end, and that this would have major implications for Irish politics. It was inevitable that relations between the UK and the EU would sour and that Ireland would ultimately be forced to come down on the EU side, given the long term success of Ireland's EU membership. Given also that the centenary year had seen a groundswell of public support for the historical views that media pundits and academics have spent forty years trying to eradicate, it was also plain that historical revisionism would be subjected to a more critical reception than in the past. Nonetheless it has been surprising how each turn of events in the Brexit story has tended to undermine the neo-Redmondite project in Ireland.

A quick look at some recent developments will illustrate the point. Theresa May announced her snap General Election on 18th April. In all likelihood this will result in a Tory victory with an increased majority that will have the effect of

securing Brexit from the threat of a second referendum. It will also probably strengthen the British Prime Minister's hand so that she can appoint more capable Ministers and be more able to make concessions to the EU without the threat of an election hanging over her. This is a blow to those Irish Redmondites and Blairites who pinned their hopes on the Brexiteers running aground.

I have already described how the mini-summit of April 21st led up a garden path to nowhere. The damp squib in the Hague shows how unrealistic were the prescriptions of the pro-British lobby in the Irish media in previous months. On April 26th, at a dinner attended by Theresa May, Jean Claude Juncker, and Michel Barnier at Westminster, the delusional expectations of the British side came to the surface and this was reported back to Angela Merkel who duly responded with her speech in the Bundestag on April 27st. This shows how the EU has the upper hand at the start of the negotiations and provides another compelling reason why it makes sense for Ireland to be aligned with the EU side.

Another event that occurred on April 26th was the invitation to Michel Barnier, the EU's chief negotiator, to address both houses of the Oireachtas (Irish Parliament). The invitation originated, not from the Government, but from the Dáil Business Committee which is chaired by Ceann Comhairle (Speaker) Seán Ó Fearghaíl; in other words it was a Fianna Fail initiative. Earlier in the year Enda Kenny made a similar invitation to Theresa May which she wisely turned down; she would have had nothing substantial to say. Michel Barnier on the other hand had every reason to accept the invitation and on May 11th he duly addressed the members of both Irish parliamentary houses, listened attentively to the reply speeches and otherwise conducted a successful diplomatic visit to Ireland.

Two aspects of the Barnier visit might be noted in passing. Two days before the chief negotiator addressed the Dail, the *Irish Political Review Group* reply to Nigel Farage was published in the *Irish Times*. It was fortunate timing. The letter turned out, in one respect at least, to be representative of a large swathe of political opinion in that two of the Leaders' responses to Barnier, those from Micheál Martin and Gerry Adams, referred to Brexit in the context of the 1916 Proclamation and the nationalist tradition, as the letter had done. The Barnier visit also took place on the same week that Charles and Camilla of the British royal family were visiting

Dublin. The Irish public was being 'love bombed' from both sides, as a leader writer in the *Irish Times* described it. However, in TV news bulletins Michel Barnier received the higher prominence.

The Brexit wind currently gusting through Irish politics blows only in one direction—away from Britain and towards Europe. It shows no sign of abating.

Dave Alvey

• Biteback • Biteback • Biteback • Biteback •
Biteback • Biteback • Biteback • Biteback

Nigel Farage and Irish EU membership

Nigel Farage strikes a bum note when he states that the people of Britain struck for their freedom last year in the Brexit referendum, "100 years on from 1916" ("Ireland should remember who its real friends are when Brexit comes", Opinion & Analysis, May 5th).

The Easter Rising of 1916 was indeed a strike for national freedom but, under the influence of Roger Casement, it was also an action in sympathy with Germany and "European civilisation". Casement is the father of Irish foreign policy and his writings on the diplomatic machinations that led to the Great War gave the 1916 leaders their orientation in international affairs. This is expressed in the sacred script of Irish nationalism, the Proclamation, in the reference to "gallant allies in Europe".

Membership of what became the EU afforded Ireland the opportunity to escape an exploitative dependence on the British market. The net gain to the economy from EU funds over the years has been €44 billion and that is without mentioning the far greater gains that have come from foreign direct investment directed at the EU market. Yet Irish membership has always been "a political end in itself" addressing "more than a problem in mercantile arithmetic" to borrow phrases from a German journalist (Ludwig Gelder of *Die Welt*) writing in September 1962, having been briefed by Irish officials.

In today's world the pursuit of national independence in isolation from our partners in Europe would simply lead to an increased dependence on international capital and a return to the previous relationship with Britain. Admittedly there are aspects of the EU architecture, especially relating to the now discredited doctrine of economic liberalism, that require reform, but in the past the European Union has overcome major challenges and the omens are good that it will overcome the present malaise.

Nigel Farage would like to see the European project torn asunder; Ireland should be to the fore in making sure that doesn't happen.

Dave Alvey
Irish Political Review Group,
Irish Times 9th May

Brexit and a snap election

Referring to communications between Irish and British officials over Brexit, John Callinan, Ireland's top Brexit official, is quoted by Ruadhán Mac Cormaic as saying "we're unrepentant about the level

of close engagement and discussion" ("British government realises Brexit is a mistake, official says", April 14th).

Given the scale of the challenge to Irish interests represented by Brexit, it is legitimate to question the purpose of this close engagement. Is it as the article suggests "to push key Dublin concerns to the top of the Brexit agenda" or does it reflect a conviction that Ireland should be the UK's strongest ally in the EU?

In reality both aims are inextricable elements of the Anglo-Irish relationship of recent years. By continuing the close alignment with the UK that obtained pre-

Brexit, the Government is allowing Ireland to be cast in the role of the UK's proxy in Brussels.

Is that a stance that is likely to win us support within the EU? Is it compatible with the solidarity now expected between EU member states?

As the Brexit negotiations are about to commence we suggest that close engagement on matters pertaining to the negotiations between Irish officials and their UK counterparts are wholly inappropriate.

Dave Alvey
Irish Political Review Group
Irish Times, 19th April

War Games In WW2 Northern Ireland

As boys during the Second World War in Carryduff, County Down, we would creep through the wire around practice firing ranges being used by Brit and US troops, when they had left, and pick up stray live ammo, mostly .303 and ammo from US carbines. This could be exchanged for comics at school, which were in short supply due to the war economy. Sometime we might fire the bullet by wedging it in a rock and exploding it with a nail and hammer; or light a fire, throw on a couple and then run and hide.

Two boys were eventually killed when they picked up live hand grenades and pulled the pin out. They belonged to another school a few miles away.

There were never any court cases or legal action taken against the British or US Governments. You were responsible for your own actions then. But we were aware, as the war was a daily sight for us with army convoys on the narrow roads, marching soldiers, searchlights in the sky at night, despatch riders on motorcycles taking short cuts across fields, tanks being tested, army engineers building pontoon bridges across flooded quarries, air-raid drills at school, carrying gasmasks to school every day, the school being buzzed by RAF fighters on exercise, war-time posters showing bombs that were being

dropped by German planes, and a poster telling you what not to pick up: toys with possible explosives inside them, safety razors, again maybe to be dropped by the Germans, just as they were said to have been dropped in Poland.

On top of that there were outbreaks of US black soldiers firing on their white compatriots, with gun battles going on all day in a US camp in Carryduff and one in Downpatrick lasting for 48 hours. We knew about the Carryduff one for we heard the rifle fire and then eventually the machine-guns, and silence. The Downpatrick one was told to us by a bus conductor, these being the best conveyor of news. Nothing in the press or radio of course because of wartime regulations.

The odd thing about the Carryduff incident was that the US camp there was of mostly army padres of all denominations, plus recovery and burial parties getting ready for D-Day. I knew that because the camp chapel was open to the few local Catholics in the area, with serving soldiers as altar boys. One Sunday I was at Mass with my mother and sisters when a Carryduff Protestant protest against this accommodation was quickly dispersed with shots fired over their heads by the sentries.

The shots rang out during the raising of the Host so no one took any notice, least of all the soldiers there. Nearby was an RUC barracks which just ignored what had happened because the military had any amount of leeway.

We would have known about sea-mines as children, posters at schools warned us about them in case you had a day by the sea. The British Army also came to the school and put on display all their guns and ammo and had a large display outside of tanks and trucks and half-tracks which you were encouraged to get into, or to get behind the controls of an ack-ack gun. Cannon-fodder for post-WW2: for some of the boys joined the Royal Navy as soon as they left school, the minimum age being 14 years and 3 months.

The girls at the school did take part in our war games with the whole school in half as Germans and English.

In Northern Ireland there was no conscription because of Protestant protest against it. So these children didn't see themselves as being part of the war. Mainly we just saw two armies, Brit and US, using our area for a while.

The girls had no interest in the trophies of war, such as live ammunition or a live German incendiary bomb from the Belfast blitz found by a Belfast evacuee kid.

Wilson John Haire
5 May 2017

Irish Foreign Affairs, June 2017

Editorial: Europe and Ireland
Habermas Philip O'Connor

Balfour and Eugenics, *Pat Walsh*

Documents:

Nazi and Zionist Co-operation in Germany, 1937-1939 (Part 1)

Domenico Losurdo: The Germans: A Sonderweg of an Irredeemable Nation? Introduction (First English translation)

THE UNKNOWN CASEMENT (II) A Selection of his Writings from *The Continental Times 1914-15*

Statement by the German Foreign Office, The Treaty With The German Government with an excerpt in Casement's handwriting of his draft of the Treaty.

Sir Roger Casement's Letter To Sir Edward Grey

Letters to the Editor — Adler Christensen. Lord Charles

The Code of British Diplomats

ALSO: Redmond's Childish Lie. The Step-Mother: A Weakness for Souvenirs, A True British Habit. The Great Offensive. Secrets of British Diplomacy. The Sick Man, a Fable. The Three Friends, a Fable. The Grey Man, a Fable. The Thugs of Diplomacy. German Gold, CT 29/9/1915. Still Further North, CT 22/10/1915

Irish Foreign Affairs, quarterly at €5, £4. **Electronic €12 (£8).**

Letter sent to *The Irish Times* by leading Sinn Féin Dublin City Councillor, **Michéal Mac Donncha**, in reply to **Fianna Fail** Councillor **Malcolm Byrne**, which appeared on 21st April. The letter was not published:

Fianna Fáil, Sinn Féin and Abstentionism

As a member of Fianna Fail I presume Cllr Byrne recalls that his party's founder Eamon de Valera was elected as an abstentionist Sinn Fein Westminster MP for Clare 100 years ago this summer. In 1924 he was elected as an abstentionist Sinn Fein MP for South Down, while he was a political prisoner in Crumlin Road Jail. Two years later he founded Fianna Fail and that party adopted an ultra-abstentionist position—they did not contest elections in the Six Counties at all from that day to this. When Northern Nationalist MPs later sought admission to the Dail they were barred by the de Valera government. And Fianna Fail in our own day failed to deliver on promised Northern representation in the Oireachtas.

So forgive us if we decline to take advice from the hurler on the ditch on this occasion.

Micheál Mac Donncha, Sinn Féin, Dublin City Council

Letter submitted to *Irish Times* but not published

National Identity And The EU

Your correspondents Paul O'Beirne and Saoirse Ní Chruaíaoich express opposing views on the subject of Irish national identity and membership of the EU in the context of Brexit, but I agree in part with both of them.

I agree that 'EU membership has only enhanced our national identity', as Ms Ní Chruaíaoich argues and I agree that our national identity needs to be 'restored' as Mr O'Beirne contends.

In reaction against the violence of the Northern conflict the historical tradition on which Irish independence was based has been decried and abandoned by an influential section of the Irish elite. I view this as an intellectual development unconnected with the underlying reality of Irish national identity.

This intellectual phenomenon eventually found expression in the adoption of an ideological mindset with a strong Anglophile content. In due course a new closeness was developed in the Anglo-Irish relationship coinciding with, and enhanced by, the political settlement in Northern Ireland. The new closeness allowed Ireland and the UK to cooperate more closely in the EU.

Then the Brexit vote happened, creating a real problem for the Anglo Irish relationship as it had been developing.

I consider that the Irish response to Brexit should be three-fold: restore Irish national identity by reconnecting with the tradition that gave us independence; renew our commitment to the EU for the reasons expounded by Saoirse Ní Chruaíaoich; and unpick those aspects of the recent relationship with Britain that were based on an Anglophile mindset.

Once these fundamentals are got right economic policy can follow.

Dave Alvey

Prince Charles and Tony Blair both visited Ireland in May. The Royal visit coincided with Michel Barnier's highly unusual Address to the Dail, an Address which sent a strong message indicating full European support as Ireland starts a new future, detached from the British connection. At this time, it may be useful to remember another Royal visit, a few years ago, which coincided with the anniversary of the Dublin/Monaghan Bombings and which elicited the following letter to the press:

Dublin, Monaghan bombings

I may have been the only journalist on a Dublin street when the bombs went off and ran to alert my then employers RTÉ and BBC. My reactions were certainly a lot less courageous than those of Vincent Browne and others who ran to help the injured. That was the difference between Belfast and Dublin. Experience in the North taught people to run away from the scene of a bomb blast. Soon afterwards that day with cameraman Dave O'Connor from Bray I was in Monaghan to cover the aftermath of the bomb there. The butcher's bill for that dreadful day was worse than anything that any of us had encountered before . . . surely the story would run and run? It didn't.

The Garda investigation was wound down after just six weeks. That investigation was not led by the Garda Special Branch, but by the detective unit, which was less well-equipped to deal with terrorist offences. Forensic evidence was sent to a lab in England for assessment and the Garda files are now "missing". Certainly the British authorities have questions to answer and files to produce that were withheld from the Barron inquiry; but there are others with questions to answer.

There are those who sat in cabinet at that time and others in the Department of Justice who owe it to the dead and bereaved to say what they know . . . to explain the desultory nature of what passed for an investigation.

It took only a few weeks for some journalist to get what seems to be a plausible picture of what happened that day. A loyalist murder gang from Market Hill in Co Armagh planted the bombs in Dublin. The Monaghan bomb was a diversion to draw Irish security forces away from the main Dublin Belfast road. But who made the bombs? Allegations persist that the killers were controlled by two British army officers based in Lisburn. Were those allegations ever investigated?

The royal visit has served to remind people of an atrocity that might otherwise be allowed to pass almost unnoticed. I for one would like to know who tried to kill me and anyone else who happened to be passing that day. I don't seek an explanation to score any kind of political point or to try in some way to explain IRA atrocities.

It is for me and for most of the others personal. We are entitled to know.

Derek Davis, 20 May 2011 *Irish Times*

Derek Davis died in 2015.

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

LESLIE PRICE, BEAN DE BARRA

A most instructive and very enjoyable evening was the 5th General Tom Barry night at the Cork Grocer's Club on the 21st April 20017. The speaker was Liadh Ní Riada, Sinn Féin MEP, who spoke about the life of Leslie, Bean de Barra, General Tom Barry's wife.

The Cork Grocer's Club is a venerable institution established in 1882 by workers in the grocery trade as a place for socialising with each other, and to play billiards, snooker, pool and cards. The Club has the best billiard table in Cork in a room with tiered seating and there are card rooms and a licensed bar. The membership is men only, and women guests of members are welcome. General Tom Barry was a member of the club and as his residence was nearby, he attended the club many evenings on a regular basis. He was always conscious of his safety and he felt safe in the Grocer's Club among his friends.

Liadh Ní Riada speech was as follows:

"You will have often heard the old cliché that behind every great man stands a great woman, and while there is no doubt that Tom Barry was a great man; Leslie de Barra was no supporting character in the struggle for independence. More than just Tom Barry's wife, although there is no doubting the two adored each other, she was an extraordinary woman in her own right. While Tom fought in a British uniform in Mesopotamia, Leslie Price, as she was then, fearlessly carried messages and ammunition between the main rebel positions across Dublin during the Easter Rising; a perilous task to say the least.

De Valera said of the women of Cumann na mBan that they were "at once the boldest and the most unmanageable of revolutionaries". It is a quote that could have been written for Leslie de Barra. Despite the confusion of countermanding orders that scuppered the Rising across the country and almost stopped it in its tracks in Dublin, Leslie marched out with her fellow members of the Central Branch of Cumann na mBan. Her section was originally to report to Commandant Edward Daly in the Four Courts only to be told that they were not needed and

ordered to go home. "I did not obey orders that day" she later remarked. Instead her and her close friend Bríd Dixon went straight to the GPO where Tom Clarke had plenty of use for them. Leslie was first sent to the Hibernian Bank, which was under the command of Captain Thomas Weafer. Hours later he would die in her arms.

On Easter Tuesday a sniper's bullet whizzed past her and struck Captain Weafer. A Volunteer who ran to his aid was also then shot but this did not stop her from tending to both men, even if all she could do at that stage was whisper a prayer in their ears. She returned to the GPO and throughout the week, while Dublin was shelled mercilessly from the gunship Helga, she brought dispatches between the GPO and the Four Courts. Her heroism saw her promoted in the field. By Thursday, as the numbers of dead and wounded began to rise, she was ordered to cross O'Connell Street, a dangerous no-man's land that she remarked "neither flies nor anything else were going up or down at that stage", to the presbytery to fetch a priest.

Miraculously, she made it, only to find that the priest on duty was less than sympathetic to her plight declaring he would not help anyone taking part in a "socialist rising". While she never named the priest nor detailed the words she used to convince him, one can imagine. Suffice to say he soon got his coat; the British bullets being a less fearsome prospect than the ire of Leslie Price. By Friday, the Rising looked increasingly hopeless and Pearse ordered the women to take the wounded and leave the GPO. Leslie and her comrades took them to Jervis Street Hospital but were soon arrested and taken prisoner to Broadstone. Not knowing what to do with this group of unmanageable revolutionaries, the British released them shortly after.

She watched on in horror, with the rest of Ireland, as the leaders of the Rising were summarily executed by the British. Thousands of miles away her future husband Tom Barry had also heard word of the Rising and the executions. By now the British having recognised his skills as a soldier and leader had promoted him to the rank of Corporal. In protest at the extrajudicial murder of his fellow countrymen he rejected the rank and demoted himself back down to gunner. By the time Barry got back to Ireland in 1919, yet to even start his republican career, Leslie had

been a prominent member of the Cumann na mBan Convention and Executive Committee for over a year.

Possessed of seemingly limitless energy she had left her teaching career in 1918 to focus fully on reorganising the movement. She travelled the length and breadth of the country by train and bicycle helping to set up branches of Cumann na mBan wherever she was needed. By the time Tom Barry had gotten back from the war, she had helped the organisation balloon from just 17 branches nationwide to over 600. The following year she was made National Director, a position she held right up until the end of the Tan War.

While working for Cumann na mBan in Cork she met Charlie Hurley of the West Cork flying column and the pair became engaged. Tragedy struck however on the 19th of March 1921 when Charlie and several other comrades were killed during the Crossbarry Ambush. While Crossbarry was the latest in a string of large-scale victories carried out by the column under Tom Barry and Charlie Hurley's command, the loss of such fine comrades dampened any celebratory mood. United in grief, the loss of Charlie seems to have brought Tom and Leslie closer together and the pair were married later that year during the Truce period. Photographs of the wedding showed numerous high profile republican leaders there enjoying the day, little knowing that just months later they would be split over a bloody Civil War.

Like her new husband, and the vast majority of the organisation she led, Leslie, now de Barra, stayed true to the republic and was on the anti-Treaty side of the movement. These were difficult years for the republicans. Tom Barry, who gave a riveting account of his Column's experiences during the War of Independence in his book *'Guerrilla Days in Ireland'*, rarely spoke of the Civil War, finding the memories of comrades fighting comrades too painful to recall. Cumann na mBan paid a huge price during the conflict with more than 400 women from the organisation jailed during the Civil War, while further splits after the Truce weakened the organisation further.

Leslie remained a committed republican however and, when Irishmen joined socialists and republicans from around the world to fight Franco's fascism in Spain, she became involved with the Irish Red Cross, using her

influence to ascertain the whereabouts and well-being of Irish soldiers and prisoners. When World War Two broke out, she turned to organising the care of orphaned children, with both herself and Tom helping refugees from Czechoslovakia and Poland.

Her passion, energy and determination had not waned since her days as Director of Cumann na mBan and she soon became a figurehead in the Irish Red Cross, representing them at conferences in Toronto, Oslo, Monaco, New Delhi, Geneva, Vienna, The Hague, Athens, Istanbul, and Prague. In 1950, she was made Chairman of the organisation, a position she held until 1973. During that time, she also helped set up the Voluntary Health Insurance organisation and later launched the Freedom from Hunger campaign, which would later become *Gorta*, of which she would also be Chairman.

In 1979, the year she stepped down as Chair of the Red Cross, she was awarded the Henry Dunant Medal, the highest honour of the global Red Cross Movement. Less than a year later, her beloved husband Tom would die, still inspiring generations of freedom fighters. Two hundred and fifty miles away, and locked in a filthy six by six foot cell, 27 year old Bobby Sands, who would face death himself less than a year later, drew strength from Barry's example, composing on toilet paper with a smuggled pencil the ode *'Tom Barry'*:

"In the southern realms of Munster world,
The humble gorse did sway,
Shedding yellow tears like child
For a legend passed away."

The poem goes on to ask if Barry would ever find peace.

"And we prayed tonight for Barry's rest,
Would Barry e'er be free,
As he tramps across old Munster's breast,
To blind eternity."

I imagine he did find peace, four years later, when Leslie joined him in St. Finbarr's graveyard. Leslie, like Tom, is remembered in numerous ways today, not least of which is the *Leslie de Barra Trophy*, awarded annually by the Red Cross to the *Cork Area Carer of the Year*, a wonderful tribute to her compassion and tireless work for others. And while it is important that we remember the names of these great people who helped shape our country, it is more important that we remember

their example. Their conviction that words—however eloquent—were never enough.

So tonight, let us not just pay tribute to the name of Leslie de Barra. Let us take inspiration from her legacy and in doing so imagine how we can act to make our community, our country and our world a better place. If we can imagine that, then we will truly be honouring her memory. The memory of a loving wife, a proud Irish woman, a fearless humanitarian, a champion for justice, a dauntless leader and an unmanageable revolutionary."

(Sustained applause).

A warm note of thanks to Liadh Ni Riada was proposed by Club member Séamus Lantry, who is President of the National Tom Barry Commemoration Committee, and it was unanimously passed by the large number in attendance.

For the evening, there was in the Club rooms an extensive exhibition of War of Independence guns, artefacts and memorabilia provided and curated by The Irish Volunteers Association. The food for the occasion was provided by Martin Harvey & Co., Solicitors. Mr. Martin Harvey himself was present—Tom Barry was his godfather. A great night was had by all.

Michael Stack ©

MARX continued

both countries to break the edge of the social conflict, whenever they think fit, by their mutual bullying and, in case of need, by war between the two countries.

England, as the metropolis of capital, as the power that has hitherto ruled the world market, is for the time being the most important country for the workers' revolution, and moreover the *only* country in which the material conditions for this revolution have developed to a certain degree of maturity. Therefore to hasten the social revolution in England is the most important object of the International Workingmen's Association. The sole means of hastening it is to make Ireland independent.

Hence the task of the International is everywhere to put the conflict between England and Ireland in the foreground, and everywhere to side openly with Ireland. The special task of the Central Council in London is to awaken the English workers to a realization of the fact that *for them* the national emancipation of Ireland is no question of abstract justice or humanitarian sentiment but *the first condition of their own emancipation*.

These are, roughly, the principal points made in the circular letter, which thereby likewise set forth the *raisons d'etre* [motives] for the General Council's resolutions on the Irish Amnesty. Shortly thereafter I sent a sharp anonymous article on how the British were treating the Fenians, etc., attacking Gladstone, etc.—to the *Internationale* (the organ of our Belgian Central Committee in Brussels). In the same article, I accused the French republicans (the *Marseillaise* had printed a stupid article on Ireland written over here by the miserable Talandier) of centering all their *coleres* [indignation], in their national egotism, on the French Empire.

This worked. My daughter Jenny, over the signature of "J. Williams" (in a private

letter to the editors she had used the name, of Jenny Williams), wrote a series of articles for the *Marseillaise* and also published a letter from O'Donovan Rossa. Hence immense noise.

After years of cynical refusal, *Gladstone* was *thereby* finally compelled to agree to a *Parliamentary inquiry* into the treatment of the Fenian prisoners. Jenny is now the regular correspondent on Irish affairs for the *Marseillaise*. (*This is between us, of course.*) The British government and the British press are murderously furious that the Irish problem is now on the *ordre du jour* [order of the day] in France and that this *canaille* is now being watched and exposed throughout the Continent, via Paris.

This stone also brought down another bird. We thus forced the Irish leaders, journalists, and the like in Dublin to enter into relations with us, something that the *General Council* had been unable to achieve previously!

In America you have a broader field for work along the same lines. *A coalition of the German workers with the Irish* (as well as with those English and American workers who are ready to do so) is the most important job you could start at the present time.

This must be done in the name of the International. The social significance of the Irish problem must be made clear . . .

Salut et fraternité!

KARL MARX

(From *Letters to Americans*-1848-1895-By Karl Marx and Frederick Engels-International Publishers, New York-Third Edition 1969)

1. "£6000-£8000" refers to the average income of an absentee landlord.

MEYER, SIEGFRIED (1840-1872). German-American mining engineer and socialist; emigrated to U.S. (1867), where he helped found General German Working Men's Union of New York, a section of First International. [1864-1876]



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 35 No. 6

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

Karl Marx and the Fenians

Dear Meyer and Dear Vogt:

After occupying myself with the Irish question for many years I have come to the conclusion that the decisive blow against the English ruling classes (and it will be decisive for the workers' movement all over the world) can *not* be delivered in *England* but *only in Ireland*. On December 1, 1869, the General Council issued a confidential circular drawn up by me in French (for the reaction upon England only the French, not the German, papers are important), on the relation of the Irish national struggle to the emancipation of the working class and therefore on the attitude which the International Workingmen's Association should take toward the Irish question.

I will here only give you in brief the decisive points.

Ireland is the bulwark of the *English landed aristocracy*. The exploitation of this country is not only one of the main sources of their material wealth, it is their greatest *moral* strength. They, in fact represent the *domination of England over Ireland*. Ireland is therefore the *grand moyen* [great means] by which the English aristocracy maintains its *domination in England* itself.

On the other hand, should the English army and police move out of Ireland tomorrow, you would at once have an agrarian revolution in Ireland. But the overthrow of the English aristocracy in Ireland involves and has as a necessary consequence its overthrow in England. And this would fulfill the prerequisite for the proletarian revolution in England. The destruction of the English landed aristocracy in Ireland is an infinitely easier operation than in England itself, because the *land question* has hitherto been the *exclusive form* of the social question in Ireland, because it is a question of existence, of *life and death*, for the immense majority of the Irish people, and because it is at the same time inseparable

from the *national* question. Quite apart from the passionate character of the Irish and the fact that they are more revolutionary than the English.

As for the English *bourgeoisie*, they have *d'abord* [in the first place] a common interest with the aristocracy in transforming Ireland into a mere pasture land, which provides the English market with meat and wool at the cheapest possible prices. It has the same interest in reducing the Irish population to such a small number, by eviction and forcible emigration, that English *capital* (leasehold capital) can function with "security" in that country. They have the same interest in clearing the estate of Ireland as they had in the clearing of the agricultural districts of England and Scotland. The £6000-£8000 absentee and other Irish revenues which at present flow annually to London have likewise to be taken into account. (I.)

But the English bourgeoisie has also much more important interests in the present Irish regime. Owing to the constantly increasing concentration of leaseholds, Ireland constantly supplies its own

surplus to the English labour market and thus forces down wages and the moral and material position of the English working class.

And most important of all! Every industrial and commercial center in England now possesses a working-class population *divided* into two *hostile* camps, English proletarians and Irish proletarians. The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of life. In relation to the Irish worker he feels himself a member of the ruling *nation* and so turns himself into a tool of the aristocrats and capitalists *against Ireland*, thus strengthening their domination *over himself*. He cherishes religious, social, and national prejudices against the Irish worker. His attitude towards him is much the same as that of the "poor whites" to the Negroes in the former slave states of the USA. The Irishman pays him back with interest in his own money. He regards the English worker as both the accomplice and the stupid fool of *English rule in Ireland*.

This antagonism is artificially kept alive and intensified by the press, the pulpit, the comic papers, in short by all the means at the disposal of the ruling classes. *This antagonism* is the *secret of the impotence of the English working class*, despite their organisation. It is the secret by which the capitalist class maintains its power. The latter is well aware of this.

But the evil does not stop here. It continues across the ocean. The antagonism between English and Irish is the hidden basis of the conflict between the United States and England. It makes any honest and serious co-operation between the working classes of the two countries impossible. It enables the governments of

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

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

1 Sutton Villas, Lower Dargle Road
Bray, Co. Wicklow or
33 Athol Street, Belfast BT12 4GX or
2 Newington Green Mansions, London N16 9BT
or *Labour Comment*, TEL: 021-4676029
C/O Shandon St. P.O., Cork

Subscription by Post:

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

Electronic Subscription:

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

You can also order from:

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

continued on page 25