

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

January 2019

Vol.34, No.1 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.33 No.1 ISSN 954-5891

The 1918 Election And The *Traumatised Neo-Redmondites!*

The coincidence of the centenary of the 1918 Election with Brexit has cornered many prominent Anglophiles into a kind of intellectual nationalism. The presence of Britain in Europe enabled them to reject the Irish national viewpoint on the world in substance without having to do so in form. Being good Europeans was their way of being British.

But the British decision to withdraw from the EU has left them naked in the world and traumatised them into a kind of Irish nationalism.

While Britain was a participating member of the EU, they never stood for Europe against what Britain was trying to do to it. And, if Britain had not voted for Brexit, we can be sure that their comment on the 1918 Election, if they noticed it at all, would not have been what it is now.

The headline on Fintan O'Toole's comment in the *Irish Times* (Dec 8) is: "100 years ago this week, in an act of peaceful secession, Irish people chose to be citizens not subjects". And the Irish people "proposed to call into being a new democracy, using the methods of democracy itself".

So how did it happen that the democratically-enacted peaceful secession of Ireland from the British state was followed by a war between the Irish democracy and the British state? O'Toole offers no explanation.

The only possible explanation would have advanced him a bridge too far away from his beloved Britain—the British State would not peacefully accept the peaceful Irish secession, and so the Irish had to fight a war for their independence, just as if they had never voted for it. And so the criticism that was made of the 1916 Insurrection—that it was not mandated democratically—falls away as irrelevant.

continued on page 2

1918 Election: Looking For Authenticity!

Fake news, phoney philosophers, quack doctors of letters, hack historians, are not new phenomena.

But it seems that never has the human race faced a greater tsunami of shite, poppycock and tommyrot than it does today.

Nowhere are these phenomena greater than in today's Ireland. In some specific issues there are apparently co-ordinated acts of psychological sabotage.

We should be celebrating Ireland's exercising her Right to Freedom, and her repudiation of a party begging favours from her enemies. Ninety-Eight years before England voted for Brexit, Ireland in a General Election, "regarded on all sides as a Plebiscite" according to London's *Times*, gave the English King, all his horses and all his men notice to leave Ireland.

continued on page 4

December Brexit Summary

A High-Wire Act!

Since the European Council formally agreed the texts of the *Withdrawal Agreement* and the *Declaration on a Future Relationship* on December 2nd, the point where last month's Brexit summary ended, there have been five important developments, yet uncertainty continues to the order of the day. Most of these developments have provided insights into the political realities underlying the current stalemate.

The first event was that, having promised that the critical Commons vote would take place on Tuesday, 11th December, Theresa May, unprecedentedly, pulled it from the agenda of Parliament on the day before it was due. She announced that she was deferring the vote and embarking on a new round of diplomacy with various EU heads. This reflected a recognition by Downing Street that opposition from Tory backbenchers was of a sufficient scale to

easily defeat the deal. Approximately 90 Tory MPs were known to oppose it, a margin that was too large to be whittled away, even in the event of a second vote. The calculation was that the various forms of pressure that the Government can bring to bear on backbenchers would not be enough to get the May Brexit deal through Westminster.

The next development was that the number of letters from Tory MPs demanding a vote of confidence in the Prime Minister reached 48 and a vote was duly called. Before the vote May announced

continued on page 4

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
The 1918 Election And The Traumatized Neo-Redmondites! Editorial	1
1918 Election: Looking For Authenticity! Donal Kennedy	1
A High Wire Act. Dave Alvey (December Brexit Summary)	1
Readers' Letters: Plebiscites And Referendums. John Martin	3
Border Poll polling: December 'Lucidpoll' confirms No-Deal 'hard' Brexit sway towards a United Ireland. Mark Langhammer	5
1919 Government Bulletin. Donal Kennedy	7
LEST WE FORGET (1). Extracts from <i>Irish Bulletin</i> . This issue lists British Acts Of Aggression, 1919-mid April 1920 (ed. Jack Lane)	8
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (Clair Wills And The Story She Tells. Part 7)	10
Redmondism Defeated in Waterford. Pat Muldowney	13
Dr Vincent White and the Ballybricken Pig Buyers!	13
Readers' Letters: Who Creates Money? Martin Dolphin	14
Money Supply Revolution. Angela Clifford	14
The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings, 17 May 1974.	15
John Morgan (Lt. Col., retd.)	15
Victims Of The British State! Wilson John Haire	16
(Review of <i>Life After Life</i> by Paddy Armstrong)	16
The Russian Revolution. Brendan Clifford (100th Anniversary, Part 13)	19
Lemass In The De Valera Era, And A Dillon/Bowen Digression.	23
Manus O'Riordan (Lemass, Part 4)	23
Biteback: Fr. Michael O'Flanagan and the 1916 Rising. Manus O'Riordan	29
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Budget 2019; Academic Independence?)	30

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

James Connolly

The Exclusion of Ulster

(back page)

But Britain is the home of practical democracy, as France is of democracy as an ideal. So must we say that democratic Britain behaved undemocratically?

Stephen Collins (Irish Times Dec 11) says:

"One of the main reasons why the First Dail and its successor persuaded the British government to grant independence was the pressure of British public opinion, which accepted the legitimacy of Irish national aspirations and was revolted by the government repressive response... British democracy recoiled from such a response..."

But the British democracy was the British Government, elected by a landslide in the 1918 Election. The modern meaning of democracy—the post-Athenian meaning—is that the populace elects a party to govern it. Move away from that meaning and the idea of democracy gets lost in the clouds.

The British populace elected the Lloyd George Coalition, and stood behind it throughout its war on the Irish democracy. The restraining influence on it was that of

American opinion—which was not only Irish-American. Britain had reduced itself from a creditor to a debtor state by its spuriously democratic war on Germany and Turkey. America was nudging it into second place and it had to take serious account of strong opinion within America towards it—a thing which it could have brushed aside before August 1914. And it was the successful anti-Treaty rebellion in Turkey that brought down the Lloyd George Coalition in 1922.

British democracy made war on Irish democracy in 1919-21. Democracy is not internationalist. It is essentially a national political system. And Burke, the Whig/Tory who was the founder of British political philosophy for the era of sovereign party-politics around which democracy developed, said he did not know how to indict a whole people.

The United Nations, when drawing up its *Universal Declarations*, evaded the issue. It invented the category of war-crimes, but did not prosecute the nuclear obliteration of two undefended Japanese cities that were not military obstacles or

objectives. The implication was that the actions of democratic states, being in principle actions of the people, were not subject to international law when making war on a state that was not organised democratically. The populace of an undemocratic state may be punished at will by a democratic state.

But that doesn't help us in the case of the war that followed the 1918 Election, which was a war waged by a powerful democracy on a virtually unarmed democracy.

The newly-born nationalists hatched by Brexit still have a lot of figuring out to do, seeing that they are also enthusiasts for Britain's Great War on Germany as an idealistic war for democracy and the rights of small nations.

Stephen Collins observes that—

"The solidarity shown to Ireland by our European partners in stark contrast to the international response to the First Dail. One of the main objectives of that Dail was to obtain international recognition at the Paris peace conference ... However the Irish delegation was given the cold shoulder as the major powers showed solidarity with the British by refusing to countenance the claims for Irish independence..."

50,000 Irish died in the Great War, having been shepherded into it by John Redmond, and presumably killed a great number of Germans and Turks. And, according to media comment of the past generation, that was a very good thing, because they fought for the freedom of the world and of Ireland. So, how could it have happened that the major Powers, which had fought for those ideals and won, behaved so badly at their post-war Conference?

Obviously because what they had actually fought for was not those ideals. The Irish masses that flocked into the British Army killed, fought and died for an illusion that was dangled before them. The 'Peace Conference' put into effect the actual purpose for which the victors had fought.

The German Government was locked out of the 'Peace Conference' along with the Irish, breaking the precedent of centuries. The Starvation Blockade on Germany was tightened up after the Armistice, and was continued into the Summer of 1919 until the German Republic accepted the terms that were dictated to it.

The Hapsburg state was broken up into nationalities that had never asserted themselves as the Irish had done, and

independent 'nation-states' were created that had little regard for national cohesion and that proved not to be viable.

The Ottoman state, which had maintained peace in the Middle East, was broken up and Palestine was opened up to Jewish colonisation at the expense of the native population.

The Italian Government had been drawn into the War with lavish British promises of Austrian territory—which Britain was unwilling to deliver in full in 1919.

And France seized the Alsace-Lorraine region of Germany in an act of irredentism which had been its main reason for war on Germany. But France was prevented by Britain from gaining the security of a Rhine frontier with Germany.

"*International response*" in 1919 meant little more than British response. Germany and Austria were defeated countries. The Russian state was doing its own thing. The "*major powers*" were Britain and France, and Britain at the 'Peace Conference' quickly established its ascendancy over France. And Britain, of course, did not recognise the Irish Republic.

The *devaluation* of the 1918 Sinn Fein vote—begun by Professor Allison Phillips of Trinity at the time and reasserted by Robert Kee in the early 1970s, and regularly repeated in the *Irish Times* ever since, barely gets a mention now by O'Toole: "*Sinn Fein benefited hugely from the Westminster first-past-the-post electoral system—it won nearly three quarters of the Irish seats with just 48 per cent of the vote*".

The significant thing about Sinn Fein's failure to gain a majority of the votes is the reason for it: the Redmondites did not contest enough seats for Sinn Fein to get a majority of the votes. In Constituencies where no candidates were fielded against Sinn Fein—and that was about a quarter of them—Sinn Fein got no votes at all.

The result of the Election was not decided by the contested seats, where the main opponent was the Unionist Party. The decisive thing was the demoralisation of Redmondism even before the event, which caused it to let so many seats go by default.

And the cause of the demoralisation?

"...this was a reaction, not just to the Easter Rising... and its transformative effects on public opinion, but to a far greater turmoil: the Great War... It might have been different. John Redmond ... could have been seen in retrospect to have placed a successful bet—he had backed the British Empire in 1914 by

Plebiscites And Referendums

The Irish describe the people's vote to inaugurate bunreacht na hEireann as a plebiscite because it was not amending a constitution. It was a vote to introduce a new constitution. Once the constitution was accepted as law all subsequent votes to amend the constitution are described as referenda.

In general a plebiscite is a consultative exercise which does not change the law. A referendum does change the constitution.

The British vote to exit the EU was a plebiscite. British politicians had no obligation to bring the vote to the people. And apparently they had no legal obligation to accept the result.

The Irish votes on Lisbon and Nice were referenda. Irish politicians were legally obliged to amend the constitution because, as it stood, Nice and Lisbon were in conflict with the constitution. The only way to amend the constitution was by a vote of the people.

The thing about law is that it is circumscribed. It has a specific application. Since the British plebiscite is not circumscribed by law its application is not limited.

John Martin

urging Irishmen to join its armed forces and the empire had won... But this vindication had already turned sour. The 1918 election was decisively shaped by anti-war sentiment."

Why was there a sudden eruption of anti-war sentiment? Because of the 1918 decision to extend British conscription to Ireland, we are told.

Britain was at war to save civilisation from the barbarism of the Hun. The Redmondite ideologues, Tom Kettle and Robert Lynd, said so very forcibly, and only small-minded insular extremists disagreed. But the Hun held out very much longer than was expected. By 1916 volunteering fell short of requirements and compulsion was introduced in Britain.

Then, in the Spring of 1918, there was a strong German offensive in the West, made possible by the peace with Russia. In order to hold the ring until the Americans arrived, it was decided to apply compulsion in Ireland too, where the bad example of the Easter Rising had led to a decline in volunteering. And the Irish, in response, decided to let civilisation go hang!?

Could it possibly have been that there was a growing opinion amongst the Irish that the war was not about saving civilisation at all?

The Christian Brothers, a staunchly Redmondite institution in 1914, and a popular institution in its own right, had noticed that Britain, in the War, was doing the very same thing that it had accused the Germans of when declaring war: invading neutral countries. It invaded neutral Greece, overthrew the Government, and

installed a puppet Government which joined it in the War. Tom Kettle apparently did not notice this, but the Christian Brothers did, and said so.

So was it a war to save civilisation, which the Irish withdrew from in 1918, or was it something altogether different? Could it have been what Casement and Connolly described it as being in 1914?

Another factor in the collapse of Redmondism in 1918 is that it was not altogether sudden, or related to the War. The collapse began in 1910 when it lost ten per cent of its seats to the national movement led by Canon Sheehan and William O'Brien, which accused it of turning the Home Rule movement into a Catholic Ascendancy movement, and of driving the country towards Partition. At the second 1910 Election Redmond set the precedent for 1918 by not even contesting the North Cork constituency.

The neo-Redmondites, in their resentment of Brexit, have taken a mini-step away from the Redmondite mythology that they have been constructing into history. In order to take another step they will have to begin refuting themselves.

Forgotten Aspects Of **Ireland's Great War On Turkey**. 1914-24
by *Dr. Pat Walsh*.

540pp. €36, £30

The Christian Brothers' History Of The Great War, first published in monthly instalments in 1914-18.

52pp (A4). €10, £8

Prices postfree

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

1918 Election:

continued

A near namesake of mine, Dennis Kennedy, sought, in a long article in *History Ireland*, to forestall a celebration of that democratic exercise.

Instead he wanted us to show our gratitude to Lord Fitzalan who condescended to grant Dublin Castle to "the Provisional Government of the Irish Free State" on 16th January 1922, by celebrating Independence Day on January 16th.

I pointed out that voters had not established the 'Provisional Government' but had freely established Dail Eireann on 14th December 1918 and suggested that, if we were to celebrate an Independence Day, it should be on 14th December. It would honour the plain people of Ireland and could not be misrepresented as militaristic.

Anyhow the Tin Soldier and the Friends of Dorothy Gale (not Dorothy MacArdle!) appear to have stymied the appropriate commemoration of the 1918 establishment of the Republic at the Ballot Box.

I see that the Centenary of the Inaugural meeting of Dail Eireann involves some panel discussion chaired by Stephen Collins. I have been reading pieces by Stephen Collins for years, none of which impressed me in a positive way.

He claims the Labour Party (founded 1912) is the oldest party in the Dail. Sinn Fein was founded in 1905 and established the Dail; and Sean T. O Ceallaigh and W.T. Cosgrave, founder members of the Dail, had been Dublin Corporation Aldermen since before the Labour Party was founded. I don't know whether the Labour Party had any members of Dublin Corporation in 1919 but it did not contest Parliamentary elections until 1922.

Fine Gael, Fianna Fail and Clann na Poblachta were major or minor off-shoots of Sinn Fein. Indeed, when Stephen Collins made his assertion, many Labour Party men in Leinster House had cut their political teeth or sown their wild oats with Sinn Fein.

Stephen's ideas about history are matched by his sense of taste. The *Irish Times* reproduced a Cumann na nGaedhael election poster from 1932 which would shame a schoolyard bully for its stupidity and its attempt to win the votes of bigots and xenophobes—

It was headed—

DEVVY'S CIRCUS

Featuring SENOR de VALERA

Monsieur LEMASS

Shanty O'KELLY

The poster was displayed all over the country in 1932, proving there's no such thing as bad publicity. Senor De Valera, Monsieur Lemass, and their lampooned colleagues had their names so imprinted in the minds of the electorate that they were repeatedly elected and re-elected and formed the Government for the following 16 years and the party formed most governments in the 70 years since 1948.

The most impressive thing Stephen wrote was about the time he asked Charles Haughey if he was about to resign. Charlie grabbed Stephen by the lapels—or the throat?—and told him to "F*** OFF". Is it any wonder that Charlie remained the People's Darling for some years afterwards?

Anyhow I named this column *Looking For Authenticity!*

Donal Kennedy

A High-Wire Act!

continued

that she would not lead her party into the next Election. The result, announced at 9pm on Wednesday 12th December, was 200 votes for May and 117 against. Following an initial response in which the emphasis was on May's victory, a more sober assessment took hold. A Martin Turner cartoon showing a lame duck labelled Angela Merkel waddling over the corpse of Theresa May captured a more realistic assessment of the vote.

On the day after the confidence vote, May was in Brussels attending the December meeting of the European Council. True to form her efforts to soften the Irish backstop got nowhere—one EU official described it as a repeat of Stuttgart. But there was an interesting twist. Recognising that the British PM needed assistance, officials were instructed to draft a six paragraph statement containing conciliatory language while holding the line that the negotiations could not be re-opened. According to RTE correspondent Tony Connelly, some of the conciliatory language was criticised by Irish officials and by Leo Varadkar at the political level. Connelly states:

"Around 7.30pm on Thursday evening Theresa May finally made her pitch to the EU 27. By midnight, it was clear her pitch had fallen flat: EU leaders hardened

their position, offering straightforward clarifications, but dropping the paragraph promising "additional assurances" and the language that said the backstop was "not a desirable outcome". (*Dramatic week leaves us none the wiser*, RTE News website.)

It seems that the conciliatory paragraph from the statement was dropped as a result of Irish pressure. The manner in which May was treated by the EU was presented in the British media as a humiliation. All of this will undoubtedly feed the strong feelings of resentment that have been building up in Britain over the Irish role in the Brexit negotiations.

Following the European Council meeting the next development was a series of statements made through the British media on Sunday, December 16th. The first arose from an interview provided by British Foreign Secretary Jeremy Hunt in the *Sunday Telegraph* in which he expressed an ambition to become Prime Minister at a relatively early date in 2019 and stated that Britain has faced far bigger challenges in the past than a No Deal Brexit. Hunt is reported to be among a group of Cabinet Ministers pressing a reluctant Chancellor of the Exchequer, Philip Hammond, for funds to be released so that preparations for a Hard Brexit can proceed. Leader of the House Andrea Leadsom is reported to have requested that a No Deal update be provided in the Commons each week until exit day.

Another media story on the same day described an attack by Theresa May on Tony Blair for undermining the UK's negotiations and insulting the Office he once held by calling for a second referendum. In a commentary in the *Sunday Telegraph* Janet Daley argued that the secret negotiating strategy of Team Remain "is beginning to come out of the shadows" and that Blair is no longer bothered to maintain his usual false diffidence. Daley considers that Blair is actively collaborating with Brussels to undo Brexit.

The fifth development was an announcement from Theresa May on Monday December 17th that the debate about the Withdrawal Agreement will take place during the week beginning December 7th and the vote will take place on the following week. This caused an angry response from some Tory MPs and provoked Jeremy Corbyn to table a motion of no confidence in the Prime Minister, as opposed to the Government. The smaller Westminster parties then proposed an amendment to make confidence in the Government the issue.

Another talking point, as the Westminster Parliament winds down for Christmas, is the level of cooperation between the Government Chief Whip, Julian Smith, and his counterpart in the Labour Party. Brexiters are seeing this as an indication that May will try to enlist Labour support, either from rebels or from the Labour leadership, for her deal. However, it is difficult to see how a Labour rebellion, even one that had Corbyn's tacit backing, would be large enough to outweigh the effect of Brexiteer opposition.

On the basis of the December developments the likeliest outcome in January is that the May deal will fail to get the support of a majority of MPs in the Commons. Given that she has displayed tenacity in retaining her leadership, it is possible that May, at that point, will propose a second referendum so that that the fate of her deal may be decided by the electorate, but that is now highly improbable. There are too many complications surrounding the framing of a referendum. The more likely outcome is that she will resign at that point. In the event of a leadership contest the outcome of Brexit would then be decided by the choice of who becomes the next Conservative leader.

In the last Summary I suggested that Michael Gove's position of supporting the May deal in order to achieve a soft Brexit and then chipping away at it during the trade negotiations, looked like a messy strategy that just might win out in the end. That interpretation is no longer credible. Uncertainty still reigns but what now seems more likely is an orderly Hard Brexit without a formal agreement. The phalanx of Tory opponents of the Irish backstop is unlikely to collapse—the Brexiteers seem to be the most purposeful element at Westminster—the extent of support for the May deal from Labour MPs is unlikely to be large enough to make a difference and May no longer has the standing that would inspire wavering MPs to place their trust in her leadership.

As I argued in the November *Irish Political Review*, notwithstanding the economic disruption, and given that a new constitutional relationship is the essence of the question, the least bad outcome for Ireland, the EU and the UK is *No Deal*. A full Brexit rather than a half in/half out arrangement is likely to be less exasperating and less contentious for both parties. The achievement of an irrevocable separation between the two blocs would also provide the certainty that is now the overriding need on all sides.

There are of course other possibilities. Assuming that May resigns, a Remainer like Amber Rudd or a moderate like Philip Hammond might become the new Conservative Leader. The alleged conspiracy between Blairites, Tory Remainers and some EU officials—a grouping that may have the sympathies of Leo Varadkar—may be able to influence events so that a second referendum containing an option to Remain, is provided. But these possibilities and even the chance that the UK electorate would vote to Remain seem remote at this stage of the process.

An interesting event this month was a lecture delivered at a Belfast conference of the Nevin Economic Research Institute, an all-Ireland Trade Union think tank. Delivered by the Oxford-based Irish economic historian, Kevin O'Rourke, the lecture ranged over past trends relevant to Brexit. O'Rourke explained how British trade policy since Neville Chamberlain,

instigated the Imperial Preference system of protectionism in the early thirties has been antipathetic to the idea of a customs union, especially one based in Europe. A podcast of his talk is available on the Slugger O'Toole website. A recently published book by O'Rourke, *Une brève histoire du Brexit*, explains Brexit to a French audience and will be available in English translation early in 2019.

The results of a UK YouGov poll this month were trumpeted as evidence that the Remain option is now the most popular choice of the British electorate. However, the poll measured the numbers favouring three options: Hard Brexit, Soft Brexit and Remain. If the totals for the two Brexit options are combined, the result is a clear majority for Brexit. In a major political battle like Brexit such media trickery is unlikely to enhance the prospects of the Remain camp.

Dave Alvey

Border Poll polling:

December 'Lucidpoll' confirms *No-Deal 'hard' Brexit* sway towards a United Ireland.

Under the provisions of the Belfast / Good-Friday Agreement, at Schedule 1, Paragraph 2, if the Secretary of State thinks that a majority wish to have a united Ireland, s/he is required to call a border poll to confirm this.

A range of polls have shown a tightening of the potential majority within Northern Ireland to remain within the United Kingdom, with a surge towards support for a United Ireland (and re-entry into the EU). The *Deltapoll* online poll of 1,199 people from Northern Ireland was conducted between August 27th and August 30th and published on 3rd September 2018. One of the questions posed was this:

"Imagine now that the UK decided to leave the EU. Under these circumstances how would you vote in a referendum on the constitutional arrangements of the island of Ireland?"

More than half—52 per cent—said they would vote for a united Ireland, while 39 per cent said they would vote for Northern Ireland to remain part of the UK. These polling figures are unparalleled since partition in 1921.

The poll also found that more would

vote for a united Ireland in the event of a 'hard' Border, with 56 per cent saying they would vote for unity in a Border poll while 40 per cent responded they would vote to remain in the UK.

Catholic community opinion in particular, has hardened. A total of 94 per cent of those surveyed from a "*nationalist heritage*" said they would vote for unity in the event of Brexit. However, that nationalist figure dropped to 73 per cent if the UK did not leave the EU.

Among people who described themselves as neither from a nationalist nor a unionist heritage, support for a united Ireland dropped from 59 per cent to 23 per cent if the UK stayed in the EU.

The *Deltapoll* findings have largely been conformed by the most recent *Lucidpoll*, published on 6th December, based on 1334 full responses, the following question was asked:

Q Assuming a NI Border Referendum occurred in 2019, say shortly after the Brexit date (March)—What way do you think you would vote according to the following scenarios?..."

Three scenarios were posited, with results as set out in the table below.

VOTING INTENTIONS IN A NORTHERN IRELAND BORDER REFERENDUM

Scenario	NI remain in UK	Don't Know	NI to Leave UK, join United Ireland
Brexit based on UK Government's current withdrawal agreement	48% (39% '100% certain', 9%' probable vote')	4%	48% (30% '100% certain', 18%' probable vote')
Brexit based on a 'No deal'	42% (38% '100% certain', 4%' probable vote')	3%	55% (48% '100% certain', 7%' probable vote')
Brexit doesn't happen, UK remains in EU	60% (47% '100% certain', 13%' probable vote')	11%	29% (21% '100% certain', 8%' probable vote')

A more detailed look at these figures by political preference showed:

- * 11% of Unionists polled would vote for a United Ireland in a 'No Deal' scenario, as compared to 3% based on the UK Government (Theresa May) agreement or 0% where Brexit doesn't happen
- * 70% of Others polled would vote for a United Ireland in a 'No Deal' scenario, as compared to 54% based on the UK

Government (Theresa May) agreement or 2% where Brexit doesn't happen

- * 98% of Nationalists polled would vote for a United Ireland in a 'No Deal' scenario, as compared to 92% based on the UK Government (Theresa May) agreement or 64% where Brexit doesn't happen.

In short, Nationalist sentiment is strong and hardening, based on how extreme the Brexit settlement becomes.

A significant minority of 11% of Unionists sway towards a United Ireland in the 'hard—no-deal' Brexit. And a high percentage of 'Others' sway towards a United Ireland in any situation where Brexit occurs.

Developing story.

Mark Langhammer

December Lucid Poll Reference: https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/024943_b89b42d32364461298ba5fe7867d82e1.pdf

Lemass In The De Valera Era [from page 26](#)

citizen. This I now determined to do... I sent Mr Aiken my resignation... I told him that I was making the step irrevocable—he would not, I knew, have been likely to accept my resignation otherwise—by sending at the same time a statement, of a political and controversial character to the Press... The line of official British comment on my departure was that I had been an obstacle to conciliation and negotiation and that the way now lay open for a peaceful settlement. Three days later, [on December 5th](#), the second round of fighting between the UN and Katanga forces started... [On December 8th](#) the British Government announced 'conditional agreement' to supply 'a small number' of bombs for use by UN aircraft. [On December 10th](#), Sir Roy Welensky (Prime Minister of Britain's white minority-ruled Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland) attacked the decision about the bombs, and on the following day the British Government returned to what was for me a more familiar posture... that, it was not, after all, providing the bombs, pending 'clarification'..." (pp 329-30 and 342-4).

On that same day, [December 11th](#), Elizabeth Bowen wrote to Ritchie from England:

"My darling... How is that fiendish United Nations? Is the Katanga issue as tortuous as it sounds at this distance? It's making me quite frenzied. I'm a Conservative backbencher for the duration (of this). We should never have given these bombs. It's awful to

feel so liée (linked—MOR) with Lord Beaverbrook and Sir Roy W, but I do... One meets more and more people in streets and shops saying, 'We do hope Katanga wins!' (not that that unfortunate country possibly can, I suppose)."

As Glendinning footnoted this letter:

"After Belgium granted independence to the Congo in 1960, the province of Katanga—the copper belt—seceded... the UN sending in soldiers to restore order. There was controversy whether arms should or should not be shipped... The Beaverbrook press in Britain was against, as was Sir Roy Welensky... who was hostile to the UN. CR was heavily involved in UN discussions about the Congo crisis" (pp 374-5).

And, of course, Charles Ritchie had indeed been heavily involved in the moves against the Cruiser. In *'Memoir—My Life and Themes'* (1999) O'Brien identified who *'Pump'* was—Freddie Boland, formerly Secretary General of Ireland's Department of External Affairs, who in October 1960, as President of the UN General Assembly, had such tempestuous clashes with USSR Premier Khrushchev. O'Brien now gave a more transparent account:

"Immediately after I arrived in New York... my pleasure at being about to get a hearing at the highest level began to collapse. FH Boland, still head of the Irish mission to the UN, invited General McKeown to dinner... 'I hope you won't mind my not asking Conor', said Boland to McKeown. 'He's not quite the right

colour'... The wind was blowing from a point somewhere between Mr Charles Ritchie and Sir Patrick Dean... I had not been at all prepared for such a reception, or rather lack of reception. I did not realise that my colleagues in New York, Boland and (Éamon) Kennedy, had been working quite closely with the British to blacken my character and have me removed. This is documented in Alan James's 'Britain and the Congo Crisis 1960-1963' (London and New York, 1966). It seems that Boland had recommended to Aiken that I be withdrawn from UN service and recalled to Ireland, but that Aiken had refused to recall me. Then Boland suggested to the British that they should go over his own Foreign Minister's head and get the Taoiseach, Seán Lemass, to recall me. It was recorded that the head of Ireland's Permanent Delegation had suggested to the British 'in confidence' that the 'best way to get rid of O'Brien (whom incidentally they all hate) is somehow to get beyond the Irish Foreign Minister and go to the Prime Minister'—quoting (British) FO dispatch of November 3, 1961" (p 244).

Bowen's lover Ritchie had been involved in the plot to undermine de Valera's anti-Imperialist foreign policy legacy, as embodied in Aiken, by seeking to go over his head with a direct approach to Lemass. But—enough already—of literary or political biographies and histories! I should now examine how economists have assessed Lemass's role in de Valera's Ireland.

Manus O'Riordan

(To be continued)

1919 Government *Bulletin*

"The *Irish Bulletin* is a detailed account, issued daily between 1919 and 1921, of the means by which the British Government attempted to rule Ireland during the three years after it had comprehensively lost the General Election in Ireland...

It was published by the elected Irish Government of 1919-21 to inform British public opinion about how the unelected British Government of Ireland was trying to govern... against the will of the Irish democracy...

It ceased to be published... in December 1921 and has never been reprinted until now... there was no need for it during the two generations following the War of Independence.

People knew what had happened. They knew in detail what had happened in their own locality, and they knew much the same thing had happened in other places...

The situation began to change drastically a little over a generation ago... partly due to the fact that common knowledge grows weaker with the passing of generations. It is chiefly due to a systematic effort on the part of the Universities to throw doubt on the generally-accepted story of the War of independence, and the increasing influence on public opinion of what was taught in the Universities, due to the great expansion of second and third-level education..." (From the Introductions, by *Brendan Clifford* to Volumes I and III of collected Reprints of *The Irish Bulletin* covering July 1919- January 1921. Volume 1 of the Reprints covering July 1919 to June 1920 was issued in 2012 and Volume III, covering September 1920 to January 1st 1921 in 2015. Volume IV covering January 1921 to March 31st 1921 will follow shortly.)

The *Irish Bulletin* was spectacularly successful and British Cabinet Ministers were challenged in the House of Commons on the conduct of their agents in Ireland by Members who read the *Bulletin*. Notable among them Captain William Wedgwood Benn and Lieutenant-Commander Kenworthy, both War Heroes. Benn was to become an Air Commodore and Secretary of State for Air. Both he and Kenworthy entered Parliament as Liberals and later switched to Labour. Benn was made Viscount Stansgate and Kenworthy was made Baron Strabolgi.

Benn served with Erskine Childers in the Great War.

Ignorance about the *Irish Bulletin* is almost total in Ireland today. The

biography of Hanna Sheehy-Skeffington by Margaret Ward describes it as a Broadsheet paper.

One Michael Foley in a review of "*Periodical and Journalism in Twentieth Ireland*" (*Irish Times* 14 February 2015) gave it short shrift as it "*was not available from corner newsagents*".

In fact the paper was mimeographed using a typewriter cutting a stencil which transferred its message on foolscap sized paper 13 and a half by 8 and a half inch paper. They were posted, a few at a time, from scattered postboxes to avoid detection to trusted politicians and journalists, in Britain and further afield. Those producing the paper risked death at the hands of the Crown Forces and the idea of it being available in newsagents is ridiculous.

Edward Mac Lysaght (1887-1986) recalled in his Memoir "*Changing Times -Ireland since 1898*", published in 1978, how he had kept every copy since its inception, and his mother had borrowed a couple of copies to read on a train from Killaloe to Limerick in February 1921. The train was boarded by Crown Forces, she was searched and the papers found, court-martialled and sentenced to a fine of £20 or a month's imprisonment. She chose imprisonment, but her husband, who arrived home that day from a business trip to Australia paid the fine for her. I suppose today's lobotomised academics and journalistic hacks should be told that there were no air services between Australia and Limerick in 1921 and that Australia is a long way away.

Notable in the production of *The Irish Bulletin* were Lawrence Ginnell, Erskine Childers, Robert Brennan, Frank Gallagher, and Desmond Fitzgerald, and Kathleen McKenna, all of them extremely able people.

Brennan who became Irish Minister in Washington was associated in the launch of the *Irish Press* in 1931, of which Gallagher became long-time Editor. Childers won fame as author of *The Riddle of the Sands*.

Desmond FitzGerald, who held a number of Ministerial Posts between 1919 and 1932 was a published poet who wrote a short memoir in the 1940s. His son

Garrett became Taoiseach.

Brennan's memoir "Allegiance" is a delight to read. Gallagher wrote "*The Four Glorious Years*" under the Pen-name David Hogan, a classic.

The British captured the presses of *The Irish Bulletin* once and immediately ran off a fake copy which they sent to its mailing list.

But the *Bulletin* had duplicate equipment and a duplicate list and sent out the genuine paper without a pause.

The genius who prepared the fake paper had previously produced a film on Killiney's Vico Road, by Dublin's seaside, purporting to show the scene of the Kilmichael Ambush inland in County Cork. He was part of the British Propaganda Gang in Dublin Castle. His name was Captain Hugh Bertie Campbell Pollard.

He was a small arms fanatic and a pathologically racist anti-Irish bigot. He was, incidentally a Catholic.

In the 1930s he flew General Franco from the Canary Islands, where he had been stationed by the Spanish Government to keep him out of mischief, in a private plane to Morocco, whence the mutinous traitor launched his attack on democracy. Pollard was a member of Britain's MI6 and was their man in Britain's Madrid Embassy when the city was abandoned to the Tyrant in 1940.

I expect any day now to read in *The Times* and its imitators that Pollard, like the Nazi' collaborator Frank Foley of MI6, is to have a statue erected in his memory as a humanitarian who saved Jews from Fascists.

The reprints are unpaid labours of love by the Aubane Historical Society including Jack Lane, Philip O'Connor, Geraldine Conway, Jenny O'Connor and Angela Clifford.

The Reprints, like the Originals, never get a mention from paid historians or other paid commentators but they are essential for an understanding of Ireland these past 100 years.

So, come to think of it, is the Silence of the Hacks.

Donal Kennedy

**Look Up the
Athol Books
archive on the Internet
www.atholbooks.org**

LEST WE FORGET (1)

In this decade of commemorations we are encouraged to remember and not to forget. Very good advice and we will do our bit during the hundredth anniversary of "*the four glorious years*" to recall the facts of those years. We will do so with the help of the "*Irish Bulletin*", the daily paper of the Dáil.

There could not be a more appropriate source as the whole object of the War that Britain engaged in was to destroy that Dáil. This is history from the horse's mouth.

People who set up the *Bulletin* published lists of atrocities before it was officially launched in November 1919 and did so afterwards as well. Below is a list for 1919 and early 1920. It is not all comprehensive as it relied to a large extent on newspaper reports which were all censored and dozens suppressed and before the *Bulletin* had established a network for receiving news of atrocities independent of the press. Later lists will show much more comprehensive listings for the period covered here.

However, it gives the flavour of the ongoing terror campaign in period it covers and confirms the "*existing state of war*" as described in the Dáil's *Declaration to the Free Nations of the World* on 21 January 1919.

OUTSTANDING INCIDENTS OF ENGLISH AGGRESSION IN IRELAND

From January 1st 1919 to April 30th 1920

(In the majority of cases the dates given are those upon which the incidents were reported in the daily Press)

<u>1919</u>		
Jan	7th	People of Dunmanway, Co. Cork, attacked by <u>soldiers</u> and <u>police</u> with rifles, fixed bayonets and batons.
"	27th	<u>Police</u> with fixed bayonets attacked a crowd at Baltinglass which had assembled to welcome home a political prisoner.
Feb.	11th	Police forced doors of King's County Council Offices and attacked Council staff with bayonets.
"	12th	Patrick Gavin shot dead by <u>soldiers</u> at Curragh camp.
"	19th	<u>Soldiers</u> attacked card party at the Temperance Hall at Annacarty, County Tipperary, and wrecked the Hall.
"	20th	Timothy Connors, Greenane, Co. Tipperary, aged 11 years, kidnapped by <u>police</u> and secretly taken to unknown destination, his parents being refused all information.
March	7th	Mr. Pierce McCann, Member of Parliament for East Tipperary, died on removal from Gloucester Prison where he had lain for ten months without charge or trial.
"	10th	Matthew Hogan, Tipperary, aged fifteen years, kidnapped by <u>police</u> and secretly removed to an unknown destination.
"	24th	Mr. Charles Church, Monkstown, Co. Dublin, shot by <u>soldiers</u> .
April	6th	Robert Byrne shot dead by <u>police</u> in Limerick Hospital.
"	12th	The following districts proclaimed military areas by the English Military Government:- Cork, City and County, Limerick City and County, Westport Urban District and the Counties of Roscommon, Tipperary and Kerry.
"	14th	Several people in Bantry, Co. Cork, shot by <u>soldiers</u> .
"	"	John Sheehan, Charlmont Street, Dublin, killed by military motor lorry driven at 40 miles an hour in the streets. The jury found death was due to negligence of <u>soldiers</u> .
"	16th	City of Limerick invested by armed <u>soldiers</u> who allowed no one to leave or enter without military permit.
"	28th	Castletownbere, Co. Cork, proclaimed. All fairs, markets, meetings, and assemblies suppressed.
"	"	Michael Walsh, fisherman, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford, shot dead by <u>police</u> .
"	29th	Matthew Brady and William McNally attacked and shot by <u>police</u> at Longford.
May	5th	Many people injured in bayonet charge by <u>soldiers</u> at Athlone.
"	9th	<u>Soldiers</u> and <u>police</u> raided and occupied the Mansion House, Dublin official residence of the Lord Mayor,
		and fired on the people in the streets adjoining.
"	25th	Bayonet charges by <u>police</u> and <u>soldiers</u> in Thurles.
June	5th	Matthew Murphy, Dundalk, shot dead by <u>soldiers</u> .
"	16th	Michael Rice, aged 60 and his son, Martin, of Ardatacle, Queen's County, attacked in their own house and shot by <u>police</u> .
"	29th	Patrick Studdart, Kilkee, shot dead by <u>police</u> .
Aug.	14th	Francis Murphy, Glann, Co. Clare, (aged 15) shot dead in his own house <u>by soldiers</u> .
Sept.	2nd	<u>Police</u> and <u>soldiers</u> with fixed bayonets charged the residents of Bundoran, Ardara and Brackey.
"	5th	Four young men shot by <u>soldiers</u> at Inchicore, Dublin City.
"	9th	The town of Fermoy, Co. Cork, sacked by <u>soldiers</u> .
"	"	Police fire on two ladies and two men in a motor car at Moneygall, King's County, wounding one of the men.
"	11th	Coercion Act of 1887 revived by Proclamation. This Act was described by Gladstone as a "cup of poison", by Morley as "the essence of tyranny" and by Lord Chief Justice Russell as a "Bill to promote".
"	"	Portion of the town of Fermoy, Co. Cork, again attacked by <u>soldiers</u> .
"	13th	Dail Eireann, the Irish republican Parliament, proclaimed. English armed forces raided Sinn Fein Headquarters in Dublin and the Sinn Fein Clubs in every city and town in Ireland and the residences of all the Republican Members of Parliament and of all prominent Republicans throughout Ireland - over 1,000 houses being raided in all.
"	20th	Over 20 city and provincial newspapers suppressed by <u>military</u> .
"	29th	Baton and bayonet charges by <u>soldiers</u> and <u>police</u> at Newmarket, Co. Cork.
Oct.	6th	A boy named Coll shot by <u>police</u> at Banbridge, Co. Down.
"	22nd	A young man named O'Donnell shot by <u>soldiers</u> at Kilworth, Co. Cork.
"	"	Town of Kinsale sacked by <u>soldiers</u> .
"	23rd	Police fire on crowd at Macroom.
"	28th	Michael Hanley, aged 14, shot by <u>soldiers</u> at Belmullet, Co. Mayo.
Nov.	1st	Police fire on civilians at Ballyfermot, Co. Dublin.
"	8th	Bayonet charge by <u>police</u> at Thurles, Co. Tipperary.
"	10th	Portion of the town of Athlone, sacked by <u>soldiers</u> .
"	11th	Portion of Cork City sacked and looted by <u>soldiers</u> . People who tried to stop the looting were attacked by the <u>soldiers</u> and 40 civilians were wounded.
"	13th	People in Tipperary savagely beaten by <u>police</u> with the butt ends of their rifles.
"	17th	People at Strabane, Co. Donegal, similarly treated by <u>police</u> .
"	17th	<u>Police</u> charged with fixed bayonets people attending

- a fair at Kilcommon, Co. Tipperary.
- " 18th Police fired on crowds at Ballymote, and Gurteen, Co. Sligo.
 - " 19th Fifty people wounded in bayonet charges by police at Nenagh, Co. Tipperary.
 - " 24th Baton and bayonet charges by police in Limerick City. Many civilians wounded.
 - " " Police fire on two travellers leaving Thurles Railway Station wounding one of them.
 - " " Bayonet charges by police in Derry City.
 - " 25th Over 200 homes in Tipperary raided by soldiers and police in full war equipment accompanied by aeroplanes and armoured cars.
 - " " Portion of the town of Fermoy sacked by soldiers.
 - " 26th 20 civilians wounded in bayonet charges by police at Fenor, Co. Waterford.
 - " 27th National organisations all over Ireland suppressed by proclamation.
- Dec. 3rd Bayonet charges by military and police at Fermoy, Co. Cork.
- " 5th Soldiers wrecked Fermoy railway Station.
 - " 12th Annual Christmas Fair of Irish goods In Mansion House, Dublin, suppressed by soldiers and police who occupied the Lord Mayor's residence.
 - " 15th Violet Pearson killed by military motor lorry on South Circular Road, Dublin. The jury found negligence on the part of the military.
 - " 16th "The Freeman's Journal", the oldest daily newspaper in Ireland suppressed and its machinery dismantled by soldiers and police.
 - " 19th Lawrence Kennedy, Lucan, Co. Dublin, murders by soldiers in Phoenix Park, Dublin.

1920

- Jany. 6th Dr. Keane, Enistymon, Co. Clare, shot by police while on his medical rounds.
- " 19th Civilians at Enniscorthy, Co. Wexford shot by police.
 - " 20th Ml. Darcy, Cooraclare, Co. Clare, drowned while police held off would be rescuers.
 - " 22nd Whole town of Thurles wrecked by soldiers
- Feb. 4th Man and woman shot dead in Limerick by soldiers and police.
- " 14th James O'Brien shot dead at Rathdrum by police.
 - " 16th John Heaphy shot by police at Ballylongford, Co. Kerry.
 - " 17th Pedestrians held up at the point of a bayonet by soldiers at Thurles and the contents of their pockets stolen.
 - " 20th Mrs. M. J. Kelly, shopkeeper, 10 Wellington Place, Dublin, savagely assaulted and robbed by soldiers.
 - " 23rd Mr. J.J. Kinsella, shot at on the South Circular Road, Dublin, by a party of soldiers.
 - " 25th Mr. Philip Maher, Turtulla, Co. Tipperary, attacked by police on the public highway and beaten with the butt-ends of their rifles.
 - " " Railway employee, named Kennedy shot at by a patrol of soldiers near Thurles. Kennedy was neither halted nor challenged.
 - " " Three men named Cullanan, Burke and MacCarthy were shot at by police from while on their way to their homes at Leugh, Co. Tipperary.
 - " 27th Raiding parties of troops forced an entry into the late Headquarters at 3, 6 and 76 Harcourt Street, Dublin of the Sinn Fein Bank, the Sinn Fein organisation and the Republican Government of Ireland respectively, and systematically wrecked every room In these houses breaking even pan-handles, electric light bulbs and ink bottles. In the Sinn Fein Bank the safe was forced an £1040 stolen.

- March 1st The town of Thurles was partially wrecked by soldiers accompanied by their officers.
 - " 2nd The people of Thurles attacked by police who beat them with the butt-ends of their rifles.
 - " 3rd Spectators of daylight military raids in Dublin were attacked by the troops who dispersed them with the butt-ends of their rifles.
 - " 5th Three young men passing the police barracks at Holycross, County Tipperary, were abused and stoned by the police.
 - " 6th Property and £5 in notes were stolen from Mrs. Lynch, Richmond Road, Dublin by soldiers who raided her house.
 - " 5th The National Monuments at Thurles, Co. Tipperary were disfigured by police and soldiers.
 - " 7th Sinn Fein Clubs and the residences of prominent Republicans broke into and completely wrecked by police at Cork. Volleys fired in the public street after midnight at shop windows and into private houses.
 - " 13th Miss. Cotter, Abbey Street, Cork, shot at by police while hastening at night to call a priest to her dying aunt.
 - " 15th Spectators of military raids on the residences of Republicans at Monaghan were attacked by troops.
 - " 19th Attempted murder of Alderman Professor Stockley, Sinn Fein leader, Cork.
 - " " Police fire at crowds who endeavoured to enter Kilkenny Theatre to attend a performance of the banned play "The Parnellite".
 - " 20th Lord Mayor of Cork murdered by police who broke into his house at the dead of the night.
 - " 21st Engine driver named Hewed when passing the Thurles Police Barracks was attacked by the police who rushed from the Barracks and knocking him down robbed him.
 - " 22nd Ellen Hendrick aged 18 years and Michael Cullen aged 23 years were shot dead by soldiers who assaulted pedestrians and smashed window shops in a riotous parade through the streets of Dublin.
 - " 29th Military raiding the house of Mr. S. Byrne, T.C. looted jewellery.
 - " " Mr. J. MacCarthy brother of Mr. M. MacCarthy, Sinn Fein Leader, Thurles, was murdered by men in the uniform of police who broke into his house at the dead of the night.
 - " 30th Mr. T. Dwyer, prominent Republican was murdered by police at The Ragg, Co. Tipperary, who broke into his house at the dead of the night.
- April 3rd Military raiding the house of Mr. T. Longmore, Kingstown, Co. Dublin, looted jewellery, £3 in notes and a bottle of whiskey.
- " 6th Military raiding the Republican Temperance Bar, Dublin, fired into houses in O'Connell St. and attacked spectators with the bayonet.
 - " 9th Military raiding the residence of Mr. Frank Foy, 33 Carysfort Avenue, Blackrock, Co. Dublin looted jewellery, £4.10.0 in cash, eleven bottles of whiskey and several shillings in coppers.
 - " 10th Military raiding the residence of Mr. O'Flanagan, 14a Welford Street, Dublin looted 4 doz. eggs, a razor, a 5 naggin bottle of whiskey and several shillings in coppers.
 - " 14th Soldiers being brought to reinforce the guards at Mountjoy Jail in which Sinn Fein prisoners were dying, slashed with their bayonets at the crowd outside the jail as they drove through them.
 - " " Police and military shot dead three civilians at Miltown Malbay, Co. Clare, who were celebrating the release of Mountjoy prisoners by singing round a lighted tar-barrel. Nine others were seriously wounded.

Clair Wills and the Story She Tells (Part 7)

"And we who have been brought up to think of 'Gallant Belgium'

As so much blague

Are now preparing again to essay good through evil

For the sake of Prague;

And we must, we suppose, become uncritical, vindictive,

And must, in order to beat

The enemy, model ourselves on the enemy,

A howling radio for our paraclete..."

"And the individual, powerless, has to exert the

Powers of will and choice

And choose between enormous evils, either

Of which depends on somebody else's voice."

These excerpts from two of Louis MacNeice's poems portray early on in the Second World War how the poet really viewed the coming cataclysm. As Wills accepted:

"Like the First World War, and the war in Spain, the coming war was bound to see all principle squandered in 'panic and self-deception."

But, for all of MacNeice's doubts, he certainly swung into action once he put on the BBC's well-paid hat of the propagandist. Wills documented how the British Broadcasting Corporation worked:

"The BBC played a crucial role in mobilising the civilian war effort in Britain, in maintaining national unity and morale in a war in which, increasingly, the whole population were viewed as combatants but few were fighting. Home Front propaganda was complex, and became more subtle as the war progressed. The need to inform the population about a vast number of new regulations, and to exhort them to greater efforts in industry and agriculture, was combined with more covert attempts to influence opinion."

But the BBC, under the severe censorship of the Government and especially of the Ministry of Information, alienated enough of the people who were sick of patriotic broadcasts of the type of *'There'll Always Be An England'* and censorious statements from politicians about *digging for victory* and careless talk with the tagline *'Loose lips, sink ships'* and they went to other outlets like Germany where Lord Haw Haw (William Joyce—later hung for treason by the British) proved to be extremely popular with the masses. No less a man than Sean O'Casey, according to Wills, who was not a fan of Irish literary censorship argued that:

It Is Time

"the political censorship was not only mild but far less menacing than the control exercised by the British Ministry of Information: 'The Irish censorship is largely a farce: it is comic; but here [London—JH] as I can prove, the censorship is silent, sinister and severe'..."

O'Casey was not to know that George Orwell had well and truly marked the former's card by his List, which saw him cast as a communist-fellow-traveller!

As late as 1944 when Frank Aiken, Minister for Defence, again went to bat for Irish neutrality against Sir John Keane and *The Irish Times*, it is interesting to see him use the term "war" again and again ending with this barb:

"... We have allowed all the news to go through but we stopped the propaganda and we have enabled the Irish people to keep their balance during *this disastrous war*." (Underlinings and italics are mine—JH)

The aristocratic unionist landowner Keane could censure the Irish by patronisingly warning us that "*there was a very thin dividing line between our national interests and our national honour*". But that big-house *hauteur* has had its day and however much Sir John might faff about in the Senate, the Irish didn't need any lessons about honour from his likes especially when his blood wasn't being shed for his Britain. What is really clear from Keane's statement is how his position is exposed—he is the Anglo-Irish *colonist* rather than an Irishman, who is still out for his own interests however much he dresses them up! (He had at least two factories in Britain and many other financial interests.)

But to go back to MacNeice lecturing us—Irish—on our *duty*—there is definitely an "*unedifying whiff of hypocrisy*" according

to Wills, or what Elizabeth Bowen would call "*sheer funk*", because it took the former a lot of time before he committed to the cause and then only did so because he got a very good job at the BBC as a propagandist. The full text of his poem *'Neutrality'* has been published in at least two former issues of the *Irish Political Review* but it is worth recalling the last stanza:

"But then look eastwards from your heart,
there bulks

A continent, close, dark, as archetypal sin,
While to the west off your own shores, the
mackerel

Are fat—on the flesh of your kin."

Here MacNeice's textual allusions to cannibalism on behalf of the Irish are really grotesque but then that was all grist to the mill of Britain's war-aims—one of which was to crush our neutrality. And, if that failed, well then it must be portrayed as negatively as possible. Nicholas Monsarrat's *The Cruel Sea* also attacked Irish neutrality in what Robert Fish acknowledged was a "*savage and damaging... manner after the war*" but the truth, as the latter was to acknowledge, was a quite different thing altogether:

"There was another factor which historians tended to ignore. For the first four years of the war, German intelligence had been able to break British naval codes and pin-point for Raeder's U-boat fleets the exact location of Allied convoys in the Atlantic. The German *Beobachter Dienst*—the Observation Service—penetrated the British and Allied Merchant Ship Code until 1943, an appalling lapse in naval security and one that must take a large share of the blame for the loss of British ships in the Atlantic."

(Robert Fisk's *In Time of War: Ireland, Ulster and the Price of Neutrality 1939-'45*, André Deutsch Ltd., London, 1983.)

But, even after having made such a truly astonishing admission, Fisk still avowed:

"The Irish Government could not escape the accusation—indeed should not have escaped the accusation—that dead British seamen were being washed up on Eire's shores because of her policy of neutrality."

That is the thing with Fisk, there remains always the kick beneath the fact and always his constant conditional (*an modh coiníolach*—as we say in Gaelic) phraseology. For instance, Lieutenant Colonel, Sir William Spender (the Ulsterman who commanded the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) and for such sterling service to Britain ended up as Head of NI civil service) wrote to Lord Hankey urging more backbone to be put into their negotiations with de Valera's Government saying:

"...The Englishman usually begins a

speech on Irish matters with an admission that the Irish were ill-treated in the past and that he wishes to make up for this whereas in actual fact the Irishman has been the spoilt child of the British Government for the last 60 years. This policy of appeasement had had, I believe, the reversed effect to that which it intended to achieve... Concessions which are wrung from weakness lead to contempt."

Fisk admits that what "*Spender was advocating*" was—

"a programme of economic sanctions, and within days Churchill was demanding from his ministers—and receiving—advice on the financial and trade restrictions that could be placed upon Eire."

And this was precisely what happened. But again, according to Fisk:

"At no point was it to be officially admitted that any of these restrictions were to be punitive".

The "squeeze" that Churchill had wanted for so long to put on Ireland was now effectively in play. And Britain also called on Greek and Norwegian ship-owners to deny the Irish any requests for ships. The financial ploy was to freeze "*Eire's balance of sterling*". (This was our State's Foreign Reserves which consisted of Deposit Accounts which the Irish Banks, including the Central Bank of Ireland, held in the Bank of England. These Deposit Accounts arose from the enormous food and wool clothing exports which the Irish had supplied to England especially during World War 1 and subsequent trade—This "**freezing of our assets**" was an Illegal Act.—JH.)

Maffey, the British Representative to Ireland, who had been summoned to an interview with the Taoiseach Eamon de Valera over these latest actions, reported the conversation to London:

"Mr. de Valera did not say a great deal about economic measures... He was particularly bitter on one point, namely, the opportunity which had now occurred to acquire arms in America. The (British) Purchasing Committee had, indeed, suggested that the transaction should be put through without delay. But the (British) Treasury had refused to transfer funds for the transaction. Actions such as this would provoke violent anti-English feelings".

But Dev kept these revelations about supplies and trade secret, even from the Front Bench of Fine Gael, saying:

"...the British up to the present had been dealing with us with extraordinary generosity..."

Fisk sees that in this light:

"The British were playing cat and mouse with the Irish, and de Valera did not quite know how to react."

In the same communiqué to London, Maffey continued contemptuously:

"...It is sheer hypocrisy on his [the Taoiseach's] part to bring up the Prime Minister's speech, which he deliberately made use of here to inflame passions. The fact is that Mr. de Valera is more uneasy today than he has ever been at any stage of his non-stop political career. Ireland being Ireland, in the mass ignorant and responsive to old hatreds, he is still the chosen tribal leader for their feuds. But Mr. de Valera hitherto has used this Irish fanaticism on a bigger stage than his platform of today. Through it he has achieved prestige in America, in England and Geneva. He could stir world-wide interest in the soul of Ireland. But it is the soul of England which stirs the world today, and Eire is a bog with a petty leader raking over old mud heaps. He had in the past enjoyed world prestige, he is vain and ambitious, but the track he has followed without looking either to right or to left is now leading into insignificance."

Maffey's fury and barely concealed livid hatred for de Valera was enlivened by certain facts that the English had uncovered. Fisk reported that "*in a special poll conducted among first and second generation Irish Americans, 52% had opposed any abandonment of Irish neutrality*".

"These Irish Americans" raged Maffey "are the pillars of Mr. de Valera's temple. They created him, preserved him and endowed him... In his predicament he follows his old and only technique. He blames England."

But Lord Cranborne "*was inclined to support de Valera's request for arms, 'especially as he seems to regard our acceptance or refusal of his request as, in some sense, the touchstone of our goodwill'...*". There is an interesting footnote in Fisk's book to the effect that even Maffey knew that kicking Dev would prove counter-productive, much as he and Churchill might want to do it:

"Maffey did not approve of strong economic sanctions against Eire, apparently fearing that de Valera would tell his people that the British were trying to squeeze them into the war. Spender who was in London when Maffey was there realised that he had been brought over from Dublin so that he [could trot] out the usual 'bug-bear'—the Anglo-American vote" (Spender obviously meant the Irish-American vote —JH).

But it is Prime Minister Churchill's reply to Cranborne that is very telling:

"No attempt should be made to conceal from Mr. de Valera the depth and

intensity of feeling against the policy of Irish neutrality. We have tolerated and acquiesced in it, but juridically we have never recognised that Southern Ireland is an independent Sovereign State, and she herself had repudiated Dominion Status. Her international status is undefined and anomalous... Let me have a further report on economic pressure."

Fisk sees in this—

"the old Churchillian malevolence, the hatred of de Valera's neutrality and that familiar suspicion that Eire—despite her irritating political freedom—might not have the constitutional right to exist. He still sought to destroy Irish neutrality—though by economic means rather than military coercion."

But the Taoiseach's response to British economic sanctions was to warn the Dáil in mid-January 1940 that—

"food shortages were likely and an immediate order was made extending compulsory tillage to bring one fifth of Eire's arable land under the plough. If Britain had turned to economic warfare, Eire would strive for self-sufficiency."

Notice how Fisk uses the conditional "*if*", when he knew well by the facts that he had laid out that the Irish were now unofficially under economic warfare.

Clair Wills in her book *That Neutral Island* very effectively used Irish writers' voices to try and undermine our policy of neutrality. But she is fair enough when it comes to seeing through most of—what in effect were—their charades. In previous articles for the *Irish Political Review*, I wrote about Louis MacNeice who only fetched up in London when Dublin in particular didn't pan out for him, and nor did America. But his putting in for a lectureship in Trinity College, Dublin, on the say so of his chum Walter Starkie, led me to look at Starkie. And, when I found out about the latter's very definite fascism, I wrote it up in the December 2018 issue of the *Irish Political Review*. At that time I still had not been able to access his biography but our Cork Grand Parade Public Library eventually got it for me through inter-library loan from Howth Library, Dublin.

I can understand now why one reviewer I quoted was flipping through the pages—because this is not a book that is easy to read. Jacqueline Hurlley, Starkie's biographer, is—according to the back-cover of the book a "*lecturer in the Department of English and German at the University of Barcelona*". It is written as an academic tome and maybe, after over twenty years of research, that is what Hurlley intended. But, if one perseveres, there are definitely

some very good nuggets to be had. For example, Starkie first interviewed Mussolini on Monday, 11th July 1927:

"that is, as it turned out, the day following the assassination of the Free State Minister Kevin O'Higgins... As Starkie's interview with Mussolini began, the Italian Premier had communicated his awareness of O'Higgins's death and expressed admiration for him. Given his sojourn in Italy, Starkie did not attend the funeral of the Free State Minister but his name appeared among those who expressed their condolences to the widow." (Hurtley's footnote refers us to 'Sympathy with Mrs Higgins', Irish Times, 14th July 1927, p.5. Starkie appears thus: 'Walter Starkie, Masone', that is, he is recorded as being resident in the Ligurian village where his mother-in-law had died in 1924, not in Rome'.)

Coming across from Hurtley's biography is an intention to make Starkie appear as someone who in his travels was almost accidentally in these places like Italy and Spain and who consequently took on the colour of these places which just happened to be fascistic. But that does not stack up at all. Even Hurtley notes that Starkie broadcast material favourable to Mussolini and to the latter's attack on Abyssinia; that he then wrote up articles in *The Irish Independent* extolling the virtues of the Italian occupation and "praising the great colonising work which Italy is doing in this far-off land in East Africa". So Hurtley is not surprised—

"to find Starkie already expressing support for the rebel general's coup in 1936 and coming to pronounce favourably in the press as Franco and his forces gained ground".

Hurtley's reticence is completely overturned by a book which a colleague from this magazine gave me to read, *Papa Spy, A true story of love, wartime espionage in Madrid, and the treachery of the Cambridge spies* by Jimmy Burns (Bloomsbury, London, 2009). This is a biography by a son of Tom Burns, covertly an agent and spy for Britain. He was a Catholic publisher when the Ministry of Information came calling and he was soon posted to Madrid as press attaché to the British Embassy in 1940. This is what Burns has to say about Starkie:

"Starkie was a British agent, his eccentric public persona belying a background of discreet service to His Majesty's Government as an Anglo-Irishman who strongly identified with the Allied cause and equally strongly opposed his native Ireland's neutrality in the war on the grounds that he considered it part of the British Empire... Starkie was a Catholic professor at Trinity College, Dublin who had spent his holidays before the war travelling round Europe writing about

living with gypsies and earning his keep with his fiddle... His camouflage as an eccentric expatriate was completed by his marriage to an Italian amateur opera singer Italia Augusta Porchiatti..."

Years later in his memoirs Burns credited Lord Lloyd, the then head of the British Council, with Starkie's "imaginative appointment" to Spain. Burns continued—

"For how could official Spain ever say that Starkie was *persona non grata*? He knew more about the country, its literature and folklore than most Spaniards... he could hardly be suspected of being a British agent".

There was one thing though that the British accepted and that was that Starkie, while a prodigious drinker, held it well—but that he had to be watched nevertheless in case he accidentally spilled secrets. The British Ambassador to Spain, Sir Samuel Hoare, "barely tolerated the 'Irishman' Starkie despite his declared anti-(Irish) republicanism". But Starkie and Burns got on famously as the son Jimmy was to write:

"Both men mixed in similar social circles of bullfighters and artists, and looked to each other's foreignness to rescue them on occasions from the stuffy insularity of some of their diplomatic colleagues."

Tom Burns could never have got the English actor Leslie Howard to travel to the Iberian Peninsula without the cover of the British Council and Starkie. In 1943, Howard, best remembered for his role as Ashley Wilkes in *Gone with the Wind*, was put under huge political pressure to go to Spain and Portugal for the Spanish release of the film which became a huge favourite of Franco personally and that of the people.

The British and Americans wanted to "consolidate their influence on the Franco regime", especially—

"in the months after the North African campaign had got under way in 1942... The plan was to use Howard as a propaganda tool, and to have him ingratiate himself with Franco by establishing ties with the Spanish film industry which the dictator was keen on developing as popular entertainment."

The US Ambassador to Spain, Carlton Hayes, sponsored a gala showing of *Gone with the Wind* in his Embassy and it was a huge success so now Leslie Howard "was subjected to further pressure from senior British government figures, Brendan Bracken, the MoI chief and Anthony Eden, the foreign secretary". Eventually Howard caved in and with his agent Arthur Chenhalls set out for Lisbon and from there travelled to Madrid on the overnight

Lusitania Express where he was to pose as Burns's assistant. Howard gave lectures on Shakespeare and on the British and American film industries and, despite Starkie's packed itinerary of speaking engagements, and embassy cocktail parties, found time to engage in many seductions.

Of course we now know it ended in terrible tragedy for Leslie Howard because the Germans were watching him all the time and Burns seems to explicitly suggest that one of the actor's many seductions was with a German agent who was posing as a beautician working in the Ritz where he was staying. Certainly Burns accepts that Gloria Von Furstenberg, "the glamorous Mexican wife of a German count" sexually entertained the actor and got from him his "future travel plans". On 1st June 1943, the Ibis DC3 in which Howard was flying was shot down on the Lisbon-UK route, "the first commercial airliner to be shot down by the Luftwaffe". But Howard was just not a propagandist but an enemy agent because according to Jimmy Burns's account:

"British intelligence attempted to cover up the real reason for his death—the suspicion that he was not just a propagandist but also a spy. Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the whole Leslie Howard affair is the possibility that by June 1943, the breaking of German codes meant that a small exclusive sector of British intelligence may have known in advance of German plans to attack the aircraft, and that the information may have been deliberately suppressed so as not to comprise the Enigma breakthrough at Bletchley Park" (Underlinings—JH).

A bit like Robert Fisk's account of the shipping losses off the coast of Ireland! The downed aircraft had—

"seventeen people on board, including four crewmen. Other notables on the flight were Wilfred Barthold Israel of the Jewish Refugee Mission and Tyrrel Shervington, the Shell Manager in Lisbon. There were no survivors. Nor were any remains of the aircraft ever found".

Walter Starkie's CBE (Commander of the British Empire) was awarded to him in 1948 and he received his CMG, "The most distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George (1818), which honours service overseas in connection with foreign or Commonwealth affairs") but really is more for secret military/intelligence service.

Julianne Herlihy ©

To be continued.

(PS) In my last article I mistakenly noted that the Provost of Trinity College was Dr. Philip Coleman when I should have said Dr. Patrick Prendergast).

Redmondism Defeated in Waterford

Dr Vincent White's *Witness Statement*

More on the Ballybricken Pig Buyers!

Coverage of the centenary of the 1918 General Election was marked by misdirection and evasion. The most notable feature of the election in Ireland was the rejection of the people's vote by the power which had fought and won a terrible war, supposedly in defence of democracy. But the first thing it did when the war was over was to suppress democracy in Ireland.

What you read about in the centenary commemorations is not suppression of democracy, but its extension in the form of women's suffrage.

The first thing that happened to women after they voted for the first time ever is that their vote, like everybody else's, was suppressed. With one hand the vote was given. With the other it was taken away. There was not a mention of this in the centenary reports.

Also brushed under the carpet was the violence and vote fixing. Not by the independence activists, but by the "*democratic constitutional reformers*".

The violence and thuggery of the Devlinites in Belfast was so extreme that even the revisionist history academics mutter evasively about "*scuffles*" breaking out.

But there is never a word about the violent methods of John Redmond MP and his son, Captain William Redmond DSO MP, in Waterford.

In 1892 John Redmond defeated Michael Davitt for the Waterford seat. Davitt had come to Waterford to try to patch things up with Redmond after the Parnell split, but when he was set upon and beaten up by Redmond's supporters he decided to contest the seat himself against Redmond.

Redmond was supported by the *Ballybricken Pig Buyers Association*, a thuggish outfit who controlled the city and who beat Davitt and his supporters off the streets. Speaking after the election, Davitt said he would rather lose than win by Redmond's methods of Terrorism and Toryism.

When Redmond died in March 1918 his son William used the same methods to defeat the Sinn Féin candidate Dr. Vincent White. In the General Election of December 1918 there was a repeat performance,

but with a closer margin in the expanded electorate. In addition to street thuggery, Captain Redmond DSO had also taken the precaution of using his influence to gerrymander the constituency boundary in his favour.

When William died in 1933 his widow Bridget Redmond was elected TD, again with the support of the *Pig Buyers* who were, in effect, her constituency organisation. Bridget and her *Pig Buyers* were primary movers in dissolving the Cumann na nGaedheal party of W.T. Cosgrave into the Blueshirt/Fine Gael organisation under General Eoin O'Duffy. (O'Duffy was such a disaster as Fine Gael leader that after a short period he had to be removed.)

Bridget Redmond TD was a leader and organiser of Blueshirts and Blueblouses. When she died in 1952, her coffin was carried, like her husband William and father-in-law John Redmond before her, not by relatives but by the *Pig Buyers*. Redmond political power was the work of the *Pig Buyer* mafia.

Dr Vincent White's 1958 Bureau of Military History witness statement describing Redmondite violence is available here:

<http://www.bureauofmilitaryhistory.i...BMH.WS1764.pdf>

White was overwhelmingly elected Mayor in the Municipal Election of January 1920, and elected TD unopposed in July 1921 General Election.

Dr. White describes working as GP in the 1918 flu epidemic in the alleys and lanes of Ballybricken, helping people who nonetheless smashed his head in when he stood against Redmond. He also describes the decisive move by the forces of the elected Government of Dáil Éireann to take control of streets from the *Pig Buyers* and their ex-British soldier allies, after the death of Terence McSwiney in October 1920 at the hands of the unelected government in Dublin Castle.

Here is Dr. White's description of his election as Mayor in January 1920, expressed in his trademark flamboyant style even though he was dying at the time:

"Twelve months after [the December 1918 General Election], we got another opportunity of testing and proving that strength. The occasion was the Waterford Municipal Elections in January, 1920. At that election, Sinn Féin 'swept the boards' and elected a majority to the City Council, by whom I was elected Mayor. The bogey called 'Redmondism' had at last been driven into its rightful corner.

On the occasion of my installation as Mayor of my native city, I discarded the wearing of the usual red robe and donned, instead, a robe of green Irish poplin with yellow facings and lined with white. I did so the better to illustrate the fact that Waterford City was now marching truly with the new risen Ireland.

Our victory in that election was a great gratification to our followers who had so loyally fought out the Republican issue in two successive Parliamentary elections and had now witnessed their long-sustained efforts being crowned by victory.

I remember clearly the day I was elected Mayor and the gold Mayoral Chain was placed on my shoulders. Immediately, I pointed to the maces and other English insignia that lay on the table before me and called out in a loud voice: 'Remove that bauble!'

Poor Johnny Harrison, who had been the mail-bearer to many occupants of the Mayoral Chair in the past, promptly proceeded to remove these symbols of Irish slavery amidst a thunder of cheering that echoed out on the street below.

It was, indeed, a proud day for me when I signed the declaration of loyalty of the Waterford City Corporation to the Republican Dáil of Ireland. The wheel had come round now in its full circle; Waterford City had pledged its loyalty to the Irish Republican Government, and, from the flag-staff over the City Hall, flew the Irish Tricolour, the flag beloved of that great Irishman and Waterford-man who first presented it to the Nation—Thomas Francis Meagher."

Pat Muldowney

Editorial Note

'Betrayal Day',

Pat Maloney's

letter to the *Evening Echo*,

which appeared in the

December *Irish Political Review* ,

WAS PUBLISHED ON 27TH NOVEMBER 2018.

The Debate

Who Creates Money?

I am unclear what John Martin is saying in his article 'What is Money' in the November issue of *Irish Political Review*. Perhaps it could be further clarified. He says that "Contrary to popular belief a commercial bank cannot create money out of thin air. So, in order to lend, it either must borrow or use money from its own resources." But what exactly does this mean? Let me give an example.

Customer A. deposits £100 in bank x.

Customer B. requests and receives a loan of $£100 \times 90/100 = £90$ (assuming a 10% reserve rate) from bank x and pays it to customer C.

Customer C. deposits £90 in bank x.

Customer D. requests and receives a loan of $£90 \times 90/100 = £81$ from bank x and pays it to customer E.

Customer E deposits £81 in bank x.

Customer F. requests and receives a loan of $£81 \times 90/100 = £73$ from bank x and pays it to customer G.

Customer G. deposits £73 in bank x.

Customer H. requests and receives a loan of $£73 \times 90/100 = £66$

And so on until, on the basis of that initial deposit of £100, bank x could end up loaning £1,000 (assuming a reserve rate of 10%).

Does John Martin agree with this description ?

Now suppose that later customers A, C, E, G turn up at the bank and demand their deposits in cash. The bank would have to find $100+90+81+73 = £344$.

Clearly the £344 owed is greater than the original deposit of £100 yet the reserves of the bank due to the sequence of deposits will be less than £100. So it needs to find another £244. It may have some other shareholder reserves of say £100 but that would still leave it with a problem of finding £144.

What happens now in this model of the financial system? Well bank x goes to other banks and tries to borrow money from them. If that does not work bank x goes to the Central Bank and asks to have £144. The Central Bank asks for collateral. Bank x shows its (hopefully) AA credit rated loans to customers B, D, F, H. On that basis the Central Bank credits Bank x's reserve account (which is just the name

given to the deposit account that a commercial bank has with the Central Bank) with the required monies.

So it is unclear to me if John disagrees with this description of the money creation process or whether he is taking issue with naming it as 'money creation' by a commercial bank?

It seems perfectly reasonable to me to name the process described above as the creation of money by a commercial bank.

However, although this description of the financial system does lead to the creation of money, it is an incorrect description of what actually happens.

This model of events would suggest that there is a limited amount of money that can be created which is equal to the initial customer deposit, divided by the reserve rate. In the example above this limit is $100/10\%$ which equals 1,000. Furthermore this model suggests that the Central Bank can control the amount of money created by altering the reserve rate. So if the reserve rate was changed to 20% then only £500 would be created by the commercial bank on the basis of the initial customer deposit of £100.

This is a false description of what actually happens.

Commercial banks pay little attention to their reserve position when they make loans. As long as a bank thinks that a loan is good (interest and capital will be paid on time), it will make a loan. It will worry about finding reserves later, if the need should ever arise. So a commercial bank most emphatically does not need to borrow before it can start lending! This is not a small point since it means that money can be created very rapidly if commercial banks think they are being presented with profitable projects against which to make loans. And of course that will be the belief in the upswing of a business cycle.

So customer deposits do not lead to money creation. In fact the exact opposite is the case. A bank creates money by creating a deposit in the form of a loan to a customer for a project which the bank believes will be profitable.

This money creation activity of the commercial banks was well described by Paul Tucker, Deputy Governor of the Bank of England, in 2007:

"Subject only but crucially to confidence in their soundness, banks extend

credit by simply increasing the borrowing customer's current account, which can be paid away to wherever the borrower wants by the bank 'writing a cheque on itself'. That is, banks extend credit by creating money" (p22, *Where does Money come from?*, Josh Ryan-Collins, 2011).

So, according to Tucker, reserves do not enter into a bank's calculations when making a loan. Its **only** consideration is whether the loan will be repaid.

Martin Dolphin

Money Supply Revolution

John Martin suggested in *What Is Money?* (December *Irish Political Review*) that banks do not create money, a thing which can only be done by Central Banks. An Internet search on this matter produces money rebuttals of this view such as the one at: <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/wm-macroeconomics/chapter/how-banks-create-money/>

The two big developments in capitalist economic theory in the 20th century were theorised by Maynard Keynes and Milton Friedman. Keynes advocated the use of State spending and borrowing policy to maintain full employment and develop social assets. Friedman argued for private initiative and against State interference in economic and other areas of public life.

The Keynesian approach remained dominant until American administrations started printing dollars to finance the Vietnam War. This caused inflation around the world, because of the dollar's position as a reserve currency. In particular, Oil producers, who were paid in dollars, found they could buy less with them and started raising their prices. This set off economic crises around the world, as countries tried to cope with the large hike in oil prices. Governments tried Keynesian remedies: spending their way out of the crisis, but found themselves getting deeper and deeper into debt. Ireland was just one of a number of countries in this situation.

In the end, the way out of this morass was found through a Friedman approach: Government spending was cut back. Credit creation by the banks increased. And Capitalism got another lease of life.

It appears to me that, since that period, bank lending has expanded exponentially. In Britain, there was a huge expansion of mortgage lending.

And there was a Credit Card revolution. This saw first the introduction of Credit Cards and then the amount that could be borrowed on them rise steadily. People could have multiple cards. Credit Card spending has become a form of money creation, which enables the public to spend money that has not been earned yet. Sometimes this money is borrowed against their houses, but sometimes Credit Card spending does not seem to have any asset backing.

The Friedman libertarian approach also encouraged wild private financial shenanigans which brought about the 2008 Crash. Gambling with illusory money, particularly in America and Britain, has not stopped since then.

The trouble with handing over a sizeable area of economic policy to the banking system, which is what the Friedman approach has amounted to, is that it is a very

blunt instrument for fulfilling social needs.

In Ireland the result of that policy was the selling off of two State-sponsored institutions: The Agricultural Credit Corporation and the Industrial Credit Corporation. These State-sponsored institutions were inherited from the protectionist era and were intended to provide finance for economic development. The ordinary banking system is simply not able or interested in sponsoring economic development which is needed by the country, but not necessarily able to yield a profit in the short or medium term. There are also gains to the economy—and thus to the populace—which cannot be measured in Profit and Loss terms.

Angela Clifford

John Martin will reply
next month

The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings, 17 May 1974

There I was. The wolf at the door. Broke again. Dreaming of a juicy steak. Striploin. In the local. The Vietnamese chef is magic. I was watching the telly. "Babe station", "Get Lucky". I must have dozed off. Mushrooms, chips, sauce, zzzz.

A voice said, "The only morality they recognise is that which furthers their cause". Holy Cow! That is something, I thought. I awakened with a start.

"Ignore the necessary and let transgression occur." Or, "Permit the venial, so the more serious prevail." Make up your own. But, what of the others? Like the politicians in power in 1974. Or the Garda cartel that dozed along with them. "South of the Border." Or the participants, the Loyalist criminals and abettors. They were all in deep: Mitchell, Jackson, Hanna, Fulton, Boyle, Kerr, McConnell, McCoo, Marchant, Mulholland, Somerville, Whitten, Young (Ivor, Nelson, Stewart) etc. (The participants in the Dublin/Monaghan Bombings, 1974.) The Garda cluster that manipulated the 'sleep-in'. And the politicians who were privy, post- and pre—who became aware and took the easy way out; stayed mute, as the cover-up continued. Not to forget the farm of James Mitchell, Glenanne (ex 'B' Special). The bomb assembly point.

The chief tactician was Major Peter Maynard, Bomb Intelligence Officer, 3 Bde. B.A., in Northern Ireland. The Main attack occurred in Dublin (Parnell St., Talbot St., S. Leinster St.). One bomb per street, at 17.30 hours, May 17, Friday.

The Supporting Attack on Monaghan occurred at 1900 hours. *Intoto*, 34 innocent civilians died. (27 Dublin, 7 Monaghan.) Four deadly bombs.

Maynard had form. He was decorated by 'De Queen', who years later would play 'footsie' with the Dublin Castle inner circle, as the ragamuffins were 'ignored'. "Wow", said our President as De Queen murdered the 'Cúpla Focal' (couple of words).

Monaghan Garda Station was used as a Brit. Forward Observation Post. Garda John McCoy abetted Maynard. The investigation was allowed to quietly lapse. Security was non-existent. I repeat *non-existent*. The Irish Government stayed aloof. Garda Siochana heads stayed mum. It was all allowed lapse. The attackers had been allowed freedom of action. The participants came mainly from Armagh, Portadown, Lisburn, Lurgan, Glenanne, Belfast, with British Army technicians. Freemen of the Republic.

There was *No* security. The bombers had freedom of movement, throughout the country. Their routes were all revealed since. It all beggars belief. Nowhere else could this happen. "Wow."

With a nod and a wink, it was permitted. "Just a little, now. Don't tell me all. OK." Some Garda Siochana senior officers had agreed to a Brit intervention. (It was all done in the interest of outsmarting Republican actions in the 26 Counties, so that PIRA be put on the back foot.) The public would be used, detrimentally, in the short-

term. Later this would fructify as propaganda spread amongst the people.

A major Brit attack, using loyalists mainly, would penetrate the Republic and do the dirt. Now more questions arise. Why this appointment of Commissioner Harris? What's it all about? Is it part of a greater whole? Or what? Does de Queen know? What is his prey? Is he married? What family has he got? Where do they live, go to school, work? What/where are his contacts now? Is there any time limitation? All so mysterious. Has he any hobbies, interests? What's it all about? Does anyone know anything? He must know an awful lot about Dublin/Monaghan. Pull the other one. The principals are all dead by now.

Are we in for it again? Harris knows the background. He must know. Is it all part of something bigger? Riddle me this. Is there a manipulating hand behind all of this? Is there a revelation pending? Will someone open up? Reputations are at stake. Who else knew anything? Perhaps some Commissioner would like to comment, one way or the other.

Meanwhile the cover-up continues. Will there be a repeat? Will someone sing? The Brits will not reveal any info. Is there anyone, anywhere? It is vital that repetition be prevented. No. Not again.

See my book, *The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings 1974, A Military Analysis*. BHES, 2013, with Foreword/Afterword by Angela Clifford. Is Maynard still in the land of the living? Would/could McCoy talk? The money-trail must be dried up by now. The raising of eyebrows must have peaked. There are still some who'd like to see the back of me, but I'm trying to 'hoor' it out. I'll follow them, I suppose. When it's over. I hope, pray. I wonder. Will they try to shut me up, again? I'll let it be known. I have a suspicious mentality, I think. Is my phone acting up again? Listen, strange.

And what about the mysterious visit of Maynard and McCoy to the house in Blanchardstown on that Saturday of the August Holiday Week-end in 1974? That has not been fully investigated, either. I smell money. It seems money is always available. Some refused, though some lined their pockets. "Just a small little helping, to tide things over." "No, de Queen isn't told. No need." (Years back, a loyalist source said to me— *you weren't offered any money: you must be straight.*)

Anyway, that's my story.

PS: Loughinisland is not a once-off.

John Morgan (Lt. Col., retd.)

Victims Of The British State!

Life After Life is an autobiography, as told by Paddy Armstrong to journalist Mary-Elaine Tynan. And, in my opinion, told very well and set down almost verbatim as an original voice. To those whose memories have faded or to those who weren't born then, Paddy Armstrong is one of the Guildford 4, wrongly incarcerated as an IRA bomber back in 1974. His memoir was published in 2017. Since then two of the Guildford 4 have died of cancer—Carole Richardson at the age of 55 in 2012 and Gerry Conlon on the 21st June, 2014, aged 60.

So why another book on the Guildford 4 when we are thought to know so much already about that miscarriage of justice. Well, I for one, haven't before read such a detailed description of his interrogation that occurred at the Guildford police station, nor read of the terrible suffering of Armstrong in the prison system. If you are going to do 15 years, as he did, then it might be better to be ideologically armed and be part of the discipline of an Active Service Unit of PIRA and have an Officer Commanding to keep order and to keep morale up.

Armstrong acknowledges this. PIRA POWs in the English prison system knew from as far back as 1974 that the Guildford 4 were not guilty. When they came across them in the prisons, which they were *ghosted* to and from, they did their best to protect them. Armstrong was glad of this protection. There are frightening people in there.

Armstrong's life began in the Lower Falls, Belfast which he describes as a sort of fishbowl life, though happy enough. He later said he never thought he would go further than the end of his street.

He doesn't cover up how dissolute he was in that life and in a latter life in London. Work was something he loathed. He does complain about the lack of opportunities for young Catholics but, when he does get a job in Mackie's Engineering, he finds the machining, boring, dusty and noisy. Sectarianism starts on the shop floor and, instead of fighting it, he decides to leave. A friendly Protestant foreman pleads for him to stay and fight back. He even visits his home to try and make him stay. Paddy takes him to a local

pub where he is welcomed. But he leaves, having found an excuse not to work. He prefers wearing a suit, shirt and tie and hanging around street corners.

Next he is working as a *marker boy* in a local bookies. He leaves that after an armed robbery. He does say he was frightened. Then, after rioting on the Falls, a armoured RUC Shortland fires its Browning heavy machine gun at the Divis Flats and kills 8 year old Patrick Rooney. The boy is one of six to die that night from RUC and B'Special bullets. Armstrong talks of stray bullets hitting people, but they are certainly not *stray* but guided ones.

Then comes the Loyalist pogrom that burned down a few streets on the Falls. The males prepared to fight and the women and children are loaded into lorries to be taken to a safer area. He goes with the women and children. He confesses all this. This is his constant theme throughout the book: he prefers a way of life in bookies and pubs, and later drugs of all kinds when in London.

It's not hard to guess his reason for showing himself up like this: he doesn't have the calibre to be in the IRA. He can't stand violence. They are not even going to try to recruit what is also a petty thief. He's not against the IRA, "*somebody has to do it*". When British troops move in to the Falls, taking over from the RUC, who had lost control of the situation, he decides to go to London.

Before he goes, he sees the British Army, *once protectors of his area*, now as a force for harassment and insult and raiders of the homes of people and destroyers of their property. The British Army has now sealed off the Falls to such an extent there is only one entrance and one exit.

He says that in going to London he can earn money to send back to his family. He will only be there for a *wee while*. His local parish priest encourages him to leave to avoid the harassment of young men by the military and to stop him *getting in with wrong crowd*. That would be the IRA. But there is no chance of that happening! Some of the locals are over the Border as refugees but they soon return because of poor conditions and local hostility.

It is the early 1970s and he is in London and squatting in Kilburn. He's well into the morphine, cocaine, cannabis and amphetamines scene. Gerry Conlon (soon to be one of the Guildford 4) is his companion in the drugs scene. There is shoplifting by his fellow squatters and a raid on a chemist shop at night for its drugs. He is wrongly accused of stealing a television set and held on remand in Brixton Prison for two months before being freed and declared not guilty.

He meets 17-year old Carole Richardson, an English girl, in one squat. She is also into *living a free life*. He is 23 years old. They become a couple. When PIRA bombs go off in London, they decide to move out of London, maybe to France, just sleeping in haylofts and picking grapes for a living. But the money runs out at Dover and they return to the Kilburn squats.

Then comes that fatal day when the police arrive with wrecking bars and smash the glass panel in the door of one of the squats, with all arrested and taken to Guildford police station. Ten in all. It might be ridiculous to have the Guildford 10 to plant two bombs in two pubs so six are let go, There isn't much information on these six, rather that they were interrogated but wouldn't confess to the bombings.

Also, apparently they didn't accuse one another by naming names. And, if some of them were Irish, they probably came from south of the border and didn't fit the image of Belfast Catholics. Carole Richardson was taken in as the girlfriend of Armstrong.

It seems to have all started with Paul Hill, soon to be one of the 'four', being arrested in Belfast, accused of being implicated the killing of a British soldier. (He was later to be declared innocent of this when married to Courtney Kennedy, niece of J.F. Kennedy. Some of the Kennedy clan came with him to Belfast for the court hearing) But, before that, Paul Hill, under intense interrogation at Castlereagh Holding Centre, mentions the names of Gerry Conlon and Paddy Armstrong.

Then Gerry Conlon is arrested and, under the same intense interrogation of beatings and psychological torment at Guildford police station, gives the name of his aunt, Anne Maguire. His father Giuseppe, who is visiting his sister Anne in order to get legal aid for his son, is arrested with the Maguires, and later dies in prison of emphysema. This is a burden of guilt his son is left to carry all his life.

That leaves four to be accused of the bombings, two of whom—Armstrong and

Richardson—are under the influence of drugs and eventually have withdrawal symptoms. Carole is in such a bad condition she is fed tranquillisers in the police station, probably only after she confesses to the bombings, to relieve her withdrawal symptoms. Armstrong is told to strip naked. He is beaten black and blue, has a gun to his head with the trigger pulled, not knowing when it might be loaded. A German shepherd dog is set on him. When he tells the truth he is beaten. When he tells lies he is given coffee and a cigarette and there are smiles from his tormentors.

He is put in his cell, taken out and asked the same questions over and over again. Again he tells the truth and again he is beaten. When he resorts to lies, what they want him to say, he is again given coffee and a cigarette and there are smiles. In his cell a voice hisses and whispers loudly through the flap of the cell door:

"Armstrong? We know you didn't do it... but we're going to do you for it anyway... because we need bodies."

When under interrogation he hears the cries and screams of the others.

They can hold him, and the other three, for a week now, instead of the usual 48 hours. Gerry Conlon says that, if it had been 48 hours, he might have held out and not given names in his agony of what was torture.

Armstrong is dealt a massive punch by the visiting Assistant Chief Constable of Surrey, as if this is a funfair and he is hitting a punch bag in order to try make the bell ring.

Now it comes the signing the *confession*. But it's not as easy as that, for there will be more beatings, threats of being thrown out of the window two storeys down, or of being shot dead. They go through his *confession* line by line with threats and with faces stuck into his, slung against the wall while still in his chair, and shouts of *Irish cunt* and *Irish pig*.

After that it is the Old Bailey and the vicious-tongued Sir Michael Havers for the Prosecution, with the equally vicious-tongued Judge, Sir John Donaldson, who wishes they could be tried under the high treason act for which they could be hanged.

Armstrong gets 35 years, Conlon, 30 years, Paul Hill is to be detained until the advent of infirmity, Carole Richardson, still a young teenager, detained *At Her Majesty's Pleasure*, which amounts to a 20 years sentence. The judge then says they are not to be released before 12—15

years has passed. They did 15 years.

In my opinion, having served that term, sections of the media decided they should be free. And possibly even without a lot of effort by well-wishers they would have been freed anyway. The inner State, the dark State, in reality had got its way and was satisfied with the outcome.

A State cabal meets secretly, without informing the defence lawyer and solicitor for the Guildford 4, and make decisions, maybe even rewriting the history of this trial into papers that couldn't be released back then for 75 years.

It is difficult at the best of times to remember where you were on a precise date at a precise time, especially when you are living it up with drink and drugs. But there was an alibi for Armstrong to prove he hadn't been to Guildford on the day of the bombings. He had been staying in a Catholic hostel for Northern Ireland refugees at Quex Road, Kilburn—and someone there from Belfast remembers precisely the date and time Armstrong was there.

This person returned to Belfast. When Armstrong contacts him, he came back over to London to be a witness at the Old Bailey. He waits to be called but there is a delay. He is asked to come back the next day. He has no money and nowhere to stay and only has his return airfare ticket, so, he goes home to Belfast from Heathrow. The court then says the witness for Armstrong hasn't turned up.

Carole Richardson has a cast-iron alibi to prove that she and Armstrong were nowhere near Guildford on the day of the bombings. She has a teenage friend called Lisa who will be a witness for her and can prove they were at a music gig in South London. There are also people who were at the same music event who can prove that Carole and Lisa were there that night. (Armstrong was looking after Carole's dog at the squat).

The police then decide to raid Lisa's home and turn everything over in front of her mother. But Lisa still turns up as a witness to the Old Bailey, though the police has shaken her and made her look like a *wild-child*. The prosecution will then rhyme off the drugs she takes like LSD, barbiturates, and amphetamines in order to prejudice the jury. She does take such drugs in line with what youth will do. The four notice that the jury contains two black people and put their trust in them. When Carole's alibi fails, all their alibis fail and the jury declared them guilty.

It is more terrifying for a community to know, or suspect, that people arrested out of their community are innocent. They then know that the coercive powers of the State are being used against all of them.

The prison agony of Paddy Armstrong would take too long to be related here: suffice to mention—a razor-thin mattress with the scratchy horse hair poking through, a thin blanket, a freezing cell, dirty walls with what looks like dried blood and a dirty ceiling, half-warm grey sludge called food—which might contain prison officer's urine in it or a touch of faeces and possibly splinters of broken glass.

This, with the rough prison suit with the stripes nailing him as a Category A prisoner and therefore dangerous. He is called the usual: *Irish cunts* and *fucking Irish bastards* by the prison staff. He is what is called *ghosted*, that is being sent from prison to prison with only a few minutes' notice. Any visitors he might have are left waiting in the prison for hours without being told of his transfer. When his mother and sister do visit they are strip-searched. They don't tell him this in order not to upset him. He doesn't tell them of his agonies in prison in order not to upset them.

He is just as dissolute in prison as he has been outside, in owing money for tobacco and cannabis. But this time the tobacco and drugs baron is a high level criminal. He asks PIRA to sort him out. Three PIRA approach him saying the *baron* thinks he is PIRA and that therefore he is bringing PIRA into disrepute. So he had better pay up. Paddy Hill of the *Birmingham 6* happens to be in Gartree Prison at the same time and has taken it on to himself to protect Armstrong. He then approaches PIRA and asks them why are they doing this work for a gangster. PIRA lets the matter drop and Armstrong gets himself into the segregation unit in order to lie low for a while. That is a small isolated cell in the basement which no sound reaches and where cockroaches and mice appear out of holes.

When Armstrong is released from prison he carries on the same caper: owing money and running from gangsters. His Guildford-based solicitor, Alistair Logan, who took his case when no one else would—getting himself called an IRA sympathiser—holds his compensation money and only lets him have small amounts at a time, for his own good. He does not release two thousand pounds owed by Armstrong to betting shops in

Largs, Scotland, where he has settled.

After Armstrong is visited by a huge guy—and denies he's Armstrong—it's time to run back to London immediately on the next train.

In Dublin, where he next settles, it's the same: gambling, drugs and drink. At least he doesn't claim the interrogation, the trial and the prisons did that to him. He knows what he is and always has been.

One ugly incident in prison sees the usually mild and inoffensive Armstrong on the rampage whilst shaking like a leaf. A prisoner is tormenting him about his so-called IRA connections and indulging in calling him an *Irish bastard* and *pig*. That is disappointing for Armstrong for the black prisoners are usually sympathetic to him. This behaviour continues from this hulk of a prisoner until it looks like he could maim him and even kill him.

The prisoners don't like what they see, for this prisoner has bullied them as well. All the prisoners, and that includes PIRA, wants Armstrong to do something about it. So he is coached in how to mix a brew of scalding water and a lot of sugar that will stick to the skin. He is told to also put some batteries in a sock. When his quarry is sitting in the TV room watching a documentary with his back turned the almost fainting Armstrong creeps up to him and pours the scalding sugar-water over his head. There are screams of agony but the man is on his feet. The prisoners start shouting:

"Finish the job! He's still on his feet. Finish it or he'll kill you!"

Armstrong then takes the sock filled with batteries from his pocket and beats the screaming figure until the man falls to the floor. Armstrong is then quickly moved into the segregation unit. He is now guilt-ridden and weeps about what he has done.

He can never get it out of his mind. (A black community paper at the time was calling PIRA action *white violence* as if the UK was a black nation).

A Labour government was in power, 1974-1979. Harold Wilson was Prime Minister 1974-1976 and James Callaghan as PM from 1976-1979. Margaret Thatcher as PM 1979-1990.

27th November, 1974. Roy Jenkins, Home Secretary, in the Harold Wilson Government, introduces the *Prevention of Terrorism Act (Temporary Provisions)*

Act. It is an Act solely aimed at the Irish community in the UK. A recent examination of it by a New Zealand university legal team describes this Act as:

"Constructed for a suspect community against a background of anti-Irish racism with no respect for civil liberties and existing legal traditions."

The Government of Harold Wilson and James Callaghan made no move to examine the case of the *Guildford 4*, the *Maguire 7* or the *Birmingham 6* though a young Jeremy Corbyn would have been telling them about the injustices. Looks like social democracy was suspended for the Irish. And of course, in common with Labour, Margaret Thatcher had no time for any of the imprisoned innocents. In her memoirs the *Birmingham 6* is a mere footnote. The *Guildford 4* and the *Maguire 7* aren't mentioned at all.

It made no difference to any of the prisoners when a PIRA Active Service Unit, arrested after the Balcombe Street Siege in December 1975, mentioned the Guildford pub bombing, as well as the Woolwich pub bombing as their work. It was put down to pals helping one another out. But to accept that it was the Balcombe Street ASU which was responsible would tear the savage State set-up apart. Though the Balcombe Street Siege ASU admitted these bombings, they were never charged.

As Chris Mullin, a Labour MP, said of the failure of Guildford 4 appeal:

"Small lives were not going to wreck big reputations."

When the Birmingham 6 appeal was denied, Lord Denning said:

"If the six men win, it will mean that the police are guilty of perjury, that they are guilty of violence and threats, that the confessions were invented and improperly admitted in evidence and the convictions erroneous... this is such an appalling vista that every sensible person in the land would say that it cannot be right that these actions should not go any further."

The three policemen involved in the interrogation of the Guildford 4—former Detective Chief-Inspector Thomas Style, aged 59; Detective Sergeant John Donaldson, aged 57; and Detective Constable Vernon Attwell, aged 52—were, after a number of years, charged with a conspiracy to pervert the course of justice. After a month on trial they were cleared. Kenneth Clarke, then Home Secretary in the John Major, Conservative Government, said on the 20th of May

1993, to thunderous applause at a police federation gathering:

"I'm always glad to see innocent people acquitted."

Fine Gael, in power 1973—1979, did nothing for any of the innocents locked up, nor did any Government following.

Tony Blair, PM, from 1997—2007, made an apology about the Guildford 4's incarceration. But no one was charged. In fact Peter Imbert, then a police sergeant and involved with the Guildford 4 and with the Balcombe Street Siege investigations, was later to become Commissioner of the London Metropolitan Police in 1987 with a knighthood. He then became a Lord with Blair's nomination.

Sir Michael Havers, prosecutor in the Guildford 4 case, became Lord Havers in 1987.

Sir John Donaldson, judge in the Guildford 4 case, became Lord Donaldson and Master of the Rolls in 1982, nominated by Margaret Thatcher, then PM.

*

Paddy Armstrong, with huge regrets about everything and anything, got married in Dublin, and honeymooned in Paris. He gave up his old dissolute ways and fathered two children. It has suited him to be a house-husband while his wife continued working as a music teacher. With his wife's relatives he has a nice in-built family. He is still an Arsenal fan and so is his young daughter. His compensation is now gone: he seems happy to be rid of it.

(Gerry Conlon said of the compensation: *"It was like being give a bottle of whiskey and a revolver."* He manage to get through a million pounds, sometimes spending £20,000 a week on drugs for himself and hangers-on.)

Paul Hill defied the prosecutor and the judge at the time of his trial at the Old Bailey. Maybe that was why his sentence was: *To serve your term until infirmity*. He circulates in US high social circles now and was photographed with Obama and his wife when Obama was President. He visited Columbia to be at the trial of the 'Columbia 3', PIRA stalwarts, who had decided to visit FARC, the guerrilla movement.

A book that will make your blood run cold. All praise to Paddy Armstrong for his honesty and to Mary-Elaine Tynan who brought that honesty to the world.

Wilson John Haire.

1.12.18

The Russian Revolution

Lenin established a revolutionary socialist state in the Russian Empire, where society was over-whelmingly pre-capitalist. The revolution abolished the small amount of industrial capitalism that had been established in Russia, while at the same time abolishing the large landed estates that had supplied the cities with food and turning them into small farms, and making the farmers—the peasants—owners of the farms. The revolution created about 25 million owners of farms.

Rosa Luxemburg (who was in some respects the figure closest to Lenin in European socialism) commented, shortly before she was killed in January 1919, that "*The Bolsheviks are the historic heirs of the English Levellers and the French Jacobins*".

The Levellers, in principle, and the Jacobins, in practice, cleared the ground for the free development of capitalism. (There may have been amongst the Levellers some idea of establishing mediaevalist Communism, such as the Diggers attempted. An earlier English radical had asked—

"When Adam delved and Eve span
Who then was the gentleman?"

But Cromwell came to the opinion that life without gentry would not be worth living and he aborted the revolution which had come to depend on him, ensured the collapse of the Puritan Republic after his death, and laid the foundation for the emergence of a ruling class of gentry which shaped the development of England under the restored Monarchy of 1660.

Jacobinism—or the Jacobine event—was more thorough. A class of peasant owners sprang into existence almost overnight in the event that was known as the *Great Fear*. The aristocracy was uprooted and could never be replanted when it was formally restored along with a monarchy that was only a dressed-up Presidency. And that seems to be a major reason why France did not develop a regularly functioning political system for the democracy which it proclaimed—while England gradually, as the need arose, admitted elements of the populace to the representative party system which the ruling class had devised for itself.

The French Revolution gave the land to the peasants to do as they pleased with it.

And the development of France from its peasant base can be observed in the novels of Balzac and Zola.

The French Revolution was land to the peasants and uprooting of monarchy. The country remains decorated with empty *Chateaus*, at least one of them surrounded with statues of sheep, which have none of the interest of English Country Houses because they have been of no political or social consequence for a couple of centuries.

I do not know any novels that deal with the Jacobin regime in its final year. All that I know about it is what I got from the Belfast United Irish paper, the *Northern Star*, which nationalist Ireland has impoverished itself by ignoring. But there are indications that Lenin mulled over the career of Robespierre and saw how he might have averted his fall in Thermidor—by enacting his own Thermidor. Lenin freed himself from the fetishism of Left and Right and kept his revolution going by weaving between the two. I cannot give the reference now but I know that he said on occasion that he stood on the Right because it was the right place to stand.

Luxemburg comments, on his land policy in the Revolution, that—

"the immediate seizure and distribution of the land by the peasants was the shortest, simplest, most clean-cut formula to achieve two diverse things: to break down large land-ownership, and to bring the peasants to the revolutionary government. As a political measure to fortify the proletariat socialist government, it was an excellent move.

"Unfortunately, however, it had two sides to it, and the reverse side consisted in the fact that the direct seizure of the land by the peasants has in general nothing at all in common with socialist economy ...

"A socialist government which has come to power must in any event do one thing—it must take measures which lead in the direction of the fundamental prerequisite for a later socialist reform of agriculture; it must at least avoid everything which may bar the way to these measures.

"Now the slogan launched by the Bolsheviks, immediate seizure and distribution of the land by the peasants, necessarily tended in the opposite direction. Not only is it not a socialist measure: it even cuts off the way to such measures: it piles up unsurmountable obstacles to the socialist transformation of

agrarian relations" (*The Russian Revolution*, Chapter 2).

The right policy, she says, would have been nationalisation of the large landed estates. It would certainly have been preferable, after the establishment of the socialist state, if the great landed estates that supplied the cities had been kept in being in order to be made state property instead of being broken up into small farms, but if Lenin had concerned himself with the post-Revolution situation before making the Revolution, there would probably have been no socialist Revolution in Russia.

He piled up problems for the Revolution in order to make the Revolution. He committed the socialist State to skipping over the phase of capitalist industrial development, which required what was done by capitalism in Western Europe to be done by socialism in Russia. And, by establishing the peasants as independent owners of the land as farmers, as the major economic reform of the Revolution, he built into the Revolution settlement a major internal obstacle to its development.

Luxemburg concluded:

"The French small peasant became the boldest defender of the Great French Revolution which had given him land confiscated from the *emigres*... Lenin and his friends might have expected a similar result from their agrarian slogan. However, now that the Russian peasant has seized the land with his own fist, he does not even dream of defending Russia and the revolution to which he owes the land. He has dug obstinately into his new possessions and abandoned the revolution to its enemies, the state to decay, the urban population to famine...

"The Leninist agrarian reform has created a new and powerful layer of popular enemies of socialism in the countryside, enemies whose resistance will be much more dangerous and stubborn than that of the noble large landowners..."

This overstated the situation at the time when it was written. In 1918 the landlordist wars of intervention still lay in the future, prolonging the worker/peasant alliance. And then Lenin enacted his own "*Thermidor*" with a provisional restoration of capitalism under socialist State authority: the NEP [New Economic Policy]. And, after Lenin, the conflict inherent in the NEP was prevented from breaking out for five years by Bukharin and Stalin, while the capacity of the State for arbitrary action was preserved, despite the concessions made to the budding capitalism of the countryside.

The situation described by Luxemburg came about ten years later. She called it *Leninism*. When it happened it was called *Stalinism*.

Luxemburg, in a chapter on *The Problem Of Dictatorship*, also took issue with Lenin on the subject of democracy:

"Lenin says the bourgeois state is an instrument of oppression of the working class; the socialist state of the bourgeoisie. To a certain extent, he says, it is only the capitalist state stood on its head. This simplified view misses the most essential thing: bourgeois class rule has no need of the political training and education of the entire mass of the people, at least not beyond certain narrow limits. But for the proletarian dictatorship that is the life element, the very air without which it is not able to exist.

"Thanks to the open and direct struggle for governmental power", writes Trotsky, 'the labouring masses accumulate in the shortest time a considerable amount of political experience and advance quickly from one stage to another in their development.'

"Here Trotsky refutes himself and his own friends. Just because this is so, they have blocked up the fountain of political experience... by their suppression of public life! Or else we would have to assume that experience and development were necessary up to the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks, and then, having reached their highest peak, become superfluous thereafter...

"In reality the opposite is true! It is the very great tasks which the Bolsheviks have undertaken with courage and determination that demand the most extensive political training of masses and accumulation of experience.

"Freedom only for supporters of the government, only for the members of one party—however timorous they may be—is no freedom at all. Freedom is always and exclusively freedom for the one who thinks differently.'

"The socialist system of society should only be, and can only be, an historical product, born out of the school of its own experiences, born in the course of its realization, as a result of the developments of living history, which... has the fine habit of always producing along with any social need the means of its satisfaction.

"Lenin and Trotsky have laid down the soviets as the only true representative of the labouring masses. But with the repression of political life in the land as a whole, life in the soviets must also become more and more crippled. Without general elections, without unrestricted freedom of the press and assembly, without a free struggle of opinion, life dies out in every public institution, becomes a mere semblance of life, in which only the bureaucracy remains as the active element. Public life gradually falls asleep, a few dozen party leaders of inexhaustible energy and boundless experience direct and rule. Among them, in reality only a dozen outstanding heads do the leading and an elite of the working class is invited from time to time to meetings where they

are to applaud the speeches of the leaders, and to approve proposed resolutions unanimously—at bottom a clique affair—a dictatorship to be sure, not the dictatorship of the proletariat, however, but only the dictatorship of a handful of politicians, that is a dictatorship in the bourgeois sense, in the sense of the rule of the Jacobins... Yes, we can go even further—such conditions must inevitably cause a brutalisation of public life—attempted assassinations, shooting of hostages etc...." (*Lenin's Speech On Discipline And Corruption*).

In a chapter on *Democracy And Dictatorship* she argues that—"The basic error of the Lenin-Trotsky theory is that they too, just like Kautsky, oppose dictatorship to democracy", whereas the dictatorship should be "*the manner of applying democracy*".

It was, as far as I know, common ground amongst politically organised socialists before the Great War that existing democracies were bourgeois dictatorships. Bourgeois dictatorship was exercised through the political form of democracy. There was freedom of the press, up to a point, and freedom of assembly, up to a point. And there was free conflict of political parties in elections, up to a point—though I doubt that a party standing for the establishment of an independent Irish state would have been allowed by Britain to contest an election.

(I believe that even in 1918, after the world war for the self-determination of small nations had been won, the Sinn Fein election Manifesto was censored by the Government. But I have no means of checking on that, since bourgeois Ireland has never produced a history of the Election in which it asserted its independence—a fact which is relevant to Luxemburg's dismissive opinion about national self-determination.)

Pre-1914 electorates in the UK did not include women or the lower strata of the working class, but they are now usually regarded as having been democratic in substance. And it was widely hoped, or feared, at the time that full democratisation of the electorate would undermine Capitalism as the populace became aware of its interests and had the means of asserting them.

Luxemburg did not live to see the consequences of full formal democratisation of the electoral franchise. She did not live to see Fascism, which I can only understand to be a consequence of democratisation combined with the destruction of the pre-War European order by Britain through the Versailles arrangement. She

was killed in January 1919 in the course of the German disorder precipitated by Britain. It has often been said that those who killed her were the pioneers of Fascism, but I think that that misses the point.

The masses were thrown into disorderly motion by total war, and by the destabilising settlement imposed by the victors on the vanquished at the end of it.

The war was described at the start, on the British side, as the first middle class war. The party of the middle class—the Liberal Party—was the governing party at the moment when the opportunity came to put into effect the plans that had been made for a war of destruction on Germany. Those plans had been made secretly by the preceding Unionist Government through the *Committee of Imperial Defence*, but it fell to the Liberal Party to put them into effect.

Very few Liberals knew about the plans. Most Liberals still lived in the free-trade ideology of Cobden and Bright, and of Gladstone—the ideology of the era when British industrial supremacy combined with the undisputed dominance of the world by the Royal Navy to ensure peaceful British hegemony—under which war appeared to be an unproductive cost. But the Unionist Party, taking account of the strong economic development of Germany since its political unification in 1871, saw that it might soon become a serious rival in world affairs and determined to nip it in the bud.

The Unionist Party was created by a merger of the Tory Party with a breakaway social-reform section of the Liberal Party led by Joseph Chamberlain. It was Imperialist and Social Reformist—and Social Reform was understood as being made possible by Imperialism. The need to destroy Germany so that the free development of the British Empire might continue was preached in Unionist magazines, which presented Germany as being to Britain as Carthage had been to Rome, and which must be destroyed as Rome had destroyed Carthage.

The party-mentality, which is fundamental to British political life, tends to make the adherents of one party largely oblivious of what the other is saying and doing. The two parties regard each other as evil because that is how the system works, but the ideology of their conflict is conventional and clichéd. And Liberalism, which had been immersed in a conflict with the Unionists over Irish Home Rule for three years, suddenly found, around the 1st or August 1914, that it was governing a state which had been committed by

the Unionists to war on Germany.

A small group within the Liberal leadership—the Prime Minister, Foreign Secretary and War Minister—had been collaborating with the Unionists in making detailed arrangements with France behind the back of Parliament and they now told the Party that it was committed as a matter of honour to make good the assurances that had been given to France.

The Party did what was required of it. The Party press—the *Manchester Guardian* and the *Daily Mail*—switched overnight from reasoned opposition to joining France and Russia in war on Germany, to enthusiastic support for it.

Enthusiasm is a thing that is frowned upon in English culture, but the overnight Liberal change on 4th August 1914, on the issue of war on Germany, could only be grounded in enthusiasm. Unionism had coldly and calculatingly, over a generation, come to the conclusion that there must be war on Germany, and had made preparations for it. But the obligation to make war on Germany struck Liberalism like a bolt from the blue.

The Liberals were reassured by the Irish Home Rule Party—which was maintaining them in Government—that making war on Germany was the right thing to do. That covered the morality of it—the Irish interest having become the conscience of the Party during the Home Rule conflict. But the doing of it was not something that had grown out of a conviction of its own. Its warmongering, therefore was frenzied and delusional.

John Buchan, who was not only a popular novelist, sought to stabilise the war movement structurally into the middle class coming of age in the life of the Empire. The middle class had matured and was now taking upon itself the burden of Empire. But H.G. Wells soon gave it a millenarian purpose that was appropriate to a middle class derived from Puritanism, that had not mellowed into a ruling class: *The War That Will End War*. Not just another war, but a Just War, a final war. A war, therefore, in which a negotiated settlement with the enemy was unthinkable.

The middle class war (the war sustained by active citizens) lasted for almost two years—if one accepts that the Kitchener Armies were Citizen Armies, Volunteer Armies.

The old wars—the reactionary wars in which few people were killed (relatively!) and which often left the structure of states intact—were fought by ruling class officers with an infantry from what Wellington

called "*the scum of the earth*", who had nothing better to do with themselves. The War To End War was officered by the middle class and filled out with volunteers from the respectable classes. (A trial run for this had been made in the Boer War by Erskine Childers, who raised a kind of Citizen Army in the City of London.)

The scum of the earth, as far as it was still available, was used up quickly in 1914. Large Volunteer armies were raised by Lord Kitchener (who filled the Office of War Minister that was vacant because of the Curragh Mutiny). But the voluntary element in Volunteering diminished steadily in the course of 1915, and gave way completely in 1916.

Asquith, the classical Liberal, brought in conscription against his will. His replacement as Prime Minister by Lloyd George in 1916 can be taken as inaugurating Total War, People's War, war in which the distinction between soldier and civilian was abolished.

In the *Oxford Pamphlets* published in 1939, preparatory to the next war on Germany, the mode of war developed in 1914-18 was described by William Beveridge as "*totalitarian war*". This was war in which there were no innocents except those who were too young or too disabled to work or fight, and in which there were no rules.

Totalitarian war brought with it the necessity of democratisation. The British electorate was tripled by the Reform Act of 1918. And a nationally-organised British Labour Party was finally established.

The Secretary of the Labour Party, Arthur Henderson (who was a member of the Government that shot James Connolly strapped to a chair) ruled a negotiated settlement with Germany off the political agenda. The aims of the Labour Party declared revolution to be abhorrent. It was something to be avoided at all costs. But the Labour Party insisted that revolution must be imposed on Germany whatever the cost. There could be no negotiation with Germany until there was a revolution in Germany.

The British war propaganda had conjured the German state into an evil Autocracy that was intent on conquering the world. That was what the unprepared Liberals found it necessary to believe when they were obliged to make war in August 1914. It was a delusion that was fed by Irish Party propagandists in the Liberal press, Tom Kettle and Robert Lynd. And it was what the Labour Party bought into, in order to become a power in the state

when it was formed in the course of the war.

Revolution was hateful. It generated disorder. But Germany must be revolutionised before Britain could agree to negotiate a settlement with it. And then the negotiations consisted of Britain giving orders to a revolutionised and disabled Germany.

Britain escaped defeat narrowly in the Spring of 1918, a few months before American fighting power was brought to bear on the war, and defeat of Germany was suddenly in prospect. Preparations were being made for a 1919 British campaign when the Armistice was signed on November 11th. But Britain had worked itself into such a condition of frenzy that it could not let the war end when the fighting ended. It carried the war on into 1919, tightening the Food Blockade when the Royal Navy got access to the Baltic, and refusing to negotiate with any German Government under the Armistice—even after the Kaiser had abdicated, monarchy was abolished, a Republic declared, there was a Social Democratic Government, and revolution in the streets.

Britain just had to live out its fantasy of a German Autocracy with roots deep in a subservient society. Those roots would have to be pulled out before a settlement could be made with Germany that would leave the world free to settle down in perpetual peace, safe from a resurgence of Prussianism.

The German Social Democracy had no more of a problem with "*Kaiserism*" than the new British Labour Party had with Hannoverianism. It knew very well that the British propaganda was a caricature of the German system of Government. It declared a Republic reluctantly when the Kaiser abdicated, and fled from the British hangman. And it took Office in its Republic without radical Republican enthusiasm. As far as it lay within its power, it de-revolutionised the nominal revolution that it was cornered into. And Britain refused to negotiate with it. What it did was dictate terms to it, which it signed in November 1919 in order to end the Starvation Blockade.

There was no pragmatic democratic revolution waiting to be made in the German state in 1918. And, if there was a socialist revolution to be made, it could not be done as was done in pre-capitalist Russia. Germany was an advanced capitalist society with a strong socialist movement that was a real element in actual social existence. And "*Kaiserism*"—a

form of monarchy that was made functional by an elected Parliament—was no more an obstacle to socialist development than the Hanoverian dynasty was in Britain.

But Britain, in justification of the reckless destructiveness of its intervention in the European War, had to make a fetish of German monarchy in 1918-19. And a revolutionary fringe on the Social Democracy, apparently influenced by a combination of British and Soviet propaganda, declared revolution on the Social Democratic Government.

That revolution had no immediate object, such as the Bolshevik revolution had. There was no bourgeois revolution waiting to be made, which could be used as a stepping-stone towards socialist revolution. The German Parliament had as much power as it cared to exert—it had the power of the purse, which in England was regarded as the essential power of Parliament, and England ought to know.

The German Government could declare war without Parliamentary approval, just as the British Government could, but could not carry on a war without funds supplied by Parliament. The German Parliament voted war credits, just as the British Parliament did. The large Social Democratic contingent in the German Parliament voted for giving the Government the means of making war. The British Socialist Party did not vote war credits—because it did not exist. The Independent Labour Party leaders declared opposition to the war, but the ILP was in no way an equivalent of the German Social Democracy (SPD). It was a marginal influence in the state and its opposition was scarcely noticed. The real equivalent of the SPD in Britain in this matter were the Irish Party and the Liberal backbenches, and they voted for war.

The British Parliament was misled by the Government about the preparations being made for war on Germany, and the undertakings given to France, until these things were partly revealed to it in early August 1914. It accepted the deception as having been necessary—the Government knew best in this great affair of state how much should be revealed to it, and therefore to the enemy—who did not yet know that he was an enemy—and did its duty by voting war credits.

There was no deception of the German Parliament by the Kaiser. There were no secret alliances. There was the open Triple Alliance with Austria and Italy, which Italy defaulted on. Germany supported the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia in response to the Serbian assassination of the

heir to the Austrian throne. This was criticised as having been a little bit too emphatic, and offensive to Russian Slavophile sentiment. I suppose the German Government should have known that Russia, with its eye on Constantinople, had a secret understanding with Britain about the Ottoman Empire and was on the lookout for an excuse for war—and would have known it, if it had been intent on a war of world conquest.

But German foreign policy was conservative of the existing order of things in the region of the world that was regarded as civilised. In particular, it was conservative of the Ottoman Empire as giving orderly expression to the Islamic component of world culture. But that was a hostile policy against Britain and Russia, which were intent on making war on the Ottoman Empire and taking a bit each.

Germany can be accused of living in a fool's paradise in that period, and being neither adequately defensive nor adequately aggressive. That is what Bernhardt, a retired General, accused it of. It did not know the world it had to live in. It had developed no casuistry of simulation and dissimulation, such as had become second nature to the British political mind. And so it found itself caught in a war between two powerful land Empires, France and Russia, which had ambitions which required them to make war on it or on Austria: France for the conquest of Alsace-Lorraine and Russia for the conquest of Constantinople. And then it naively consulted Britain about passing an Army through the non-sovereign state of Belgium in order to outflank the French defences, was misled by the equivocal British response, and enabled the British Government to sweep the Irish Party and its own back-benches into an altruistic war in defence of civilisation.

And the SPD, seeing the three greatest Empires in the world arrayed against Germany, voted war credits for defence.

It made sense to James Connolly that it was a war of German defence. But Connolly's counterpart on the Continent was Josef Pilsudski of the Polish Socialist Party. On the other hand, Rosa Luxemburg, a Jew born to a substantial middle class family in Russian Poland, was without a sense of nationality and, as well as being an intellectual in the SPD, was a leading member of the SDKPiL (the Social Democracy of Poland and Lithuania) which was opposed to Polish nationalism. In her conception of things, Capitalism was all of a piece, and was driven to be imperialist by its internal functioning, and

the only homeland of the proletariat was the International. Germany could not be fighting a war of national defence because nationalism was historically obsolete, and furthermore German Imperialism was particularly evil, even amongst the great Imperialisms.

She accused the SPD of betrayal because it voted war credits. Her influence at that point was negligible. Four and a years later, in the chaos following the Armistice and the refusal of Britain and France to negotiate a settlement, she launched a revolutionary street agitation against the SPD Government. She had not developed a political organisation that could conceivably have taken over the power of government from the SPD. Her idea seems to have been that, if a permanent street agitation was maintained that prevented the SDP from forming a regular system of government, an internationalist socialist revolution would bring itself about by the self-action of the proletariat, without having a Leninist elite acting on its behalf.

A German Communist Party was founded in early January 1919, with her as leader, even though she did not believe in party leadership. Revolutionary insurrection was preached without there being any possibility of an insurrectionary Government being formed. A few days later she was killed by a group of concerned citizens trying to stop the chaos: the *Freikorps*. It was alleged that this group acted in connivance with the SPD Government.

A colleague of Rosa's in the pre-War period, Paul Lensch, published a pamphlet in 1917, *Three Years Of World Revolution*, in which he described the economic innovations by which Germany was able to sustain the war effort under a state of siege. These were the developments which Lenin saw as demonstrating the feasibility of establishing a socialist system immediately.

Lench also argued that the construction of Socialism had been misconceived in terms of the revolution which ushered in Capitalism—and that the very idea of revolution had been misconceived. The difficulty of enacting a revolution against Capitalism, he argued, was that Capitalism was itself revolutionary, continuously breaking up and remaking all that it found around it. The ground on which socialist revolution was to be enacted was, therefore, always changing.

Socialism as a revolutionary force could not compete with Capitalism.

(And in fact Marx described Capitalism as a revolutionary force that was inherently subversive of all established values,

displacing them all with the value of Money, with which everything else could be bought. And it seemed to me that the socialist ideal in England in the late 1950s, when I first saw it, amongst the working class as distinct from the intellectuals, was the existing way of life with certain unpleasant features removed.)

The German revolution failed for lack of an intelligible revolutionary object. The overthrow of the Kaiser was a pseudo-revolution—and he wasn't overthrown, he just emigrated. It was the Anglo-French who insisted on a German revolution. And the German revolution did not know what to make of itself.

It is interesting to speculate on what Lenin might have done, if he had found himself in Germany in 1918-19. He was

in practice very much given to "*concrete analysis of concrete situations*", rather than to universal ideals. He made a socialist revolution out of the bourgeois-national requirements of the society in Russia.

Would he have applied himself to the pressing German problem of asserting German sovereignty against the Anglo-French conquest? Would he have done what was left to the Fascist movement to do?

The object which gave purpose to the socialist revolution in Russia was the national task of industrialisation without which the state could not hope to survive for long. It fell to Socialism to do what Capitalism had failed to do—and to do it in defiance of the established Powers of capitalism.

Brendan Clifford

Lemass, Part 4

Lemass In The De Valera Era *And A Dillon And Bowen Digression*

Executive summary: James Dillon, who was to become Fine Gael leader, had a track record of outright hostility to all that the Dev/Lemass era represented. In the 1930s Lemass was Fianna Fáil's most analytical anti-Fascist, while Dillon himself was a Fascist, and remained so during support for Britain's War, as noted in Elizabeth Bowen's wartime intelligence reports to Churchill's Government. There was also an anti-Semitic edge to Dillon's hostility to Dev/Lemass policies, which actually became even sharper post-Holocaust. Meanwhile Bowen had moved residence to Ireland, but had not the slightest interest—as can be deduced from correspondence with her Canadian lover Charles Ritchie—in the post-War successes and failures of Dillon, her closest wartime political confidant. In semi-exile from her beloved England in response to Labour's 1945 election victory, it was only that country's politics that roused her passions. Yet even when a wartime Intelligence operative in Ireland, who had identified Dillon's Fascism, she never reported on his anti-Semitism. Perhaps she found it neither remarkable or objectionable, in view of some of her own prejudices.

1959 was the year in which two significant leadership changes took place in Irish political life: Seán Lemass replaced Éamon de Valera as Taoiseach and leader of Fianna Fáil, while James Dillon replaced General Richard Mulcahy as leader of Fine Gael. Dillon had previously held Government Office as Minister for Agriculture, in both the 1948-51 and 1954-57 Inter-Party Governments headed by Fine Gael Taoiseach John A. Costello. That was the height of Dillon's political success. As the age of de Valera ended, with Lemass becoming Taoiseach and Dillon becoming leader of the Opposition, the latter two clashed head to head for the next six years. At this stage of his political career, however, Dillon represented style rather than substance. Failing to dislodge Fianna Fáil in the two successive General Elections of 1961 and 1965, Dillon was

compelled to resign as Fine Gael leader.

Yet the Dillon of the 1930s and 1940s had been far from harmless. "*Fine Gael reflects on the time of conception*" was the headline of a report from Frank McDonald on the front page of the '*Irish Times*' of April 28th 1983, while the caption to the accompanying photo read: "*The Taoiseach Dr FitzGerald, with two former leaders of Fine Gael, Mr Liam Cosgrave and James Dillon at a function in the Mansion House, Dublin, to mark the 60th anniversary of the founding of Cumann na nGaedheal*". McDonald himself was to go on to become Environment Editor of the '*Irish Times*', until his retirement in 2015, and his autobiography, '*Truly Frank—A Dublin Memoir*', has been published this past October. His April 1983 report had continued:

"1983 also marks the 50th anniversary of the foundation of Fine Gael from an alliance between the old Centre Party, Cumann na nGaedheal and the Blueshirts, under General Eoin O'Duffy... The high point of the evening was the arrival of Mr James Dillon, leader of the Party from 1959 to 1965, who is remembered fondly for his wide-brimmed hats, his barbed wit and his powerful speeches in the Dáil and at the hustings. Not often seen in public these days, he was given a spontaneous standing ovation by his fellow party members."

But McDonald had made a judgement call at this juncture not to be "*truly frank*", and he declined to inform his '*Irish Times*' readers that the most rapturous applause received by Dillon at this 1983 Fine Gael celebration was when he declared:

"I want to recall with pride that we fought a desperate battle for the preservation of free speech in this country, and let it never be forgotten that we could not have won that battle but for the Blueshirts who helped us win it. And as they fought, they were fighting not for party but for democracy, and democracy won. No thanks to those who were opposed to it."

But, notwithstanding McDonald's reticence, the country as a whole heard the Blueshirt howls of rapture when RTE Radio News broadcast a recording of Dillon's proud boast. According to Dillon, Fine Gael's Fascist Blueshirts had saved Irish democracy from de Valera's Fianna Fáil. Not such a contradiction in reasoning as far as Dillon was concerned, even though it might defy logic for others. As Elizabeth Bowen was to note in '*Notes On Eire*', her first British Intelligence report dated 9th November 1940:

"Mr Dillon said that his fear for the world was, that we should be left, at the bitter end of this war, with the idea ('fallacy', Mr Dillon called it) that it was the *form* (EB put 'form' in italics) of government that mattered: Forms of government (said Mr Dillon) do not matter: all forms of government amount, in effect, to the same" (Aubane third edition, p 44).

It was the Blueshirt leader Eoin O'Duffy who became the founding President of Fine Gael, with James Dillon as one of his Vice-Presidents. In the Dáil debates on the *Wearing of Uniform (Restrictions) Bill*, one of the most coherent critiques of Fine Gael Blueshirt Fascism was delivered by Lemass, Dev's Minister for Industry and Commerce, on 28th February 1934, in response to the speech earlier in that day's debate by John A. Costello, the future Fine Gael Taoiseach, who had threatened:

"The Minister (for Justice) 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."

Lemass counter-argued:

"Legislation... is being introduced here, because as a post-war development there has been a tendency in many countries towards the militarisation of politics, which it is very necessary to arrest if democratic institutions are going to be preserved. We are in the very fortunate position that we have had vivid examples given us of the dangers of such developments. It is not a matter of speculation with us. We can see in many European countries this development of militarising of politics at its various stages, its incipient stages, its half-developed stages, and its complete stage. We can see them there. First of all one Party adopts a distinctive uniform. It does so on the pretext that it is necessary to organise some body in that way to protect the interests of its members, and they have always proclaimed that the uniformed body they organised was to be available to assist the forces of the State in the preservation of order."

"In making the claim that the Blueshirt organisation here had such a purpose, Deputies opposite were not original. They were merely conforming to the type of such organisations in all countries. That is the first stage. The second stage is the incitement of disorder, because the putting on of a distinctive uniform and the regimenting of the supporters of a political Party in a semi-military organisation has led to disorder in all countries. It is a fact that there is danger arising when it is possible easily to distinguish one's supporters and one's opponents. Deputies may pretend that there is no force in the argument put forward by the Attorney-General in that connection. There is very great force. Not merely does the wearing of a uniform promote in the mind of the individual wearing it a desire to support others in the same uniform in any action they take, whether that action is violent or peaceful, but the presence of such uniformed persons on the public streets seems, almost inevitably, to provoke extreme hostility among the opponents of that Party. That has been the experience not merely in this country but in Great Britain and in every European country. It is useless to pretend that only irresponsible supporters of Fianna Fáil react in that manner. The supporters of Fianna Fáil are no different in their make-up from the supporters of any other political Party in this State or in any other State... and in their reactions, they have been no different from the citizens of other countries..."

"I have traced the first and second stage in the development of militarism in politics. The third stage is the dangerous one when the opponents of the uniformed force decide to uniform themselves. I think that even Deputies opposite can see the danger that arises when that happens and is there any reason why it should not happen? If Deputies opposite insist that their constitutional rights entitle them to organise this semi-military and uniformed body, is there any reason why other political organisations in this State should

not exercise the same rights? And once that happens, civil war becomes almost inevitable. Once that happened in other countries, civil war happened. That is the next stage and the fourth stage can be seen in to-night's issue of the *'Evening Herald'* in the headlines 'Critical Day for Austria. Nazi Ultimatum to the Government Expires'. That is the next stage. Surely Deputies, with these examples before them, with these lessons to be learned from the contemporary history of other countries, are not hoping to get away with the very foolish contention that the sole reason behind this Bill is a desire on the part of the Government to prevent its opponents developing an efficient organisation?"

"These dangers have appeared and have caused concern to the Governments of Great Britain, of Belgium, of Holland, of Sweden, of Switzerland and of other countries, although in these countries there has been nothing approaching civil war for many centuries, although in these countries there has been stable government for many generations and although in these countries there is deep-rooted in the people a respect for the existing institutions and the existing forms. Here it is only a decade since there was a civil war that divided our people, and however great the dangers might be in Great Britain or elsewhere, the dangers here are ten times as great and that is the reason why it is all the more necessary for us to adopt here the same measures that more stable and longer established Governments have had to adopt to meet the same situation. I think it is true to say that the bitterness created by the civil war that took place here in 1922 has been more intense during the past six months than it was in 1924... Since the day they (Cumann na nGaedheal) quitted office here, they have been deliberately endeavouring to defeat the efforts of the Government to heal the wounds of the civil war; they have been deliberately trying to keep alive the hate and bitterness created in that period, because they believed it served their Party purposes, and even to-day they are trying to instil that bitterness and that hate into their children going to school so that the memory of the civil war will not die even with this generation. That is the greatest crime they have ever committed—a crime for which they do not deserve ever to be forgiven. That was not an accidental development. It was done by deliberate design, upon express instructions issued by the headquarters of their Party to their local branches throughout the country to put their children into their Party uniform, so that these divisions would be brought even into the schools..."

"The only information we have about the purposes of the military organisation that these Deputies are now associated with was obtained from speeches made by the leader of that organisation. He (Eoin O'Duffy) talked of dictatorship; he talked of the reform of the parliamentary institutions of this State; he talked of abolishing democratic Government and instituting a new system upon which the people would be allowed to express an opinion after it had been in existence for five years... He has made it

quite clear that Fascism of some kind is the type of political association he wants to establish in this State. Deputy Costello here to-day also made the same statement. He said the Blackshirts won in Italy; the Brownshirts won in Germany and the Blueshirts will win here in Ireland. That brings very forcibly before the Dáil another stage in the development of militarism in politics that I have not mentioned up to the present. I mentioned the first stage where political uniforms appear for the first time. The second stage where public disorder takes place; the third where an opposing uniformed force is organised and an attempt at civil war is created; the fourth, when one of these irregular private armies feels strong enough to dictate to the elected government as has taken place in Austria, and there is a fifth stage when one of these private armies succeeds in overthrowing the elected government and establishing itself in the position to dictate to the people of that country..."

The James Dillon of the 1930s was not only a Fascist, he was also a thoroughgoing Anti-Semite, who sought to exploit such prejudices in his opposition to Lemass's implementation of de Valera's policy of industrialisation. In vain did Lemass respond with the question "*if you have no clothing industry here, to whom are the woollen mills going to sell their cloth?*" when James Dillon railed in the Dáil as follows, on 27th October 1937:

"Any fly-by-night from Czechoslovakia, Great Britain or Yugoslavia can come here, provided he has got a name you cannot get your mouth around, and he will be nurtured and cherished by this Government, to the detriment and the ultimate destruction of people who were engaged in industry in this country before de Valera was heard of... (and) worth more than all the new industries, established by gentlemen with unpronounceable names, put together... I should like to have a list of the manufacturers of ladies' clothes in this country. I should like to get their names and I should like the Minister to try to pronounce them. He would choke before he would get through the list..."

Maurice Manning, Chancellor of the National University of Ireland, was a Fine Gael member of the Oireachtas for 21 years. In 2011, Fine Gael Taoiseach Enda Kenny appointed Manning as Chair of the Expert Advisory Group on Commemorations. His 1970 book, *'The Blueshirts'*, is a soft focus narrative which sought to minimise the Party's Fascism. In his 1999 book, *'James Dillon—A Biography'*, Manning acclaimed his Party's former leader: "*He adopted a singular stance on Irish neutrality during the war years, calling on the country to support the Allies against the Nazis' threat to democracy.*" Yet nowhere in his biography did Manning even allude to, not to mention going on to examine, Dillon's Anti-Semitism. Indeed, until recently, I believe my own article in the August 2009 issue of *'Irish Political Review'* stood alone in addressing it.

This October has, however, seen the publication of *'Irish Questions and Jewish Questions'*, edited by A. Beatty and D. O'Brien, which contains a very worthwhile essay, entitled *"Rethinking Irish Protectionism: Jewish Refugee Factories and the Pursuit of an Irish Ireland for Industry"*, to which I'll return in the final article in this series. Writing of the 1938 campaign against one such Jewish factory in Galway, author Trisha Oakley Kessler relates:

"Encouraged by leading Fine Gael politician James Dillon, Les Modes Modernes hats were boycotted by consumers and wholesalers, which placed the owners in a precarious financial position and challenged Fianna Fáil's investment in the factory as a flagship of its industrial policies" (p 119).

So, we can conclude with certainty that Les Modes Modernes did not supply Dillon's own wide-brimmed hats, as *"remembered fondly"* in Frank Mc Donald's 1983 report.

"Notes On Eire" was the heading of the first wartime British espionage report from Anglo-Irish writer Elizabeth Bowen in July 1940, and the title of the compilation of such reports first published by the Aubane Historical Society in 1999, which saw a third edition in 2009. As Brendan Clifford commented in the latter:

"When Elizabeth Bowen ferreted out the fascist and the pro-British tendencies in 1940, she found that the two were one. James Dillon was the only major politician in the Dáil who wanted to make war on Germany in alliance with Britain, and she judged him to be a fascist" (p 98).

And in his 1999 Introduction to the first edition, Jack Lane had noted:

"People like James Dillon were mortified when they learned, long after the War, that intimate conversations held in apparent friendship had been reported back to the British State, and that they had been courted for ulterior motives. Like all spies, Bowen basically despised those she spied on, and made that clear towards the end of her life (she died in February 1973) when she told Hubert Butler that she hated Ireland, and said so with a vehemence that shocked him and his wife. Butler, being a gentleman, put it down to her illness, but if he had known of her spying, he would no doubt have taken a very different view" (p 10).

There are, of course, several Irish academic historians and pundits who wish to make a virtue of Dillon's pro-British opposition to Irish wartime neutrality. Such is the case with Brian Girvin's 2006 book *'The Emergency'*, wherein he related:

"James Dillon had broken with neutrality ... in a surprise speech at the Fine Gael Ard Fheis in February 1942. This was in response to American entry into the war and according to Bowen, who was present,

had the impact of a bomb exploding among the delegates. Dillon wanted Ireland to end its neutrality and openly support Britain and the United States against Germany..." (p 242).

And in his concluding chapter Girvin fully concurred: *"The position taken by James Dillon in 1942... was the policy most likely to fulfil most if not all of the objectives of national policy..."* (p 324). But, when he himself had quoted from Bowen's report of 9th November 1940 (p 168), it was more than a little disingenuous for Girvin to stop short from even alluding to the following observations in that same report regarding Dillon:

"He holds some views which even I distrust, and which are abhorrent to many Irish people whose integrity I respect... I have heard Mr. Dillon labelled a Fascist—which I am afraid is at least partly true" (Aubane third edition, pp 43-44).

Yet, comprehensive and all as was that Intelligence report of November 9th, recording conversations with so many diverse sources of information and opinion, it ended on a very unsatisfactory note. Tacked on, almost as an afterthought, was a final short paragraph: *"I noticed that anti-Semitism in Eire is considerably on the increase. It is said to arise from business jealousy—plus the inevitable results of campaigns abroad. It has ugly manifestations in the business world"* (p 45). But, on this issue, Bowen pulled back from naming names, even though Dillon should have been cited as the prime candidate.

On 31st July 1942, Bowen further reported on a conversation with Dillon concerning *"another of his anti-neutrality speeches in the Dáil"* on July 16th:

"Mr de Valera, he said, made no reply or comment, and did not once, while Mr Dillon was speaking, raise his head from his hands. I must observe, however, that from my own attendance at the Dáil I formed the impression that this attitude of Mr de Valera's, during any ('any' in italics) debate, is habitual. He remains with his head supported inside his hands, his fingers laced over his forehead. The attitude implies intellectual weariness, and the very barest degree of tolerance exercised towards most of the speakers... and their inability to keep to the point... Some were barely audible... General opinion has it that Mr Dillon has still, in the country, very little support. The reputation of being a warmonger clings to him" (pp 63-64).

Brian Girvin's back cover blurb claims that his book *"vividly tells the story of what in Ireland is known as 'The Emergency' but elsewhere as the Second World War"*. But that same Bowen report gave the lie to such a Girvin claim. It was very much called *the*

War here, as Bowen related:

"The prominence given to war news in in 'The Irish Press' (the official Government paper) might support the Cosgravite contention that the Government is exploiting the people's interest in 'foreign generals and soldiers on fields thousands of miles away', in order to distract attention from... affairs at home" (p 63).

While Bowen did not mention Lemass by name, her detailed reports had section headings covering his areas of responsibility as wartime Minister for Supplies, namely: Supply Difficulties, Economic Fears, Transport, Clothes, Rationing etc. She recognised the reality of the sovereignty that de Valera and Lemass had achieved since coming to power, which it would be foolish of Churchill to underestimate:

"It may be felt in England that Eire is making a fetish of her neutrality. But this assertion of her neutrality is Eire's first *free* self-assertion... Eire (and I think rightly) sees her neutrality as positive, not merely negative... In fact there is truth in Mr de Valera's contention. It would be more than hardship, it would be sheer disaster for this country, in its present growing stages, and with its uncertain morals, to be involved in war" (p 37).

In his 1997 biography, *'Seán Lemass—Enigmatic Patriot'*, John Horgan was to write of him following the conclusion of World War Two:

"He objected to an extremely modest proposal from the the Department of External Affairs that Ireland should take about 250 Jewish refugees from the Continent, giving high unemployment as his reason. De Valera, on this issue, was considerably more forceful, urging that Ireland might eventually find homes for up to ten thousand, although in the event no more than 925 were admitted in the five years to 1950, half of these already having connections of some sort with Ireland. It is difficult, however, to infer hard-heartedness on Lemass's part, as he evidently thought that the more practical approach was to tackle the problem of food supplies to Europe's starving refugees, a problem that he approached with his customary vigour after the war ended and at a time when shortages were still common in Ireland... Some at least of his critics were not convinced that he had done the right thing. 'You let the Jews in', one political opponent charged in 1950 in the course of a bitter Dáil exchange. (9 March 1950). And many years later (in April 1963) an anonymous British Foreign Office official, drawing up a profile of Lemass in advance of trade negotiations, remarked that he was rumoured to be of Jewish origin and that 'his appearance does not belie this fact'..." (p 125).

Although of French Huguenot, and not of Jewish descent, Lemass was undoubtedly targeted by those with anti-Semitic agendas. The anti-Semitic TD quoted, but left unnamed

by Horgan, was John O'Leary of the Labour Party. But it is strange that no other writer, bar myself in the August 2009 issue of *Irish Political Review*, has ever seen fit to highlight the fact that the most prestigious opponent of the Dev/Lemass provision of food supplies to Holocaust survivors had been James Dillon. Following the death of de Valera, the *Irish Times* would report on 2nd September 1975:

"The Chief Rabbi of the Jewish community in Ireland, the Very Rev. Dr. Isaac Cohen, last night at a memorial service in the synagogue in Adelaide Road, Dublin, recalled the late Mr. de Valera's deep personal sorrow and concern at the suffering of the Jews in Europe in the second World War... They also remembered that, at the very earliest opportunity after the War, his Government had made a generous gift of one million tons of Irish meat as a gift to the survivors of inhuman Nazi concentration camps."

In the Dáil debates on 13th February 1947, however, Dillon had denounced that de Valera's gift of meat to Holocaust survivors, as he bombastically harangued the Minister for Agriculture, Jim Ryan. Mr. Dillon:

"Has the Minister's attention been drawn to the statement which appeared in the *New York Times* of <file://localhost/x-apple-data-detectors/6Thursday, February 6file://localhost/x-apple-data-detectors/6th>, headed 'Dublin' and which goes on: 'The Irish Government is preparing to ship 10,000,000 lb. of kosher meat to Europe for distribution among Jewish displaced persons'... How much of this meat is going to Europe in the form of kosher meat?"

And, two months later, on 16th April 1947, Dillon continued to harass Dev himself in the same matter when he asked de Valera—

"whether his attention has been drawn to a series of articles appearing in the American Press... whether he is aware that, in the *Denver Register* it is alleged... that 10,000,000 lb. of kosher meat was being shipped to Europe from this country, for distribution among Jewish displaced persons, at a cost of about \$3,000,000..."

Bowen's wartime confidant had certainly not changed his spots. He revealed himself, in the immediate aftermath of the Holocaust, to be more anti-Semitic than ever before.

'*Love's Civil War*' is the title of the 2009 book, edited by Victoria Glendinning, of diary entries and letters exchanged between Elizabeth Bowen and Charles Ritchie, who had become her lover when wartime Private Secretary to the Canadian High Commissioner in London, while she also maintained her marriage with Alan Cameron. With Ritchie back in Canada by war's end, Bowen wrote to him from London on 8th May 1945:

"On a monster scale it (VE day—the end of the War in Europe) was like an experience in love. Everything, physically—beginning and ending with the smell of sweat, so strong and so everywhere that it travelled all through this house by the open windows—was against exultation and yet it happened... (She and husband Alan walked to Westminster Abbey)... As you know, I do in general loathe Demos. I don't think anyone has less warm feelings or fewer illusions than I have. But after a 'crise' (which happened quite early on) of hysterical revulsion and tiredness, I passed beyond and became entered by a rather sublime feeling" (pp 44-45).

While Bowen happened to have been born in Dublin, she would never, of course, have stooped to express herself in Dublinese, where '*demos*' is the term used as shorthand for protest demonstrations. As Glendinning helpfully explained in a footnote, Bowen used the Greek word '*Demos*' to denote what she regarded as "*common people en masse*".

On June 26th, she reported again from her London home, following a visit to her Inherited Bowen's Court family residence in Cork, and she offered Ritchie the following observations on politics in de Valera's Ireland:

"In Dublin on my way back, spent a long afternoon in the Dail, listening as closely as possible to the proceedings, but unfortunately they are almost inaudible. I should be prepared to bet that, as to length, 'longue haleine' ('long-winded'—MOR), the TDs outdo South Americans. But no baroque eloquence there. As a matter of fact, the virtue of most speakers, there, is that though flat-footed, long-winded, styleless, and absolutely without apprehensions as to boring their fellows—they are admirably concrete. Our new President, Sean T O'Kelly, is apparently rather a lamb: just every bit as much of a comic as he looks, and immensely bonhomous. No fool, and bon viveur (rare in middle-class Ireland)... His wife was 'one of the clever Ryans'. Sir John Maffey (Britain's first High Commissioner to the Irish Free State 1939-49—MOR), sensitive in these matters, says she lacks feminine charm" (p 50).

But, as regards British politics and the imminent General Election, she commented:

"I have only been back about 4 days... Electioneering seems to be getting more and more idiotic on all sides: at intervals loud-speaker vans dash round the park. I have had my bluff called by a Liberal candidate having cropped up at the last moment. I suppose I shall have to support this lost cause. I always have gone about blowing off and saying I was a Liberal... Alan says he is going to vote Labour because the Labour candidate is a woman.

I ask him whether he wants this country run by Jews and Welshmen? I am afraid these are the only Election angles I am able to give you."

By way of an explanation of Bowen's ethnic antipathies, Glendinning offered:

"The General Election... resulted in the ousting of Churchill and the Conservatives, with the first Labour government ever to have a clear majority coming to power... Jewish intellectuals have tended to be Labour supporters, and several (such as Maurice Edelman, Ian Mikardo) entered Parliament as new MPs in 1945. Aneurin Bevan, Attlee's Minister of Health, was a Welshman" (pp 50-52).

On July 29th, Bowen castigated the Tories for their inept campaign:

"Keeping on telling the people Churchill had won the war for them. Of course he had, but it was not the thing to say... The people are firmly convinced that they won the war. Ma by standing in the fish queues, little Herbert by helping with the fire-watching. It now seems clear that their voting was a reflex of indignation at being told anything to the contrary... Personally, selfishly, I am feeling what a terrific advantage it is to be Anglo-Irish. I mean, to belong to a class, that potted at by the Irish and sold out by the British, has made an art of maintaining its position in vacuo... If there is any aspect of Red England you are particularly interested in, do ask me, and I'll employ my well-known faculties for espionage. I have woken up from my melancholia, to a degree, at any rate; and am feeling more ginned up and observant. Ought you not to come over and observe the changed face of England for yourself? Nobody could give Ottawa a more valuable report than you."

At which point, Victoria Glendinning again helpfully explained:

"She travelled frequently to neutral Ireland during the war to collect intelligence from her professional and political friends in Dublin, without their knowledge, and reported back to Ministry of Information in London" (pp 53-55 and 25).

From Bowen's Court she wrote on August 24th:

"I have been feeling desperately aggressive and disaffected... I can't dis-obsess myself from the feeling that democracy has celebrated its victory by being had for a mutt in a big way. The smug blah being talked in England, inside and outside Parliament, was beginning to make me quite ill. I know that at least 20% of these people (Left-wing people and the new Labour government—VG) are All Right... But the few good ones have this awful entourage of the sissy, the half-baked... the people with the chips on their shoulder, the people who've never made any grade and are convinced that it must be grade's fault. VJ Day (Victory in Japan—15 Aug 1945—VG) meant nothing... Violent anti-Yank demonstrations in Piccadilly, etc... And there was a majority guilt-feeling (wrong, I think)

about the atomic bomb. (The nuclear bomb was dropped on Hiroshima on 6 August 1945, and on Nagasaki on 9 August- VG)."

"So you see it was high time to be here. I stare at the outside of this house and think my ancestors didn't care a damn about English politics, and how right they were. This country, come back to, seems very amiable and good and sweet (in the sense one speaks of air being sweet). Quite illicitly—I mean, in view of their having been neutrals—everybody is enjoying peace madly; going about with shining and beaming faces. In fact the Irish are the only people I have met so far who really are getting 100% kick out of world peace. They also remark with justifiable smugness that they always knew this war would end up in Bolshevism, and they are gladder than ever they kept out of it" (pp 56-57).

Whatever about her ancestors, and notwithstanding her own protestations to the contrary, the problem for Bowen herself was that she cared very much indeed about English politics, and was horrified that what she regarded as something akin to Bolshevism had won out in England itself. And that is why she had taken refuge in Bowen's Court, away from such an outcome.

Three years later, on 13th May 1948, she wrote:

"There is, for the first time, a slight whisky shortage over here. The Duke of Westminster is said to have sent out, during his months here, and bought up practically all the whisky in these southern counties. If the Windsors (ex-King Edward VIII and his wife—MOR), as has been rumoured, are also to join us, I suppose there will not be a drop of anything left. I hope we shall not have too ('too' underlined by EB) many of these rich refugees from red England—I have always liked, in this country, rambling along in one's own shabby and seedy way; and I should hate the whole place to go Kenya-type smart" (p 122).

Yet again, Glendinning helpfully explained:

"With the Labour Party in government, some wealthy and right-wing English people moved to Ireland, fearful of high taxation and the march of democracy, and seeing Ireland as providing fine country houses, plentiful domestic help, and a 'traditional' way of life. This was known as the 'flight from Moscow'. The Duke and Duchess of Windsor did not move to Ireland. Kenya was, notoriously, another playground for the rich English."

But back again to 1945, when Bowen wrote on that November 18th:

"I found the enclosed extraordinary letter from Shaya (the Oxford don and political philosopher, Sir Isaiah Berlin). I suppose that—in view of his 'burn this, burn this, destroy this'—I ought not to be sending it on... Though one never forgets that Shaya is a Jew, I suppose I had rather forgotten that Shaya is a Russian Jew... I shall very much like to know what you think of this letter. I suppose you had either burn it; or better,

keep it locked up and give it back to me some day... There certainly would be a breach if he knew that I'd sent it on... I also feel guilty because his whole letter is inspired by a misapprehension—I know I never said, in any way that 'Pravda' could have got hold of, that I wanted more Russian works to be translated..."

"With the beginning of the hunting, Co. Cork has woken up from its long summer sleep, houses (i.e. Anglo-Irish houses—MOR) that were empty are being opened, and men just out of the (British—MOR) army are rushing about doing things about their horses. It's like a scene out of 'War and Peace'—they might really be coming back after the Napoleonic wars—pretty women in 1938 evening dresses sitting round them in groups in lamplit drawing-rooms, hanging on their words. It's being like that in your ('your' underlined by EB) country, I hope and expect. And, of course, both the Anglo-Irish and the Canadians have the distinction of being voluntary fighters, with the old gallant surround. Certainly, they are both luckier, now, than the young men coming back to England—to tired women, long tales of civilian suffering and, in so many cases, no homes at all. It's desperate (word underlined by EB) for the English. I'm beginning—anyhow at this safe distance—to have a renewed, emergency, 1940 fondness for them" (pp 76-77).

A week later, on November 26th, Bowen described a trip to Dublin to Ritchie:

"I saw a lot of people, was shown a beautiful private collection of old Irish silver belonging to a German Jew, went to the museum to look at more silver... and bought some clothes... much nicer than they now have in London... A tremendous blinding white fog... came... In the middle of it I picked my way along the Merrion Square railings to 50 Upper Mount Street (Office of 'the United Kingdom Representative to Eire'—MOR), as I was going to meet Sir John Maffey there and drive with him out to his house... for lunch. The British Representative's office was in the grip of a diplomatic crisis because of the fog. Sir John buoyantly determined to drive out to Dundrum, come what might, and his two detectives (who look the most awful thugs) dissuading him... So we filed to the club through the blind fog, preceded by the detectives who attempted by fanning movements to disperse the fog ahead of Sir John. They also when we had to cross streets uttered foghorn-like noises. Certainly if British Representatives had been knocked into by a bicycle it would look like an incident" (pp 78-79).

And that, dear reader, was the closest to any comment from Bowen to Ritchie on the Irish political society of de Valera and Lemass, and the very last one, in the 1945-1958 years she took up residence at her

Bowen's Court home in Cork. If anything underlined how much a spy she had been during the War years themselves it was this contrast. She had no instinctive interest in the politics of the land of her birth while living in the country. Her intense interest in 1940-45 had been out of a sense of British patriotic duty. The fact that de Valera would be defeated in both the 1948 and 1954 General Elections, and that her wartime confidant James Dillon would become a Minister in both victorious Inter-Party Governments, were matters of supreme indifference to her, not worthy of a comment to Ritchie.

So, Bowen had certainly not become anymore Irish in her 'escape' from what she abhorred as 'Red' or 'Bolshevist' or 'Jewish' about the British Labour Party now governing her beloved England, Victoria Glendinning had previously related Bowen's relationship with Ritchie in her biography, *Elizabeth Bowen—Portrait of a Writer* (1977), where she also quoted the judgement made by the Sligo Republican artist, Jack B. Yeats, no less a Protestant than Bowen herself, but possessing a very different sense of national identity:

"The relationship of each with London, with England, was not so very different—he as an Anglo-Canadian, she as an Anglo-Irishwoman. Elizabeth's feelings for England were coloured always by the slightly romantic strangeness of its not being her native land; she could have used Charles's words about himself for herself—he saw, he said, things in England as 'an outsider-insider—one immersed from boyhood in English life but not an Englishman'. They had both been brought up within tight social groups that looked to England as the source of what was best and right and worth fighting for. For even though Charles's family had been in Nova Scotia for four or five generations (Elizabeth's had been in Co Cork for even longer), 'the devotion to Crown and Empire was a romantic fidelity, quite different from the satisfied acceptance of the English by themselves as English'. The Bowens' devotion to England had not in general been so intense or romantic; but the same condition prevailed for the Bowens, not belonging properly to the country of birth, separated by religion and interest and the walls of the demesne from the rest of Ireland. When Elizabeth was taken by Terence de Vere White (who would become VG's husband—MOR) in 1947 to see the painter Jack Yeats in his studio, it was not a success... Yeats's comment was: 'The English who settled in Cork remained English. They liked it because it seemed like a part of England. She was afraid I'd expect her to buy a picture.' A strange thing to say of a member of a family who had owned land in Cork and lived continuously on it for three hundred years. But that is how it was" (1993 edition, p 138).

Yes, indeed, that's how it was. Yet, in

reality, it was not so strange. In his diary entry of 27th July 1958, Ritchie lamented: "*E writes that she must sell B Court. I feel as if my home was going—the other home I have had since The Bower (the Ritchie family home in Halifax, Nova Scotia) sold*" (Letters, p 314). But, a year later, Bowen had once again become upbeat about England. It was England's politics that concerned her. Indeed, there had been tensions between herself and Ritchie on that score in 1956, as he recorded that November 13th:

"We agreed that a crisis suits us. Perhaps, but not THIS crisis—it's too embarrassing. I hate being in London at a time when so much is at stake and not being at one with the Londoners. I feel an outsider and I am haunted by memories of 1940 when I felt such a complete identity with London."

Glendinning explained:

"The Suez crisis—on November 5 British and French assault troops landed in Port Said with the intention of retaking the Suez Canal from Egypt. The governments of the US and Canada, Britain's natural allies, were appalled. In the UN, Lester Pearson (Ritchie's personal friend —MOR), then Canada's Minister of External Affairs, pressed through a resolution to send a force to the area on the withdrawal of the British and French... EB argued that one should back one's friends, whether they were right or wrong" (p 251).

Under Harold Macmillan's Tory Government, however, he could tell Britons: "*You've never had it so good!*" And Bowen agreed. On 1st August 1959, she enthused to Ritchie:

"Charles, I can't tell you how lovely (word underlined by EB) London is looking. It's completely knocked me flat—I've fallen in love with it all over again!" (p 326).

And again, on August 16th:

"It's being pleasant to be in England now, it's v good policy, I realized. It was time I 'showed', and I'm awfully touched by the tremendous welcome back everybody has given me... I like this new, rather flashy, robber-baronish, up-and-coming England, and feel well able for it. I think really I had become panicked by the decay and depression and dishevelment of those immediately post-war years in London: my one idea was to barricade myself into Bowen's Court as far as possible from the hideous scene. But now the scene has changed, or is at least very rapidly changing" (p 329).

But there would again be for Bowen a disagreeable interlude when the 1964 General Election returned a Labour Government headed by Harold Wilson. And when it came to the defiance of the Wilson Government by Ian Smith, the White supremacist Prime Minister of Rhodesia (1964-79), who was to pronounce that "*never in a thousand years*" would that country see rule by its African majority, and

who would issue his own "*Unilateral Declaration of Independence*" to try and prevent any such outcome, Glendinning's biography of Bowen revealed that—

"she was, she told Jean Black in 1965, 'very pro-Rhodesian; I mean, Smith-Rhodesian. They may be foolhardy, but they're brave; and why should (EB's italics for 'should') they be pushed around by people who don't understand their problems' ..." (p 231).

A manifestation of "*Bowen's blood will out*" identification with "*kith and kin*"!

Bowen had fled what she regarded as the Hell of a "Red England" run by the "Jews and Welshmen" of the Attlee Labour Governments of 1945-51. By comparison, she endured the Wilson Labour Governments of 1964-70 as more akin to a Purgatory, if I do not cause offence by borrowing a Roman Catholic metaphor.

But she was concerned with how her Queen was having to endure it. In May 1967, Bowen's lover Charles Ritchie was appointed Canadian High Commissioner to the United Kingdom. Commenting on a weekend that Ritchie had spent with the Royal family at Balmoral, accompanied by the Prime Minister, Bowen wrote on 22nd September 1969:

"I hope ('hope' underlined) Mr Wilson didn't interfere, that horror, between your Royal Mistress and you. I've been thinking about you so much up there (Scotland) during this last week-end" (Letters, p456).

Glendinning's biography further recorded how Bowen was glad to see the back of Wilson's Government. In September 1970 she wrote to Bill Koshland in New York:

"One immensely cheering-up factor in this country has been the change of government. I always have thought the world of Edward Heath. The idea (up to last June) of a possible further (EB's italics for 'further') five years of that dreary Labour Government had become a nightmare" (p 231).

But, while Bowen had nothing to say to Ritchie about Irish domestic politics, her correspondence on another topic helps resolve the mystery about that one gap in her wartime reporting on James Dillon. Bowen was one of those who could in all honesty say: "*Some of my best friends are Jews*". Sir Isaiah Berlin was to the fore, and of another Glendinning wrote: "*Marshall Berland became and remained a devoted friend to both EB and CR*" (p 301). But encountering Jewish people in large numbers seemed to unnerve her. On 6th November 1962, she wrote of a stay in New York:

"Marshall has been very kind... (and

took me shopping at Orbach's... (With the exception of the 6th floor's Oval Room) all the other floors are a great surging sea of Jewesses, young, old, good, bad or indifferent, beautiful or god-forsaken, dashing about, shopping. Literally millions of them, I thought, whizzing up and down on the escalators, too. I don't think I saw a Gentile in the place, other than myself" (p 402).

Yet of the "*very kind*" Berland himself, Bowen could also write on 29th September 1964, when reporting to Ritchie on a visit he had just paid her:

"For quite a bit of the time he was very pleasant company; a dear nice affectionate and rather touching creature... But he also... has a side... at intervals—brash, smug. The awful thing is, being with him has (sometimes) made me see for the first time how and why people can ('can' underlined) hate Jews. A sort of crassness? In fact more than that, a sort of hell-bent stupidity. God forgive me for saying so, but he's so greedy. Feeding him became a nightmare; it was like entertaining a cormorant" (pp 429-30).

But it was not "*for the first time*" that she had so reacted to Berland. Six and half years previously, it was also her first reaction, as she had written to Ritchie from the University of Wisconsin on 10th March 1958:

"The leading bright boy, or at any rate the most pushing, is inevitably a Jew—Mr Marshall Berland. I must say I do see why Jews get themselves hated—always there ('there' underlined) slightly before anyone else" (p 301).

Perhaps the reason why Bowen did not report on James Dillon's Anti-Semitism in her wartime '*Notes On Eire*' was that she had found it either unremarkable or unobjectionable.

Bowen had not displayed the slightest interest in Irish domestic politics during the post-War de Valera era years of 1946 to 1958, while she dwelt amongst us, But Bowen was to have an indirect relationship with respect to Irish foreign policy during the post-Dev Lemass era, through her lover's association with a 'diplomatic' plot to undermine Ireland's Minister for External Affairs, Frank Aiken, by going over his head to Lemass. Ah yes, there have always been those anxious to run down Aiken by extolling Lemass. In a hymn of praise to German Chancellor Angela Merkel in the '*Sunday Independent*' this past November 4th, Eoghan Harris hailed her deployment of German troops in external conflicts, and gratuitously had some sideswipes in an attempt to settle some of his own scores with Irish history:

"She has no time for the amoral neutralist posturing we have loved since Frank Aiken's era at External Affairs... and she deserves a standing ovation from all Europeans for defending the elusive political value George

Orwell called 'decency'... Sean Lemass showed the same clear-eyed balance when he said: 'If the Irish people have a fault, it's a tendency to feel sorry for ourselves.' Hard to imagine current politicians, or public intellectuals, having the humility to tell us that current wallowing in past victimhood is poisoning the national psyche."

In 1961, Conor Cruise O'Brien was still living out the anti-Imperialist phase of his chequered career, and was the Irish public servant in charge of UN operations in Katanga, whose secession from the Congo had been inspired and backed by the combined interests of Belgian, French and British Imperialism. O'Brien has, in my opinion, been very accurately portrayed in the 2016 film *'Siege of Jadotville'*, and his own 1962/65 account, *'To Katanga and Back'*, needs to be balanced by other sources (See www.independent.ie/irish-news/the-lethal-struggle-in-katanga-was-not-obriens-finest-hour-35116549.html for "*The lethal struggle in Katanga was not O'Brien's finest hour*", by Michael Kennedy.)

It cannot, however, be denied that British Imperialism was out for the Cruiser's scalp at that juncture. And Bowen's lover, Ritchie, played a leading role in the Empire's pincer-movement against him. O'Brien related how, on 14th November 1961, he had been summoned to New York for a UN Security Council debate on Katanga, along with General McKeown, Irish commander of the UN troops in that province:

"A prominent UN personality, a close and longstanding acquaintance of mine, hereinafter called Pulp, invited General McKeown to dinner on the night of our arrival, for a discussion of the Congo situation. The other guests were Sir Patrick Dean, Permanent Representative of Great Britain, Mr Charles Ritchie, Permanent Representative of Canada, and (the UN's) Dr Bunche. 'I hope you won't mind my not asking Conor', said Pulp to General McKeown, 'but he's not quite the right colour.'... Pulp's opinion was a sound one... Pulp recorded the prevailing wind (from UN HQ) on the East River. And the wind was blowing from a point somewhere between Mr Charles Ritchie and Sir Patrick Dean. I turned up my collar... The spotlight was on me and a section of the British Press, in particular, would, on a signal or even without one, give me the full treatment... I found myself in the jaws of a pincer-movement. Sir Patrick Dean's disciplined divisions had long been doggedly pressing on my right flank and now, on the left, over the brow of the hill, I could hear the noisy vanguard of Lord Beaverbrook's uncouth but formidable columns. What to do?... The thing to do now was to extricate myself with all speed, and with the honours of war, from the Dean-Beaverbrook convergence... One cannot, as a member of the foreign service of a small and friendly country, go round publicly denouncing the British Government. To permit oneself that luxury one has to become a private

To page 6

Fr. Michael O'Flanagan and the 1916 Rising

Writing of Sinn Féin and its victory in the December 1918 general election, Fintan O'Toole writes: "Its leading propagandist, Fr Michael O'Flanagan, had strongly opposed the Rising and allegedly referred to those who took part as 'murderers'" ("The 1918 election was an amazing moment for Ireland", December 8th).

In his 2004 book, *The Transformation of Ireland 1900-2000*, Diarmaid Ferriter had previously maintained: "Mrs Tom Barry's statement to the Bureau of Military History recorded that at the time of the Rising in 1916, Fr Michael O'Flanagan, later vice-president of Sinn Féin, had remarked of the fighters in the General Post Office, 'let these people burn to death, they are murderers'."

Mrs. Barry had indeed named the 1916 Easter Week curate at Dublin's pro-cathedral as a "Father Michael O'Flanagan", who was at that time a parish curate in his native Roscommon, and already a public figure and member of the Sinn Féin executive.

She had, however, two decades after the Rising, inaccurately recalled the name of the pro-cathedral curate she then encountered.

For he was neither a Michael nor an O'Flanagan, but a Fr. John Flanagan. In his 1964 book *The Easter Rebellion*, Max Caulfield related how Fr. John went on to serve as an "unofficial chaplain" to the GPO garrison, and the curate's own account would be reproduced by Keith Jeffrey in his 2006 book, *The GPO and the Easter Rising*.

When Cathal Brugha presided over the inaugural meeting of Dáil Éireann on January 21st, 1919, he hailed Fr. Michael O'Flanagan as "the staunchest priest who ever lived in Ireland". But mud sticks. It is now high time for all concerned to remove the slur cast on Fr O'Flanagan's character.

Manus O'Riordan

[*Irish Times*, 17th December:
letter submitted 8th December]

MANUS O'RIORDAN COMMENTS—

The letter, as published, was not as submitted—presumably to leave no blemish on the research and analytical reputation of star *Irish Times* columnist, Diarmaid Ferriter, Professor of History at University College Dublin, and, quite wrongly, to 'finger' instead the 1916 Rising and War of Independence veteran, Mrs. Tom Barry (Leslie Price) for the slur on the character of the Republican Michael O'Flanagan. For the letter, as published, had been editorially doctored to remove a key clause, exonerating her for being responsible for that slur, from the letter as originally submitted:

"Mrs Barry had indeed named the 1916 Easter Week curate at Dublin's Pro-Cathedral as a 'Father Michael O'Flanagan', but she herself was in no way responsible for confusing him with the Father Michael O'Flanagan who was at that time a parish curate in his native Roscommon, and already a public figure and member of the Sinn Féin Executive."

The concluding sentence of the letter was also editorially doctored to absolve the professional historian of failure to get the historical facts right. For, that concluding sentence, as submitted, had actually read: "*It is now high time for all concerned to remove the slur cast on O'Flanagan's character by an inaccurate historical narrative.*"

See <http://carrowkeel.com/frof/traduced.html> for the critique of Ferriter carried over twelve years ago in the July 2006 issue of this magazine.

FIRST DÁIL CENTENARY LECTURE ON MICHAEL O'FLANAGAN

On Tuesday, January 22, at 8 pm,

just one day after the centenary of the
inaugural meeting of the First Dáil,
where Fr. O'Flanagan had recited the opening invocation,
a commemorative lecture entitled

*"The Staunchest Priest Who Ever Lived In Ireland
—The Story Of Fr Michael O'Flanagan"*,

will be delivered by **Manus O'Riordan** at the

Howth Angling Centre,

under the auspices of the

Howth Peninsula Heritage Society.

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

BUDGET 2019

The State Budget for 2019 introduced by Minister for Finance, Pascal Donoghue TD, Fine Gael, on 9th October 2018 did not introduce any big changes to the tax rates or to the general burden of taxation. A few things do stick out as obvious unfairness perpetrated on certain classes of taxpayers.

One such was the Tax Credit given, quite properly to PAYE taxpayers amounting to €1,650, which has been continued for 2019, but very unfairly the tax credits for self-employed taxpayers and for proprietary directors of limited companies is just €1,350.

The continuing unfairness of this difference is all the more marked when the taxpayer receiving the higher Tax Credit is not obliged to make any return to the Revenue Commissioners whereas all the burdens of form-filling has to be borne by the self-employed taxpayer.

It is the legal duty of the self-employed taxpayer to collect and remit to the Revenue not only his/her own taxes but the taxes of employees also and in addition has to collect and pay VAT to the Revenue Commissioners.

Not only that, but the self-employed taxpayer is subject to very stringent penalties for any delays or even for accidental failure to accurately account to the Revenue for these various taxes.

Originally the PAYE Tax Credit was introduced at the demand of Public Service Trade Unions. However, the self-employed have no Trade Union. Most of the jobs in Ireland are created by employers who are self-employed or are proprietary directors of limited companies. The State is shooting itself in the foot by continuing this discrimination.

Another 'shooting-in-the-foot' is the rate of Capital Gains Tax which is 33% for most capital gains. This is an elective tax, in so far as a person does not have to sell land or a building unless that person wants to do so. And when the sale draws down a tax of 33%, who wants to sell? And so the supply of building land is inadequate. And, surprise, surprise—33% of nothing is the result.

Minister Donoghue would raise far

more in Capital Gains Tax if the rate was 15% or 20% because much more land would be sold and more houses could be built which would also increase the PAYE and VAT taxes involved in building works. This is not rocket science. The present CGT rate of 33% does not stack up.

Another item in the Budget for 2019 which does not stack up is the continuation of Benefit-in-kind exemption for electric cars provided by an employer to an employee. All other Benefits-in-kind are taxed as remuneration, but not electric cars. Why should electric cars receive such favourable treatment? Why indeed? It takes undue influence of considerable magnitude to get this sort of favourable commercial treatment into a Finance Act.

Electric cars run on electricity which is not green. Electricity in Ireland is generated mostly from burning fossil fuels such as coal, oil, gas and turf. It is not at all as clean as a car powered by a diesel engine. Diesel engines have been proved to be the most efficient use of energy for transport, no matter what the propaganda tells us.

The production of electricity for driving electric cars is a dirty business, as is the industrial scale production of electricity everywhere. Also electric cars are made of steel, aluminium or plastic—and the production of each of which is a dirty industrial process and damaging to the local environments in which the production takes place. The very specialised batteries and electronic components in electric cars draw heavily upon mining activities in Afghanistan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and other such countries where precious metals and minerals are extracted in labour conditions away below the slave conditions, in many cases, of former times.

And so, between the environmental impact and the impact on human suffering, electric cars are very dirty in their production and in the source of their electricity, even though the cars look so clean and beautiful at point of use. They are just another example of the wealthier section of the world's population living graciously at the expense of heartbreaking grinding poverty of the poorer people in the world.

ACADEMIC INDEPENDENCE?

When I am mediating on the relentless and inexorable promotion, throughout the media of communication, of whatever is the latest—be it electric cars, climate change, gender politics, social media, etc—a heavy part of such promotions will be receiving backing from so-called academic experts in such and such a

University. These experts are almost all in favour of the latest thing to be promoted and almost all of them will avoid mention of any negative aspects of anything.

These academic practices are closely related to the funding of universities and the grant-aiding of individual post-graduate students.

Advancement in university administration staff is now dependent on an individual's ability to attract funding to the university. At faculty level, professorships are awarded to those academics who associate themselves or their work with wealthy, usually corporate, sponsors of an university. On the other hand, it is well known in academia that a post-graduate student who is pursuing and studying for a doctorate will not be awarded the degree if the student's thesis tends to reveal a truth contrary to the interests of particular financial sponsors.

Academic independence is now a relative independence. Relative, that is, to the financiers of the university. The custom of corporate entities sponsoring academic activities seems to have started in the USA and then spread slowly to the UK universities. Now, however, sponsorship and grant-aiding by commercial companies is widespread and rampant in Ireland. This is so with the connivance of the Irish State which sees commercial sponsorship as a substitute for proper adequate funding of 'Higher Education'.

There is a resulting loss of control over the syllabus in every department of our universities. One example that jumps immediately to mind is the endowment of 'The Bank of Ireland' Chair of "Contemporary Irish History" at Trinity College, Dublin—taken up by Professor Eunan O'Halpin.

There is also the example of heavy expenditure over the years since World War 2 by the British Council, the British Embassy and other British organisations, thus ensuring that the syllabus for BA degrees in English are overwhelmingly laden with British writers, poets and literary critics—even though there is an enormous and worthy body of Irish-based Literature in the English language.

There are also huge bodies of Russian, French, Spanish, Italian and American literary works available but these are all neglected in favour of English-based authors. This imbalance went so far in the past twenty years that the British Council funding can ease off now, because many of those now in Professorships and Lectureships in Irish Universities, whose salaries are paid by the Irish taxpayer, have been to

UK universities such as Aberdeen, Liverpool, Manchester, London and of course Oxbridge (though less often in the latter, except on bursaries such as Roy Foster in the Carroll Professorship at Oxford)—where they learned and taught English Literature/History as that of the English State.

Similarly in the history faculties it is the English version of Irish history that is being taught, in which Oliver Cromwell is 'God's Englishman' and where our War of Independence is just a series of unnecessary escapades and brawls. And the BA history students are not taught how many of the Sinn Féin MPs elected in 1918 were imprisoned by the British Government, nor how the first Dáil had to meet in secret session because of British armed forces harassment and quick swoops to try and imprison the rest.

Second-level teachers of history in Irish schools are usually Irish-qualified BAs' and they have learnt the English history of Ireland. One of these teachers recently trotted out to me the rag-tag line:

"At the battle of Baginbun was Ireland's future lost and won".

She said she was taught this about the Norman Invasion of Ireland! I replied that there was no Norman Invasion—at the most about two hundred Normans came to help Dermot McMurrough. She was very upset and told me that I didn't know what I was talking about as she had a degree in History.

In vain did I point out the Norman Invasion of England in 1066 in which thousands of Normans won the Battle of Hastings by killing the English King and killing thousands of his army after which William the Conqueror marched around England securing the borders and the Royal Treasury and nailing down the landowners thus insuring their support for him. And in vain did I argue that nothing like the Norman Invasion of England had occurred in Ireland. An entire generation of Irish people have grown up on this diet of British history. This is one of the reasons our First Dáil was not commemorated. People genuinely do not know of it.

In other departments of our universities it is the same. Large corporate entities are busily at work falsifying even scientific facts to suit agendas we do not even know about. The climate change: why is it such a big issue in the EU? It yields huge taxes of course based on fake science around "carbon emissions". Even Christmas cheer was attacked before Christmas by five academics from University College, Cork who wrote an article on Cork's *Evening*

Echo, 12th December 2018, around a photo of a deliciously roasted turkey. The Emeritus Professor of Chemistry wrote of the deleterious effect on the climate of feeding turkeys, which resulted in objectionable defecations. The same professor calculated that if Santa Claus uses petrol or diesel then 45,000 to 50,000 kg of carbon dioxide gas would be released—not good for our climate.

Then again, "*chestnuts roasting on an open fire*" is not good for your health and "*your fire is not only harmful to you in your own house but also to your neighbours because 90% of the smoke and chemical fumes ends up next door.*"

This is plainly fake science.

The Professor Emeritus warns about what smoke from an open fire does to Santa Claus and suggests that you should instead buy solar panels for your roof! This is just pure fake science from Dr. Paul Deane who states:

"...burning coal in your fireplace over the winter produced about one tonne of carbon dioxide".

Is that possible? My mother used a lot less than one tonne of coal in a year and she had a fire going nearly all the time for cooking.

Dr. Paul Bolger states seriously that you and I should on Christmas Day steer the conversation around the dinner table to climate change and how effective climate action now (unspecified) can bring benefits.

On the other hand Dr. Eoin Flynn advises us to cut down on "*luxurious jumpers, jewellery, toys, clothing, electricians and other pointless junk*", and he suggests we purchase sustainable products (he does not explain exactly what sustainable means). Dr. Markus Eichhorn, School of Biological Earth and Environmental Sciences of UCC, tells us to buy a real Christmas tree which can afterwards be chopped up and used in your fire. He does not refer to the fact that real Christmas trees are a major cause of asthmatic attacks.

This pseudo scientific article ends up by telling us to plug in our headphones when we need some time out over Christmas and learn more about sustainability by listening to UCC's '*Green Talk Podcast*'.

Naturally, these academics do not refer to the fact that the greatest users of dirty electricity generated from fossil fuels are the Internet and Cloud Computing.

The bursaries and sponsorships continue.....!

It all does not stack up.

Michael Stack ©

Connolly: ULSTER continued

equal, where exclusion might be defeated as it might be if all Ulster were the venue of the poll, and all Ulster had to stay out or come in as a result of the verdict of the ballot box. No, the counties to be voted on the question are the counties where the Unionists are in an overwhelming majority, and where therefore the vote is a mere farce—a subterfuge to hide the grossness of the betrayal of the Home Rule electors. Then again each county or borough enters or remains outside according to its own vote, and quite independent of the vote of its neighbours in Ulster. Thus the Home Rule question as far as Ulster is concerned, may be indefinitely prolonged and kept alive as an issue to divide and disrupt the Labour vote in Great Britain.

The effect of such exclusion upon Labour in Ireland will be at least equally, and probably more, disastrous. All hopes of uniting the workers, irrespective of religion or old political battle cries will be shattered, and through North and South the issue of Home Rule will be still used to cover the iniquities of the capitalist and landlord class. I am not speaking without due knowledge of the sentiments of the organised Labour movement in Ireland when I say that we would much rather see the Home Rule Bill defeated than see it carried with Ulster or any part of Ulster left out.

Meanwhile, as a study in political disparity, watch the manoeuvres of the Home Rule Party on this question. The deal is already, I believe, framed up, but when the actual vote is to be taken in the Counties of Down, Antrim, Derry and Armagh and the Boroughs of Belfast and Derry, Messrs. Redmond, Devlin and Co. will tour these counties and boroughs letting loose floods of oratory asking for votes against exclusion and thus will delude the workers into forgetting the real crime, *viz.*, consenting to make the unity of the Irish Nation a subject to be decided by the votes of the most bigoted and passion-blinded reactionaries in these four counties where such reactionaries are in the majority. The betrayal is agreed upon, I repeat, the vote is only a subterfuge to hide the grossness of the betrayal.

It still remains to be seen whether the working class agitation cannot succeed in frightening these vampires from the feast they are promising themselves upon the corpse of a dismembered Ireland.

(*Forward*, Glasgow-Socialist Labour Party—11 April, 1914.)



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 37 No. 1

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

James Connolly: The Exclusion of Ulster

(Forward, Glasgow-Socialist Labour Party—11 April, 1914.)

Socialists and Labour people generally in Great Britain have had good reason to deplore the existence of the Irish question and to realise how disastrous upon the chances of their candidates has been the fact of the existence in the constituencies of a large mass of organised voters whose political activities were not influenced solely or even largely by the domestic issues before the electors.

Our British comrades have had long and sore experience of contests in which all the arguments and all the local feeling were on the side of the Socialist or Labour candidate, and yet that local candidate was ignominiously defeated because there existed in the constituency a large Irish vote—a large mass of voters who supported the Liberal, not because they were opposed to Labour, but because they wanted Ireland to have Home Rule.

Our British comrades have learned that the existence of that Irish vote and the knowledge that it would be cast for the Home Rule official candidate, irrespective of his record on or his stand upon Labour matters, caused hundreds of thousands who otherwise would have voted Labour to vote Liberal in dread that the Irish defection would "let the Tory in".

For a generation now the Labour movement in Great Britain has been paralysed politically by this fear; and all hands have looked forward eagerly to the time when the granting of Home Rule would remove their fear and allow free expression to all the forces that make for a political Labour movement in that country. Even many of the actions and votes of the Labour party in the House of Commons which have been strenuously complained of have been justified by that Party on the plea that it was necessary to keep in power the government that would

get Home Rule out of the way.

Now, in view of this experience of the Socialist movement in Great Britain, we can surely not view with any complacency a proposal that will keep that question to the front as a live issue at British elections for six years longer or rather for a totally indefinite period. We know that this "six years period" so glibly spoken of by politicians has no background of reality to justify the belief that that term can be considered as more than a mere figure of speech.

In the **Daily News and Leader** of 6th April, Mr. H.W. Massingham, writing of the Ulster Limit, says, and the saying is valuable as indicative of the trend of Liberal thought:

"Should we, therefore, make an absolutely dead halt at the six years-milestone? Both parties implicitly admit that that is impossible, for one Parliament cannot bind another."

And in the previous week the Liberal Solicitor General declared in Parliament that if within the six years period

"The other side brought in a Bill to exclude Ulster, it would have a royal and triumphant procession to the foot of the throne."

Thus we have it clearly foreshadowed that there is no such thing as a six years' limit which can be binding upon future Parliaments and that therefore the question of Home Rule for the Ulster Counties will be a test question at future elections in Great Britain, and will then play there the same disastrous role for the Labour movement as the question of Home Rule does now. The political organisation of the Home Rule party will be kept alive in every industrial constituency on the pretext of working for a 'United Ireland,' and in the same manner the Unionist Party will also keep up its special organisations, Orange Lodges, etc., in order to keep alive the sectarian appeal to the voters from Ireland who will be asked to "*vote against driving Ulster under the heels of the Papish Dublin Parliament*".

Labour men in and out of Ireland have often declared that if Home Rule was wanted for no other purpose, it was necessary in order to allow of the solidifying of the Labour vote in Great Britain, and the rescue of the Irish voters in that country from their thralldom to the Liberal caucus. It might not be far from the truth to surmise that the Liberal Party managers have seen the same point as clearly as we did ourselves, and have quietly resolved that such a good weapon as the Nationalist Party sentiment should not be entirely withdrawn from their armoury.

The reader will also see that with a perfectly Mephistophelian subtlety the question of exclusion is not suggested to be voted upon by any large area where the chances for or against might be fairly

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
P. Maloney, 26 Church Avenue, Roman
Street, Cork City**

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>