

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

October 2019

Vol.34, No.10 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.33 No.10 ISSN 954-5891

In Limbo Land!

As we write, the future is still waiting to begin. Brexit is still waiting to happen, or not to happen.

Ireland does not yet know what world it is to be part of. Will it be alone in Europe, as the sole English-speaking voice, detached from the English-speaking world to which it has been shaping itself assiduously since it rejected its own history in the early 1970s, or will it be saved from itself by the success of Gina Miller's effort to ward off Brexit by subordinating the British Constitution (Parliamentary Government subject to no laws but those which it finds it expedient to make as it goes along) to fixed laws devised outside it by the Courts and imposed on it by the Courts at the financial behest of "*Rich Remainers*" (to use Dominic Cummings' phrase).

What has happened in recent weeks is that Parliament has declared the state to be a *Parliamentary Democracy* and, with the connivance of the Speaker and the Courts, has awarded itself the power to legislate independently of the Government, and against the Government.

It needed only the defection of a handful of members of the governing party to the Opposition to deprive the Government of the ability to govern in accordance with its policies. The Opposition has enacted a law, requiring the Government to govern against its policies by signing a post-dated letter to the EU for a deferral of the existing Brexit date.

The previously-established practice was for a Government with no majority to be replaced by a new administration which could command the support of the Commons.

continued on page 2

The so-called 'Treaty' and the so-called 'Civil War'

We are approaching the centenary commemorations of what are called the 'Treaty' and the 'Civil War'. It would be useful to establish what these events actually were and what they were not. There was no such thing as a *Treaty* signed on 6th December 1921 and there was no 'Civil War' that began in June 1922. This is not playing with words because, if there had been a genuine Treaty, there would have been no so-called 'Civil War'.

I first thought about this some years ago when I read Seán Moylan's speech in the Dáil debate on the so-called 'Treaty'.

That speech is famous for its blood-curdling conclusion in response to Lloyd George's threat of "*immediate and terrible war*":

"If there is a war of extermination waged on us, that war will also

continued on page 3

September Summary

BRITISH DEVELOPMENTS

The Battle Of Brexit Intensifies

While the main Brexit action has been in Britain in recent weeks, there have been some interesting straws in the wind on the Continent as a new College of Commissioners has been selected and Emmanuel Macron has purportedly rebooted his Presidency. In the Irish media a number of commentators and broadcasters have

followed the lead of Eoghan Harris in pressing Varadkar and Coveney to give way on the backstop. Unionist leaders and British Government sources have done the same. All to no avail. British influence in Ireland is just not what it used to be! But first the hard combat in Westminster needs to be reported.

In a first foray as Prime Minister on the international stage, Boris Johnson crossed the English Channel to separately meet Merkel and Macron in the days before the 24th-26th August G7 Summit in Biarritz. On the margin of the summit he held brief talks with European Council President Donald Tusk. The pattern was initial bluster followed by polite diplomacy which Johnson later played up as positive indications that agreement can be found.

Talking to *Sky News* Johnson exuded
continued on page 5

CONTENTS

Page

In Limbo Land! Editorial	1
The so-called 'Treaty' and the so-called 'Civil War' . Jack Lane	1
The Battle Of Brexit Intensifies. Dave Alvey (September Brexit Summary)	1
Readers' Letters: Labour Candidates In NI? Wilson John Haire	3
LEST WE FORGET (4). Extracts from <i>Irish Bulletin</i> . This issue lists British Acts Of Aggression, 2nd May - 7 June 1919 (ed. Jack Lane)	8
Readers' Letters: Casement: Typescripts Or Originals? Paul R. Hyde	
A Casement Challenge! Jeffrey Dudgeon	13
Casement: Typescript Tensions. Tim O'Sullivan	14
Jewish Rights. Donal Kennedy	16
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (Claire Wills. Part 12)	17
Remembering What Didn't Happen. Brendan Clifford	
(Review of Beiner book)	19
Lest We Forget. Wilson John Haire (<i>Though Most Of Us Never Knew!</i>)	23
'Constitutionalism' And An O'Casey Song For A Collins Execution.	
Manus O'Riordan	24
Biteback: A Modest Proposal! Philip O'Connor	
(Unpublished Letter to <i>Sunday Times</i>)	24
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Switzerland and Ireland)	25

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

WWI And The USA

Clarence Darrow and Frederick C. Howe

(back page)

A Corbyn-led Government could win a majority in the House to carry out the will of Parliament and defer Brexit.

At the present time, no such administration is in sight.

In all the long history of Parliamentary Government, nothing like this has ever happened before. Throughout the entire past of the system, a Government without a majority in Parliament to enable it to do the business of governing has called an election, either voluntarily or after a vote of No Confidence.

In the present instance, however, the Opposition, though a substantial majority, insists that a Government which has lost the confidence of Parliament must remain in Office. It will not allow the Government to call an election. And it will not propose a motion of No Confidence in it.

The first measure of a written Constitution was introduced by the Liberal Democrats, when they were in an austerity Coalition with the Cameron Tories. It is a law towards establishing fixed term Parliaments of five years. Under that law, a vote of No Confidence in a Government would give the Parliament two weeks to form a new Government, and only after it

failed to find a new Government would there be an election.

But the present Parliamentary majority is not a majority that could form a Government. It is a majority only in its opposition to the Government. There are no policies around which it can unite. The negative majority is united around a single issue. It cannot take over the function of governing within the existing Parliament.

And it cannot bring down the Government which it detests because, in the end, that would lead to an election. And, in an election the solid anti-Government majority would collapse into a series of viciously competing parties. And there would be every likelihood of the election of a Government which is not to the taste of the present House of Commons, one which has a governing majority.

This situation of a disabled Government, maintained in Office by a hostile Opposition could conceivably continue for three years.

The only obvious way for the Government to end it is to resign—but would it be allowed to resign? How does a Government which is not allowed to call an election, and against which no Vote of

Confidence has been passed, cease to be a Government? Would an attempt to resign be condemned by Parliament as a reckless act of sabotage?

The term "*Parliamentary democracy*" has been much used during the past few months. It has been occurring to some MPs who want to prevent Brexit at any cost that the system as it functioned traditionally, when looked at closely, is not Parliamentary Democracy at all, because of the essential part which the Government has played in it.

On the other hand, a lawyer with a senior position in the Shadow Cabinet (shadow Attorney General Shami Chakrabarti) says the system is the oldest Parliamentary Democracy on the planet and that it is being endangered by *Government* interference!

It is certainly not the oldest democracy. But it is the oldest system of Parliamentary Government.

Throughout most of its existence, the English Parliament was representative only of a ruling aristocracy. It was the way a ruling class arranged its affairs. A democratic element was phased into the Parliamentary system gradually, and it was hegemonised by the hierarchical party system of the aristocracy.

It was functional because it was primarily a system of *government*. Its relationship with the populace was to elicit its consent to be governed. (Lack of popular consent was expressed, not through voting, but largely by rioting. The middle class forced its way into the system by threatening financial mayhem.)

Insofar as the system had an official title it was "*the sovereignty of the Crown in Parliament*".

In the 1688 Revolution—a revolution which freed aristocracy from a monarchical State—the mystique of monarchy was preserved for popular consumption, and it was carefully preserved in later centuries as the franchise was broadened. In the present crisis, caused by the vehement opposition of a majority in Parliament to the decision of the populace in the Referendum that aura is being dispelled.

The idea of impeaching the Prime Minister for lying to the Queen about his reasons for proroguing Parliament, in order to get her agreement to it became absurd when it had to be explained that the Queen is not consulted at all in this situation. She is a mere puppet in the relationship.

Tom Paine explained a couple of hundred years ago that Britain was an

aristocratic republic masquerading as a monarchy. But the masquerade had its uses and has been carefully preserved until now.

The semblance of monarchy has a use somewhat similar to the zero in arithmetic, which makes the Arabic system more functional than the Roman.

The Prime Minister acts on the authority of the Crown, which is the formal sovereign. The Prime Minister is the *Crown in Parliament*. If Parliament declares itself sovereign against the functional form of the Crown, and does so in the name of democracy while intent in preventing the implementation of a referendum decision, the result is a Constitutional mess.

The Prime Minister used his Crown authority to prorogue Parliament—as is usually done at this time of year—because it had set itself up as an obstructive force without the capacity to govern.

In order to prevent the Brexit, for which it voted, Parliament has appealed to the Courts, in the name of Parliamentary sovereignty, to assume the role of supervising the Government. By this act, Parliamentary sovereignty negates itself.

The Scottish Court has found against the Government in the matter of proroguing Parliament. The English Court is still considering that matter as we go to print. If it disagrees with the Scottish Court, the case for Scottish independence is strengthened. (Scotland entered the Union with Britain on the understanding that it would retain its separate legal system.)

Whether it agrees or disagrees, the House of Lords has altered the Constitution by taking the case.

The situation is being driven towards some kind of fixed Constitution. It is hard to see how it could be a written Constitution.

Parliament, as the creator of law, has not in any real sense been subject to law. Things have been so arranged that Governments have created whatever law they needed. The present Government is trying to preserve that situation.

The Opposition seems to be driving the situation towards a Legislature semi-detached from the Executive, with both subject to a law system operated by the Judiciary—all grating on each other—the kind of thing that the world is littered with. But that is hope rather than expectation.

Labour Candidates In NI?

This is a piece from the *Mail-On-Sunday* on 8th September. It was buried in another article by Dan Hodges:

‘LABOUR TAKES AIM AT DUP.

Jeremy Corbyn is plotting to prevent Boris Johnston forming another alliance with the DUP in the event of a hung parliament.

The Labour leader’s allies in the militant Unite trade union are planning to run “worker’s candidates” against Deputy Leader Nigel Dodds and Gavin Robertson in two Belfast constituencies.

“*In the Election, every seat is going to count*”, a Labour insider tells me, “And the can knock out some of the DUP MPs. It could tip Jeremy over the edge and into Downing Street.”

No surrender then, Mr Dodds.”

Wilson John Haire

So-called 'Treaty'

continued

exterminate British interests in Ireland; because if they want a war of extermination on us, I may not see it finished, but by God, no loyalist in North Cork will see its finish, and it is about time somebody told Lloyd George that.”

This caused quite a shock and the Dáil session was adjourned to take it on board, as it brought home to everybody what was really involved in the debate and what the consequences could be.

But it was a most thoughtful speech which Moylan did not want to make, as he was fed up with the unreality that dominated that debate. It was a very *ad hoc* speech. He began: “*I start with the assumption that every member of this Dáil has sufficient intelligence to know when a Treaty is not a Treaty, when an oath is not an oath*”.

What did he mean?

WHAT IS, AND IS NOT, A TREATY?

So what is a Treaty? It is an agreement freely entered into between two independent states. Any threat by one party against another invalidates a Treaty. A Treaty signed under such circumstance becomes what the Chinese call an *unequal Treaty*, i.e., not a Treaty at all. Moreover what was signed on 6th December 1921 was actually not even called a Treaty—it was officially “*Articles of Agreement for a Treaty between Great Britain and Ireland*”. Therefore it was not in itself a Treaty—it was a preliminary to a Treaty. That was to come—but it never came.

A Treaty does not oblige one side to have an Oath of Allegiance to the other State. The UK Government does not and cannot have Treaties with its Dominions—that is oxymoronic—and the *Articles of Agreement* clearly stipulate Ireland to be a Dominion with an Oath to copperfasten that.

Republicans have been their own worst enemy in ever referring to the document as a 'Treaty'. A Republican, or anyone else who does so, is delusional.

All this should not be new. It was brought up by TDs in the Dáil debates on the issue. The most articulate was Dr. Farnan who said:

“I was out of order, it seems, when endeavouring to raise a point of order in connection with this motion. The Point is this: I say distinctly that no Treaty has been signed—that we have not signed a Treaty. If a Treaty has been signed at any rate it has not been produced to us. We have seen a document which, as I understand, is of the nature of practically an agreed agenda for a discussion which is to take place in London between our plenipotentiaries and the British plenipotentiaries if this Dáil approves. Now, I will read on that point an authority of a

CORRECTIONS TO SEPTEMBER IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

Page 2, Column 3, paragraph 4, last line:
“the Bloody Sunday shootings in
Belfast” - **should be Derry!**
Page 3, Column 1, last paragraph, line 3
“The right could not be implemented
by invasion. Collins somehow had got
the notion that it could. He acted in May
1920 ...” - **should be May 1922**

sufficiently distinguished constitutional lawyer, with whom our plenipotentiaries came into intimate contact in London. It is very regrettable, I think, that we should have to go to Hansard for information of this kind. The Irish people have been told that there is a Treaty before them when there is no such thing. There is no such document in existence. There is such a document to be prepared if this Dáil votes away its existence as the Government of the Irish Republic and not until then. Lord Birkenhead, answering a question by the Earl of Midleton on the 16th December, said:

'If and when the representatives of Dáil Éireann approve of these Articles of Agreement it will be necessary that there shall be meetings in order to deal with matters which are supplemental, and must necessarily be added in order to make the document a complete one.'

Now, we have been instructed here that we have a complete and unalterable Treaty before us. It is distinctly told us here that there is no such thing; that there are to be further discussions and alterations in this Treaty over which this body will have no control. These will be agreed upon after discussion between the negotiators. Lord Birkenhead continues:

'I most sincerely hope, and have every reason to believe, that when that part of the subject is reached which concerns the noble Earl (Earl of Midleton) he and his colleagues will be consulted, and that which has been agreed upon will, of course, be presented to Parliament in the form of an agreed Treaty. Only then have will we the Treaty in front of us.'... (Dr. Farnan, 10/1/1922).

This is pretty clear and, if in doubt, this is what Griffith said in reply:

"The questions, I think, which the Deputies refer to were sent across by Mr. Stack. They are:

'(1) whether he had any communication, direct or indirect, from the British Government, in connection with the Treaty?'

The only communication I had was this produced here, except one where he (Lloyd George—Ed.) stated it was not a Treaty, and I got the official title: 'Articles of Agreement between Ireland and Great Britain.'" (ibid.)

And Dr. Farnan went on to comment:

"I rise to oppose the motion that Mr. Arthur Griffith be Premier of this House. Mr. Griffith, in his answer to one of the questions to-day, admitted that he was palpably tricked by Mr. Lloyd George. Mr. Griffith, when he got this document, found it was labelled 'Articles of Agreement'. He sent it back to Downing Street, and some clerk there blotted out the words 'Articles of Agreement' and substituted 'Treaty', and when he had that

done he thought he had got a Treaty. In an answer to a question put by him to Mr. Lloyd George within the last few days *he found he had no Treaty at all.*

"Now, as regards the Presidency: it is necessary, I understand, that the head of every State when assuming office shall, by solemn oath, give an undertaking to maintain the Constitution of that State. That is a precaution that all States have found necessary for their own existence. Now, I want to ask Mr. Griffith is he prepared, if elected, to give that undertaking by solemn oath, that he will preserve the Constitution of this State, which is the Irish Republic?"

MR. GRIFFITH: I am not going to answer Doctor Farnan and I shall not do so any more. I object to this manner of jumping up and putting pharisaical questions to me. The oath that President de Valera took I can take with the same covering clause President de Valera put into it, that he would take it for the good of Ireland, and use it to do the best for Ireland" (ibid. All emphasis added).

So I think that, if Griffith, who led the negotiations; Birkenhead, who drafted the document; Lloyd George, who led the other side; (and Seán Moylan and Dr. Farnan among others) agreed there was no Treaty then I think we have to agree there was no Treaty.

If it does not act like a duck, look like a duck, walk like a duck, quack like a duck, then it is not a duck.

WHAT IS A CIVIL WAR?

The so-called 'Treaty' is the crux of what the so-called 'civil war' was about. If there was a Treaty worthy of the name, there would have been no civil war because it would have meant Britain accepting the independent state that existed, the Irish Republic.

It was the destruction of the existing Republic, specified in the Articles of Agreement, that caused that war. What is a civil war? A civil war is a conflict between two opposing ways to run a country that can only be resolved by war. The American civil war was between a Union and a federation of states; the Spanish civil war was between a republic and Monarchical Fascism; the Russian, between Bolshevism and anti-Bolshevism; the English between a Monarchy and a biblically inspired Parliament, etc. In other words, a civil war is between two very different conflicting visions of how a country should be run. That was not the case here. All were Republicans. The war was over the so-called 'Treaty' and nothing else.

That is why the so-called 'Treaty' is important to look at—what it was, was not

and how it came about.

This is also necessary because of the scaremongering we have been hearing about commemorating the events surrounding the 'civil war'. The less said the better, sums up the Government's view, and that of official opinion generally.

But we should make no apologies for commemorating these events, and Republicans least of all.

THE BACKGROUND

When the negotiations began on 14th July, following the Truce on the 11th, the basic issues were made clear early on, i.e., that whether Ireland was to be a Dominion or whether it was to maintain the existing Republic. It was the former which was on offer and, when this was put to de Valera by Lloyd George at their first meeting, he rejected it out of hand. De Valera would not even take the Dominion document and went to walk away. The exchange that followed spoke volumes about both men and the fundamental issues that never changed substantially:

Lloyd George: "Do you realise that this means war? Do you realise that the responsibility for it will rest on your shoulders alone?"

de Valera: "No, Mr. Lloyd George, if you insist on attacking us it is you, not I, who will be responsible, because you will be the aggressor."

Lloyd George: "I could put a soldier in Ireland for every man, woman and child in it."

de Valera: "Very well. But you would have to keep them there." (Eamon de Valera by the Earl of Longford and Thomas P. O'Neill, p.137.)

Lloyd George changed his tune and almost begged de Valera to keep negotiating. Lloyd George always chanced his arm in politics. What worked at any moment was what mattered. But he got nowhere with de Valera by threats or cajoling. The cajoling involved taking DeV to the Cabinet room to show him the chairs for all the great Countries of the Empire, Australia, Canada, India, South Africa etc. and there was one there for him—why leave it empty? Like Beelzebub tempting Christ by offering him the world—plus cigars and alcohol! But neither tactic worked.

He also famously said that negotiating with de Valera was 'like trying to pick up mercury with a fork' to which de Valera replied, 'why doesn't he use a spoon?'

Jack Lane

Part Two next month!

Battle Of Brexit

continued

optimism on the prospects of reaching a deal, but the subtext of his statements was that he was dealing with the key European leaders, not the Barnier negotiating team. For a time it seemed that Merkel and Macron were indeed undermining the Commission's position but that impression faded as time passed without any follow up from either. Johnson's mantra in interviews was that "*in order to get a deal, we've got to prepare to come out without one*". He also upped the ante by asserting that, in the event of No Deal, the UK will no longer legally owe the £39 billion divorce bill.

On August 28th the British PM dropped the bombshell that the Westminster Parliament would be suspended or prorogued for the best part of five weeks, from some day in the second week of September until October 14th. According to the BBC, it had been expected that it would be prorogued between 13th September and 8th October. Mr. Johnson justified the length of the suspension on the grounds that his Government needed time to prepare a new legislative and policy programme. Anti-Brexit and anti-No Deal MPs—comprising most of the Labour Party, the SNP, Lib Dems, Greens, the Independent Group for Change, Plaid Cymru, over twenty Tory rebels and, most prominently, Speaker of the Commons John Bercow—viewed the suspension as a "*constitutional outrage*".

Legal challenges to the suspension were mounted on the following day in Edinburgh, Belfast and London. The plan seems to have been that proceedings would inevitably move to the Supreme Court, at which stage all three actions might be joined. Significantly the London case was initiated by Gina Miller (later supported by ex-Prime Minister John Major), who won a case in 2017 forcing the Government of Theresa May to get the approval of Parliament for the implementation of Brexit.

Johnson's dramatic plan for a long prorogation set the tone for a tumultuous week in the House of Commons, beginning on Tuesday September 3rd, when MPs returned after the Summer recess. While the Prime Minister was reporting back on the G7 summit, Tory MP Philip Lee crossed the House to join the Lib Dems thus wiping out the Government's wafer thin majority: it was a gesture aimed at the television cameras and was eagerly picked up in the media.

Later that day, Speaker Bercow controversially ruled that, under Standing Order 24, which covers the calling of emergency debates, the Opposition would be able to introduce a Bill the effect of which would be to block a No Deal Brexit and force the Government to apply for another Article 50 extension. In effect, the Bill was usurping the executive power of the Government. Since it was proposed by Labour MP Hilary Benn, the Bill has become known as the Benn Bill/Act.

The Johnson leadership responded to the decision of 21 Tory MPs to vote with the Opposition by withdrawing the whip from them, effectively expelling them from the Conservative Party. This has been viewed as a harsh measure since Tory MPs, including Johnson himself, have voted against the Party line at different points in the Brexit saga without being expelled. However, an alternative view of what happened is that this was not simply a vote against a provision in a Government Bill, but a vote to transfer ruling power from the Government to the Parliament, a move incompatible with orderly parliamentary government in general and loyalty to the Conservative Party in particular.

As the implications of Johnson's hard line sank in, other members of his Cabinet—his brother Jo and Amber Rudd—resigned, yet predictions of further resignations did not materialise.

Letters have been despatched to the Members in question, some more conciliatory than others, outlining how they can appeal against their expulsions.

The effect of Bercow's Standing Order 24 ruling was that control of the Commons passed to the mixum gatherum of Opposition parties that finally started to act as a unified bloc.

All six Commons votes taken from September 3rd to the suspension of Parliament on September 10th were Government defeats, in which the Tory rebels were the decisive element. The votes entailed: passing the various stages of the Benn Bill; a successful move to force the Government's top advisers to disclose all messages regarding the proroguing of Parliament—a measure that is certain to be legally opposed by the advisers; public disclosure of Operation Yellowhammer—a Government worst case scenario in the event of No Deal; and two failed attempts by Johnson to call a General Election under the terms of the *Fixed Term Parliaments Act*. That Act

prescribes that a Prime Minister cannot call a General Election without the support of two-thirds of MPs, even where a Government has clearly lost the support it needs in order to govern.

Three legal challenges to Johnson's Proroguing of Parliament have been mounted. The High Courts of Scotland, England and Northern Ireland ruled that the Proroguing was legal. However (as of 14th September), the Scottish Court of Appeal on September 11th overturned the ruling of its High Court, while an appeal to the Belfast Court of Appeal is pending. The final decision on the matter will be made by the Supreme Court at the House of Lords, with the hearing beginning on September 17th.

Johnson has stated he will not ask for an extension to the current phase of negotiations—"I would rather die in a ditch"—as he now seems to be required to do under the Benn Act. Rather his Government will "*test the legal limits*" of that Act. Questioned on this, British Chancellor of the Exchequer Sajid Javid averred that Johnson will act legally but will not seek an extension. Under the Benn provisions, October 19th is the deadline by which an extension must be requested, unless a deal has been agreed. Javid's reply to persistent questioning on how that particular circle can be squared was: "*You will see on October 19.*"

On Sunday, 8th September, UK Secretary of State for Business Andrea Leadsom served notice that the Conservatives, disregarding the usual convention in British politics, intended to contest the Buckingham seat of Speaker John Bercow at the next General Election. This was seen as reflecting a Government view that Bercow was a biased Speaker who had used his position to thwart Brexit. On the following day, Bercow announced that he would be resigning as of 31st October, a date which allows his replacement to be chosen by the sitting Parliament. Notwithstanding the cleverness of this manoeuvre, his decision to resign begs a question: if his rulings arose from a genuine desire to protect the tradition of parliamentary sovereignty, why will he not defend that record before the electorate?

A final development to be noted is the major shift that has occurred in the Labour Party position. Over the Summer its stance moved from respecting the referendum result, as was stated in Labour's Election Manifesto in 2017, to a position of effective support for Remain.

It is thought that Jeremy Corbyn favoured Brexit but, with a majority of Labour MPs opting for Remain, and, more significantly, with his power base in the Party—the Momentum movement—also backing that position, he has had little choice but to give way. The latest articulation of the position is that Labour supports a second referendum, in which the Party itself will be neutral, with individuals free to campaign for or against Brexit.

An interesting twist is that the anti-Brexit Establishment has come round to supporting the prospect of a Labour Government, with Corbyn as Prime Minister, pending a General Election. This development results from divisions among the Opposition parties over what to do if Johnson's minority Government resigned; the Lib Dems objected to the idea of Corbyn as an alternative PM. These divisions were undermining the credibility of the Opposition at a critical time, so pressure was brought to bear, and all were instructed to back Corbyn whose standing has risen accordingly. A graphic example of this turn-around came in an interview with arch-Blairite Peter Mandelson on RTE Radio on September 8th, in which he was asked whether he would support Corbyn as Prime Minister following a General Election. His answer was reported in the *Irish Times* as follows:

"I don't want the Tories to continue for a day longer than is absolutely necessary. I want them replaced by a Labour government. So the answer to that is yes" (IT, 8 September).

So it has become convenient to jettison the vicious smear that Corbyn is soft on Anti-Semitism and not to be trusted!

A BATTLE OF TWO NARRATIVES

The British Brexit debate has always been a battle between two contending narratives, each of which has evolved as the story unfolded. Pro-Brexit people say that democratic sovereignty is the key issue, that the referendum result needs to be honoured and that EU membership is incompatible with the British political tradition. Their opponents argue that the electorate was unfairly influenced by lies, and political representatives have a duty to avert an outcome—Brexit—that is expected to inflict economic harm on the peoples of the UK. From a pro-EU perspective this Column leans firmly on the side of the former narrative but in the interests of honest reporting it must be acknowledged that the Johnson strategy has not gone to plan.

Johnson's prorogation gambit must be

seen as a failure in the sense that the Opposition was still able to pass an Act which forces the Government to request an extension beyond October 31st. However, the prorogation has allowed the Government to get on with the negotiations unhindered by Opposition manoeuvres in Parliament. The issue is described as follows by Ronan McCrea, an expert on Constitutional Law at University College London:

"...by behaving in a way that was widely regarded as outrageous the prime minister gave a previously divided anti-no-deal majority a unity and decisiveness it had previously lacked.

Moderate Conservatives abandoned the government in large numbers and with Johnson openly breaching at least the spirit of constitutional norms, it was easy for the speaker to disregard parliamentary tradition and to help no-deal opponents to seize control of the parliamentary timetable. The newly-united opposition then succeeded in passing legislation that requires the prime minister to apply for an extension of article 50 in the few days before the prorogation of parliament kicked in" (IT, 12 September).

McCrea says nothing about the anti-Brexit lobby in Parliament which has been intent on associating Brexit with deadlock and chaos. Tony Blair and Peter Mandelson are viewed as the authors of these manoeuvres (see *Tony Blair and Peter Mandelson "pulling the strings" of Remain alliance*, Daily Telegraph, 10 September). It is precisely these tactics, mainly involving Speaker Bercow's rulings, that have made necessary the adoption of desperate measures by the British Government. Nor can Johnson be held responsible for the bizarre provisions of the *Fixed Term Parliaments Act* which seems to have been designed by Oliver Letwin and his one-time Lib Dem coalition partners to curtail the executive function of Government in the critical area of calling a General Election, a legacy from the neo-liberal aversion to politics, no doubt.

So McCrea is being partial and selective in the story he tells, but then Brexit is everywhere being reported in a partisan fashion, depending on the narrative supported by the media outlet in which the report appears.

LABOUR'S MISH MASH OF A POLICY

Speaking on the BBC's *Question Time* on September 5th, Labour's Emily Thornberry made the following statements:

"If we won an election we would need to put forward a viable way of leaving the EU ... versus remain"

"If Labour has negotiated a deal ... and we put that as one option and the other to be one of remain, I would be there campaigning to remain"

"Our position from day one was that we needed to make sure that although we had to leave the EU, we had to look after jobs and the economy".

Thornberry defended that position on BBC radio the following day, so her position reflects Labour policy. As a set of debating points, this formulation allows Labour to reconcile a pro-Remain stance with respect for democracy. But it ultimately rests on the use of economic arguments to over-rule the Referendum result, and a large segment of the British electorate will see it as a mish mash. Thornberry's articulation of Labour policy is problematic: in the circumstances where a consistent electoral majority supports a new constitutional relationship with Europe based on separation, is a party preaching '*gas and water socialism*', in denial of the overriding national issue, fit for government?

It is perhaps an unfair comparison but, in the Irish socialist tradition, James Connolly took the opposite stance. He played a leading role in a nationalist insurrection in circumstances where Irish economic interests would suffer in the event of separation from Britain, at least in the short to medium term. A socialist party aspiring to government must surely be capable of seeing beyond the immediate economic welfare of sectoral interests.

A somewhat different line has been taken by Labour MP Stephen Kinnock, who has co-founded a cross party group called *MPs for a Deal*. Kinnock is scathingly critical of the Lib Dem decision to press for a revocation of Article 50 without any form of democratic consultation. Respect for democracy for him translates as support for the Withdrawal Agreement Bill, which was an outcome of the talks between Labour and Theresa May before she resigned in May. The Bill covered:

"a pledge on workers' rights, a vote on a customs arrangement, a role for parliament in future UK-EU trade talks and even a vote on whether to put the deal back to a confirmatory public referendum" (Guardian, 10 September).

Kinnock is at least attempting to find a way out of the quagmire in a way that is more than a simple capitulation to Remain.

One factor in the mixture of reasons behind the Brexit vote was opposition to

the liberal dogma that social and political objectives must always and everywhere align with the needs of international capital. Other factors were identification with the traditional British attitude to Europe; loyalty to the British standpoint in the World Wars; and concern over the level of immigration. In addition to showing conservative disaffection for the EU, the Brexit vote provided a rare instance of a national democracy pulling back against corporate-driven globalisation. In short the Blairite liberals should not be allowed to dress up their position on Brexit in the clothes of democracy and socialism; the Brexit division is not a Left/Right division.

CONTINENTAL STIRRINGS

One of the big Brexit questions is, if and when the UK finally leaves, will the EU get its act together? Will the political implications of having a common currency be followed up through closer cooperation, including in fiscal matters. Will the Brussels institutions, especially the Commission, be granted freedom to represent and process the interests of the Union as a Union, rather than being curtailed by the cacophony of competing national interests that is the European Council? The likelihood is that the EU will continue to develop at a snail's pace but there have been some interesting recent developments.

The President elect of the Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, has announced the division of portfolios in her College of Commissioners. The new configuration is being praised for its gender balance, but also for introducing for the first time a genuine balance between the Western and Eastern parts of Europe, and for representing a calibrated balance between the main political groupings represented in the European Parliament. This last is being referred to as the "*political*" Commission. Perhaps too much can be read into that, but the appointment of the Irish Commissioner, Phil Hogan, to the critical portfolio of Trade is a significant development.

Hogan's reputation in Brussels is as a Commissioner with political *nous*. One might wish that he had deeper roots in the Irish national tradition, and the long-term vision of an influential Commissioner who still wants to reverse Brexit, seemingly, at this late stage in the game, needs to be questioned. However, Hogan has shown political competence for the most part in the last few difficult years, and his elevation up the ranks of the Commission, where the technocratic mindset presumably still holds sway, has to be a good thing.

An interesting article first published on the *Social Europe* website on March 24th and re-published in the September 2019 edition of *Irish Foreign Affairs* (Vol 12, No 3) is worth noting. Written by Andrew Watt, whose background is as a senior researcher at the European Trade Union Institute, the article has the title, "*Macron and Kramp-Karrenbauer: vive la difference*". Watt's basic point is that the chasm between Macron's EU vision and the conservatism of the new leader of the German Christian Democrats, usually referred to as 'AKK', could hardly be wider, but that the public exchanges between the two may herald an apparently long anticipated European public sphere (*Offentlichkeit*).

Summarising AKK's reply to Macron, he refers to four icebergs: Germany wants inter-governmentalism rather than a federal leap forward; Berlin also wants integration to proceed at the speed of the most reluctant Member State; AKK is more tolerant than Macron of populist tropes like Islamophobia; and she is not afraid to challenge French sacred cows, like the scale of EU agricultural subsidies. The article has the merit of realistically underlining how much the European project is stalled at the present time. its concept of an emerging European public sphere is also thought-provoking.

MACRON'S REBOOT

An article by Lara Marlowe (IT, 9 September) discusses an attempt by the French President to learn from the first leg of his Term of Office. She plays up his diplomatic initiative to save the Iran deal before conceding that this has hit a snag in the form of further US sanctions against Teheran. More credible is her account of Macron's change of tack in French domestic politics.

Macron wants to merge France's 42 pension schemes into a universal regime and he has held a public consultation on the subject. Rather than prescribing a pivotal age of 64, he has gone with the policy of the CFDT, the country's largest and most moderate Trade Union: retirement age will be based on the number of years worked. It seems that some political learning has occurred in the Elysee Palace but we shouldn't get carried away on that score. As Marlowe puts it:

"Macron aspires to humility and patience, understanding and dialogue, but without fundamentally changing course."

I am out of space with this article. I'll deal with the pro-British lobby in the Irish media next month, if the topic is still relevant.

Dave Alvey

The Congo Since Lumumba

A story of international plundering

by Pierrot Ngadi

Foreword by Dave Alvey
Launched at Roger Casement Summer School on 31 August 2019.

Published by Athol Books, Ten Euro

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



"Africa has the shape of a revolver and its trigger is in the Congo". Pierrot Ngadi uses that quotation from Frantz Fanon to underline the importance of the Democratic Republic of Congo to the entire continent of Africa.

He shows that the country's mineral wealth, instead of being a boon, has acted as a magnet for foreign intervention and been the motivating factor behind wars and fake rebellions. External interference in the 1960s partially in response to the Cold War came mainly from Belgium and the United States. In 1998 an invasion by Ugandan and Rwandan forces brought a further wave of foreign exploitation. A pattern of conflict fuelled by foreign looting, from which many Western countries are beneficiaries, became endemic and its persistence over decades has impaired the Congolese political system.

Using documentary evidence—and his experience of Congolese politics Pierrot Ngadi tells a story that challenges the accepted narrative in the English speaking world. He argues that national sovereignty, territorial integrity and democracy can prevail in his country and concludes by proposing a number of practical measures. In the book his Congolese perspective is complemented by contributions viewing the Congo, Uganda and Rwanda from a European vantage point.

LEST WE FORGET (10)

THE FOLLOWING ARE ACTS OF AGGRESSION
COMMITTED IN IRELAND BY THE MILITARY AND
POLICE OF THE USURPING ENGLISH GOVERNMENT, AS
REPORTED IN THE DAILY PRESS FOR THE
WEEK ENDING OCTOBER 25th, 1919

Date: October	20th	21th	22th	23th	24th	25th	Total.
Raids:-		25	7	2		1	35
Arrests:-	27	14		2			43
Sentences:-		1	1		2	2	6
Proclamations & Suppressions:-	1	3	4			1	9
Armed Assaults:-	1		1	1	1		4
Courtmartials:-	1	1	1		1		4
TOTALS:-	30	44	14	5	4	4	101

The sentences passed on political offenders in the six days above mentioned totalled three years and three months.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 20th, 1919.

Arrests:- Capt. Rev. Thomas J. O'Donnell, an Irish Australian Army Chaplain was arrested at the Gresham Hotel, Dublin. The charge is unstated. Fr. O'Donnell is now under close guard and is not permitted visits even from his law advisers. Mr. Joseph Birrells, Dundalk, recently released from Belfast Prison in broken health was rearrested by armed military and police. Military and police surrounded and arrested 25 young men who were spending their Sunday on the hills outside Dublin. They are being detained on a charge of illegal drilling.

Suppression:- Armed police suppressed the Annual Convention of the Cumann na mBan (Irish Women's League) arranged to be held in the Mansion House, Dublin. The Convention was held secretly elsewhere.

Armed Assaults:- Military and police attacked a crowd in Dundalk, Co. Louth, who were demonstrating against the arrest of Mr. J. Berrills above-mentioned. Several women and children were injured.

Treatment of Prisoners:- Twenty prisoners imprisoned on political charges were released in broken health from Mountjoy Prison, Dublin, where they had been eleven days in manacles night and day and fourteen days in solitary confinement.

Court martial:- Mr. Edward Gilmore, Cross Row, Lisburn, Co. Antrim, was courtmartialled at Victoria Barracks, Belfast, on a charge of having in his possession arms and ammunition. Sentence will be promulgated.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21st, 1919.

Raids:- Armed police raided ten houses in Queenstown, Co. Cork. Armed police raided the residence at Kells, Co. Meath, of Patrick J. O'Brien, Secretary of the Irish Transport & General Workers' Trade Union. At Millstreet and

Rathmore, both in Co. Cork, Armed police raided about twelve houses. At Tullogher, Co. Wexford armed police raided two houses.

Arrests:- At Queenstown, Co. Cork, ten young men were arrested by armed military and police. Denis McDonald and D. Phelan, Tullogher, Co. Wexford were arrested on a charge of endeavouring to obtain arms. At Enniskillen, Co. Fermanagh, Mr. Kevin O'Sheil, Barrister-at-Law was overpowered, searched and arrested. Mr. P.J. O'Brien of Kells, Co. Meath, was arrested on a charge of possessing arms.

Sentence:- Mr. John O'Neill, of Dundrum, Co. Tipperary was at Dundrum charged with having arms and ammunition in his possession. Although it was proved that the arms were broken and useless, he was sentenced to two months imprisonment.

Suppressions:- Armed Police suppressed a social re-union of the Staff of Messrs. O'Gorman Bros., Clonmel, Co. Tipp., Motor Engineers. A Meeting of the Central Branch of the Sinn Fein Organisation, Dublin was suppressed by armed police who took possession of all approaches to the meeting place and turned away persons who wished to attend. The Paid English Magistrate at Queenstown, Co. Cork, ordered the closing of the rooms of the Hibernian Organisation where it was alleged the drill hall of the Irish Volunteers was situated.

Court martial:- Mr. James Higgins, Trim, Co. Meath, was courtmartialled at Ship Street Barracks, Dublin, on a charge of possessing arms and seditious literature. The finding will be promulgated.

Treatment of Prisoners:- Three prisoners were released from Mountjoy Prison in broken health. They were immediately conveyed to hospital.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 22nd, 1919.

Raids:- Armed police raided the houses of Messrs. James Lawless, James Derham, Patrick Clinch, A. Williams, Patrick Harts and John Gibbons, all of Balbriggan, Co. Dublin. The residence at Gorey, of Mr. John Gannon, Secretary of the Gorey (Co. Wexford) Gaelic League, was raided by armed police who removed all books in the Irish Language.

Sentence:- Mr. James Burke, North Street, Lurgan, was sentenced to two months imprisonment for using a motor bicycle to attend a proclaimed Republican Meeting. The Court also ordered the forfeiture of the bicycle valued at £100.

Suppressions:- The Pig Market at Tipperary was suppressed by armed police who freed the pigs from the market pens, and drove them into the streets. At Nenagh the weekly fair was suppressed and at Templemore (also in Co. Tipperary) military and police took possession of the roads and dispersed the country people who endeavoured to attend the Templemore Market. At Keady, Co. Derry, armed police suppressed a Republican meeting arranged to be held in the Town Hall. The meeting was however secretly held elsewhere.

Court martial:- Mr. John Shields, Lisnacroy, Co. Tyrone, was court martialled at Victoria Barracks, Belfast for possession of a revolver and ammunition. The decision will be promulgated later.

Armed Assault:- A young man named O'Donnell was shot, without warning, by English soldiers at Kilworth Camp, Co. Cork. He is lying seriously wounded at the local hospital.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 23rd, 1919.

Raids:- At Gleneely, Co. Wicklow, the residence of Mr. C. N. Byrne, Chairman of the Rathdrum Rural District Council, was raided by armed police. The police held a warrant for Mr. Byrne, charging him with advocating the Irish Self-Determination Loan. Mr. Byrne was however not at home. The house of Mrs. Lehane, Scart, Co. Cork, was raided by armed police.

Arrests:- Mr. Joseph Haugh, of Farrihy, Co. Clare, was arrested by military and police. He was charged with endeavouring to obtain arms and was remanded. Mr. John Lehane, Scart, Co. Cork, was arrested by armed police on a charge of advocating the Irish Self-Determination Loan.

Suppression:-

Meeting in support of the Irish Self-Determination Loan was proclaimed and suppressed by armed police and military.

Armed Assault:- At Macroom, Co. Cork, armed police attacked a crowd firing at them with their revolvers.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24th, 1919.

Sentence:- Mr. W. M. Swanton, Proprietor, Medical Hall, Castle-townbere, Co. Cork, was sentenced to 5 months imprisonment by a "Crimes Court" for placing the Prospectus of the Irish Self-Determination Loan in the window of his shop. Mr. James Telvin of Castlekeernan, Carncross, Co. Meath, was sentenced by court martial to one year's imprisonment with hard labour for having in his possession arms and ammunition.

Court martial:- Mr. Richard Higgins of Landenstown, Co. Kildare, was court martialled at Ship Street Barracks, Dublin on a charge of possessing arms and ammunition.

Armed Assaults:- On the return to Tipperary of prisoners whose health had been broken by their treatment in Mountjoy jail, an effort by their friends to welcome them publicly led to an attack upon unarmed civilians by a large body of police and military who charged the crowd several times using their batons and rifle butts on men, women, and children.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 25th, 1919.

Raids:- Police armed with rifles raided a dance hall at Thurles, Co. Tipperary, and endeavoured to suppress a dance which was in progress.

Proclamations:- A Proclamation had been issued applying further sections of the Coercion Act of 1887 to Dublin City and County. By these sections the English Crown is empowered to empanel special juries to secure a conviction or alternatively to transfer the trial to any other city or county in Ireland where a conviction could be more easily secured.

Sentences:- Mr. Thomas Cotter of Ballyea, Co. Clare, was sentenced by court martial to one year's imprisonment with hard labour for possessing arms and ammunition. Mr. Edward Gilmore, of Cross Row, Lisburn, Co. Antrim, was sentenced by court martial to six months imprisonment with hard labour for having in his possession arms and ammunition.

THE FOLLOWING ARE ACTS OF AGGRESSION COMMITTED IN IRELAND BY THE MILITARY AND POLICE OF THE USURPING ENGLISH GOVERNMENT, AS REPORTED IN THE DAILY PRESS FOR THE WEEK ENDING NOVEMBER 1st, 1919.

Date:- October	27th	28th	29th	30th	31st	Nov. 1st	Total.
Raids:-	12	1		25		4	42
Arrests:-	1		1	10		10	22
Sentences:-	1	1	2	2	4	2	12
Proclamations & Suppressions:-	3	2			1	2	8
Armed Assaults:-		1				1	2
Deportations:-							1
Court martials:-				3		1	4
Daily Totals:-	17	5	4	40	5	20	91

The sentences passed on Political Offenders in the above six days totalled 3 years, 1 month and 2 weeks.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 27th, 1919.

Raids:- Armed police and military raided the houses of Messrs. T. Lanigan, - Ryan, - Davy, T. Stapleton, J. Dwyer, and six other houses in Templemore, Co. Tipperary. Extensive searches were made in all cases. The residence of Mr. Joseph Flynn, Clonakilty, Co. Cork, was raided by armed police.

Arrest:-Mr. Joseph Flynn, Clonakilty, was arrested on a charge of having in his possession a copy of the Prospectus of the Irish Self-Determination Loan.

Sentence:-Mr. James Higgins, Trim, Co. Meath was sentenced by English court martial to 12 months' imprisonment for being in possession of a revolver, ammunition and "seditious" documents.

Suppressions:-Military and police accompanied by tanks suppressed a meeting of farmers arranged to be held at Holycross, Co. Tipperary. The meeting was held secretly elsewhere. Armed police suppressed the two weekly markets customarily held at Carrick-on-Suir, Co. Tipperary.

Treatment of Prisoners:- Mr. E. T. Keane, Editor, "Kilkenny People", was released from Cork Jail in broken health before the expiration of his sentence.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 28th, 1919.

Raid:- Armed military and police raided the offices of the "Southern Star", Skibbereen, Co. Cork, and carried off parts of the printing machinery.

Sentence:- Mr. P. O'Donohue of Lakelands, Coachford, Co. Cork, was sentenced to six weeks imprisonment for possession of "seditious" literature.

Suppressions:- Military and police took possession of a sports field at Cratloe, Co. Limerick, and suppressed a hurling match. The players secured a field elsewhere and played the match secret. The Republican Weekly Newspaper the "Southern Star" Skibbereen, Co. Cork has been suppressed by order of the English Military.

Armed Assault:- Michael Hanley, aged 14 years was shot without warning at Binghamstown, Belmullet, Co. Mayo by English soldiers. The young lad is lying in a critical condition in the local hospital.

Treatment of Prisoners:- James McCann, Loughrea and Patk. Jordan, Islandcady, Co. Galway were released from Galway Jail in broken health before the expiration of their sentences

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29th, 1919.

Arrest:- Miss Bridget Mullane, Sligo, was arrested on her way from Sligo Prison, where her father, whom she was visiting, is imprisoned for possession of seditious literature, and was brought under heavy escort to Enniskillen, Co. Fermanagh.

Sentences:- Mr. Francis Neville of Kinnitty, King's County, was sentenced by court martial at Dublin to three months imprisonment with hard labour for possession of seditious literature. Miss Bridget Mullane, above mentioned was at Enniskillen, Co. Fermanagh, sentenced to two month's imprisonment for being in possession of "seditious" literature.

Deportation:- Rev. Fr. O'Donnell, Captain in the Australian Forces, recently arrested in Dublin has been deported to England and cast into the Tower of London.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 30th, 1919.

Raids:- A large force of fully armed police raided and took possession of a house in Thomas Street, Cork, arresting the

inmates. Armed police raided a house at Ballymote, Co. Sligo, occupied by a family called Hannon. Armed police raided a score of houses in the hilly country between Killeagh and Youghal, Co. Cork. The house of Mr. O'Donnaghain, Wolfe Tone Square, Bantry, Co. Cork, was raided by armed police and military. Two other houses in the same town were similarly raided.

Arrests:- Mrs. Holland, her two sons and Anthony Nunan all of Thomas Street, Cork, have been arrested on a charge of possession of ammunition. At Kilbrittain, Co. Cork, armed police and military arrested Messrs. T. Ryan, W. Kearney, members of local public bodies, John Fitzgerald, John O'Hea, James Manning, and Patrick Sullivan, on a charge of unlawful assembly. Two of the men were aged sixty years.

Sentences:- At Bandon, Co. Cork, J. Lehane of Scart in the same County, was sentenced to three months imprisonment with hard labour for a speech advocating the Irish National Loan. At the same court J. Flynn, Clonakilty, Co. Cork, was sentenced to two months' imprisonment for having in his possession a copy of the prospectus of the National Loan.

Court martial:- At Renmore, Co. Galway, Mr. John Farrell, Athlone, was court martialled on a charge of being in possession of "seditious" literature. At the military Barracks, Galway City, Joseph Bourke, of Ardahan, Co. Galway, was court martialled on a charge of possessing ammunition. At the same court martial Stephen Wyse of Coxtown, Co. Galway was charged with being in possession of a revolver.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 31st, 1919.

Sentences:- Thomas and Michael Magowan, Toomna, Joseph Burns, Cortobber and Thomas Gilchrist, Carrick-on-Shannon, all of Roscommon were remanded to prison without bail to the Winter Assizes on a charge of attempting to obtain arms. This is equivalent to a sentence on each man of two months imprisonment.

Suppression:- At Carrick-on-Suir, Co. Tipperary the usual monthly fair was proclaimed and suppressed by the English military authorities

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1st, 1919.

Raids:- The house of Mr. W. J. Buckley, President of the Sinn Fein Organisation at Clonakilty, Co. Cork, was raided by armed police and searched. The residence of Mr. John Nanagan, Monegall, Co. Tipperary was raided by military and police and searched. The houses of Mr. James Cawley and Mr. W. Conway of Emly, Co. Tipperary were searched by military and police.

Arrests:- Armed police surrounded and arrested nine young men at Ballyfermot, Dublin (See below: Armed Assault). Mr. Thomas Devanny, Pallas, Toomevara, Co. Tipperary, was arrested on a charge of possessing documents which if published might cause disaffection. Mr. Thomas Devanny, above mentioned, was tried by a paid English magistrate and sentenced to three months imprisonment. In the course of the trial it was announced that notes in a notebook dealing with the manufacture of gunpowder constituted the "documents which if published might cause disaffection". Mr. John Gannon, Secretary of the Gorey (Co. Wexford) Sinn Fein Club, was sentenced to three months imprisonment for being in possession of copies of the prospectus of the Irish National Loan.

Proclamations and Suppressions:- Mr. John Fitzpatrick, Tipperary has been served with a notice from the Commander in Chief of the English Army in Ireland, ordering him to leave the Province of Munster forthwith and to reside outside that province on pain

of arrest and courtmartial. The reason stated in the order for Mr. Fitzpatrick's removal is that he is "suspected of acting in a manner prejudicial to the Defence of the Realm." At Ballybofey, Co. Derry, a large body of troops in full war equipment suppressed a Republican meeting.

Armed Assaults:- At Ballyfermot, Dublin, armed police

surrounded and fired upon a body of young men suspected of drilling. Nine of the men were subsequently overpowered and arrested.

Court martial:-

Mr. Patrick Hegarty, Derry, was courtmartialled in that City on a charge of possessing arms and ammunition.

THE FOLLOWING ARE ACTS OF AGGRESSION COMMITTED IN IRELAND BY THE MILITARY AND POLICE OF THE USURPING ENGLISH GOVERNMENT AS REPORTED IN THE DAILY PRESS, FOR THE WEEK ENDING NOVEMBER 9th, 1919.

Date: November:-	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	Total.
Raids:-	1004	102		2	8	2	1118
Arrests:-	12	1	1	1	9	3	27
Sentences:-		22	5	3	1	1	32
Proclamations & Suppressions:-	5		1		1	1	8
Court martials:-					1		1
Armed Assaults:-			1		1	4	6
Daily Total:-	1021	125	9	6	21	11	1192

The Sentences passed on Political Offenders in the above six days totalled 12 years and 2 weeks.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3rd, 1919.

Raids:- All over Ireland armed police were engaged in tearing down posters advertising the Irish National Loan. In upwards of a 1,000 districts large bodies of police were for several hours engaged on this work. The Sinn Fein Hall at Nenagh, Co. Tipperary was entered by a force of armed police who proceeded to disperse the young men who were using the hall as a reading room. The men were warned that they could not again use their own hall without a permit from the English military. At Ballyshannon, Co. Donegal, the houses of Messrs. Seamus Ward, and Sean Kane, and Sean Murray were raided by fully armed police.

Arrests:- Eleven girls who were selling flags in aid of the Gaelic League were arrested by armed police. Mr. Sean Milroy, General Secretary of the Sinn Fein Organisation, was arrested on an unknown charge.

Proclamations & Suppressions:- At Ballybofey, Co. Derry, a Republican demonstration was suppressed by a large force of military and police who occupied every vantage point in the village. At Mullingar, Co. Westmeath, a meeting in support of the Irish National Loan was proclaimed and suppressed by the English Military and Police. The military occupied the building in which the meeting was to have been held. A meeting arranged by Nationalists to be held at Caledon, Co. Tyrone, was suppressed by large bodies of troops and police. The old established November fair at Nenagh was suppressed by English military and police. For the last two months no fairs or markets have been permitted in this town, the inhabitants of which are suffering keenly. At Clonmel in the Co. Tipperary the weekly fair was similarly suppressed.

Treatment of Prisoners:- Mr. Seamus O'Higgins was released in broken health from Mountjoy jail, Dublin, before his sentence had expired.

Militarism:- Prof. J. H. Longford of London University, writing in the "Fortnightly Review" referring to the conditions in Ireland says: "There is military domination in Ireland of which, to find a parallel, we must go to Alsace before the war – or even

to Belgium under Prussian rule... Militarism in its most arrogant form is all powerful." The London New Statesman in its current issue says "Few Englishmen realise the effect that the continuance of the war against Ireland is having on the minds of the most ardent friends of that country (England). They see around them... a regime which would not be tolerated for a moment by white people in any other portion of the British Empire."

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4th, 1919.

Raids:- Armed police and military raided upwards of a hundred houses throughout Co. Meath. The residence of Mr. James Layng, St. Mary's Road, Dundalk, was raided by armed police. In the same town the house of Mrs. Toal, Bachelor's Walk, was similarly raided.

Arrest:- A young man whose name has not transpired had been arrested at Navan, Co. Meath, on a charge of complicity in an attempt to obtain arms.

Sentences:- Twenty-two young men were sentenced to six months imprisonment each on a charge of unlawful assembly at Kiltiernan, Co. Dublin. The unlawful assembly consisted in attending a drill parade of the Irish Volunteers. The young men who were aged between 19 and 20 years refused to recognise the authority of the Court or to give bail.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 5th, 1919.

Arrest:- Mr. Thos. O'Donnell, Mullaghroe, was arrested on a charge of advocating the Irish National Loan. He was conveyed manacled and under strong armed escort to Sligo Jail.

Sentence:- Five girls were sentenced to four days' imprisonment in Mountjoy criminal jail for collecting for the Irish Language movement. They refused to recognise the authority of the Court.

Proclamation:- In consequence of the suppression by Military and police of all fairs and markets in the Co. Tipperary the farmers in that country organised an auction in the neighbouring County, (Co. Waterford) so that their stocks held up for months

could be disposed of. The police immediately interfered and suppressed the Auction although the county of Waterford is not at present "a special military area".

Armed Assault:-At Nenagh, Co. Tipperary, which is under severe military law, and in which county the people have not even the liberty to sell their cattle and produce, an effort to protest against the pro-British part of the population, fox-hunting over the lands of the farmers who are being crippled by the military repression, was met by the police with baton charges in which many people were injured. The fox-hunting then proceeded.

Confiscation:- The English Authorities confiscated the monies found in collecting boxes which were in the possession of the two girls above mentioned. The money had been publicly contributed to the fund for the spread of the Irish Language. In the Court of Appeal, Dublin, the English Authorities ordered the confiscation of £124 found on the person of William Pedlar, an American citizen, who was recently arrested as a prominent Republican and deported.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5th, 1919.

Raids:-Armed police raided two private houses at Midleton, Co. Cork.

Arrests:- Mr. Denis Costello, Cloughjordan, Co. Tipperary, was arrested on a charge of "unlawful assembly".

Sentences:- Three girls arrested in Dublin on a charge of collecting for the Irish Language Movement, were each sentenced to one week's imprisonment in Mountjoy Criminal Jail. These girls, as the five mentioned in yesterday's list, refused to recognise the authority of the Court.

Treatment of Prisoners:- Mr. Ernest Blythe, Member of the Irish Parliament for North Monaghan was released from Mountjoy Jail, Dublin, in broken health. He had served but a small part of a twelve month sentence for possessing seditious literature.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 7th, 1919.

Raids:- In the rural district of Nenagh, Co. Tipperary, armed police raided and searched eight private houses. The raids took place in the early morning.

Arrests:- In Stephen's Green, Dublin, armed police arrested a man named Massey who was suspected of possessing arms. Denis Cleary, Denis Kelly, Martin Loughnan, Denis Heffernan, of Ballyartella, Co. Tipperary, Patrick Grace, John Ahern of Richmond in the same county, and Wm. Herbert and Martin Barry of Newtown, also in Tipperary, were arrested on a charge of attempting to obtain arms.

Sentence:- Mr. John Shields of Lisacroy, Co. Tyrone, was sentenced by English Courtmartial at Victoria Barracks, Belfast, to nine months imprisonment with hard labour for possessing a revolver and seven cartridges.

Court martial:- Mr. Patrick J. O'Brien of Kells, Co. Meath, was courtmartialled at Ship Street Barracks, Dublin, for having ammunition in his possession. He refused to recognise the authority of the Court.

Armed Assault:- At Bandon, Co. Cork, police armed with carbines attacked a crowd which were sympathetically cheering seven men arrested on a charge of illegal assembly.

Proclamation:- The English Authorities in Ireland have issued a proclamation, according to which no civilian in the whole of Ireland can possess or use or drive a motor vehicle without permission from the English Military Authorities.

Militarism:-In reply to a question in the English House of Commons as to the number of Irishmen arrested upon political

charges, the English Government made answer that they could not give a detailed reply as "it would impose such an amount of work on the already over burdened police."

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8th, 1919.

Raids:- Armed police raided and searched the residence of Mr. Charles J. Garland, Enislar House, Armagh. At Kiltimon, Co. Wicklow armed police searched the residence of Mr. Charles Cullen.

Arrests:- Mr. Thos. McManus of Ballinamallard, Co. Fermanagh, was arrested on a charge of possessing seditious literature. Messrs. Philip Cassidy and Ed. Shannon, Lisnaskea, Co. Fermanagh, were arrested on a charge which has not been disclosed.

Sentences:- Mr. John McKeon of Kilshrewley, Co. Longford, was at Longford sentenced by a paid English Magistrate to two months' imprisonment for displaying advertisements for the Irish National Loan. He refused to recognise the authority of the Court.

Armed Assault:- At the trial of Mr. McKeon above mentioned, Mr. Redington entered the Courthouse with a tray of refreshments for the prisoner who had been in custody for some days during which time he was kept for long periods without food. The paid magistrate ordered Mr. Redington to be ejected, whereupon he was thrown down the stairs leading to the court by two armed police. The tray and its contents were smashed and Mr. Redington seriously hurt. Police, armed, some with shot-guns and bombs, others with carbines and bayonets, charged at and carried at the point of the bayonet the Parochial Hall, Thurles, Co. Tipperary where a meeting of Trade Union workers was in progress. The workers were dispersed, many being injured. At Borrissleigh, Co. Tipperary the police fully armed attacked and dispersed an Irish Class. When the Committee of the Borrissleigh Town Park assembled to consider how to secure some lime and stone for building the park wall, the police attacked the meeting and dispersed it.

Suppressions:- At Ballysloe, Co. Tipperary, armed police and military occupied the village to prevent the holding of a meeting of the Transport Workers' Trade Union.

Militarism:- The "London Daily News" publishes the following in its issue of to-day's date:- "Whatever may be said in Downing St., Dublin Castle relaxes none of its efforts to drive discontent underground by force. Dublin at night with armed police parading in threes and motor cars manned by police patrolling the Suburbs, bears an uncanny resemblance to Brussels under German occupation." In the Southern Police Court, Dublin, during the examination of an English soldier who when driving a military motor car at Kilmainham, Dublin, collided with a horsedrawn vehicle and although he saw the driver of the vehicle fall injured to the ground, did not stop. It came to light that the English military in Ireland have ordered their motor drivers not to stop when an accident has occurred. During the last year approximately of civilians have been ridden down by military vehicles and wagons, some of which were proved to have been driven through city streets at 35 miles an hour. No action by the English Authorities has ever been taken against these drivers.

Irish Bulletin Dáil Éireann. Full reprint

Volumes 1 to 4a now available (Volume 4b: in preparation)
POSTFREE: ₣ 36, £30 paperback, per volume. (₣ 55, £45 hardback)

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

Casement: Typescripts Or Originals?

Mr O' Sullivan has a lengthy Casement pedigree as a faithful 'interpolationist' which has led him to become an incurable speculator. This is precisely what Captain Hall intended over one hundred years ago since he understood such speculation was indicative of confusion which would safeguard his deception. Mr O'Sullivan's faith in interpolation is based on perceived resemblance in handwriting and not on verified facts. The principal verified fact is that there is no evidence for the material existence of these diaries during Casement's lifetime. Lest I am suspected of "cognitive passivity" I think it best to make the following comments and corrections to Mr O' Sullivan's article in the September *Irish Political Review*.

Mr O'Sullivan finds it a "strange irregularity" that my book does not mention the mysterious pink pages in the diaries

at Kew. I have no idea why PVA (wood glue) was splattered on some pages of the diaries and I see no point in speculating about this. There is nothing strange or irregular about declining to indulge in sterile conjectures.

He writes about pollen residue tests which have never been done and falls yet again into idle speculation. Firstly, there is no certainty that such testing would produce definitive results. Secondly, the authorities will not allow such testing. Thirdly, if it was known such pollen testing was certain to prove authenticity, the British Home Office would have conducted the tests long ago.

A small inaccuracy, no doubt, but Olsen was not a hotel porter; he was Chief Receptionist in the Grand Hotel, Christiania. A more serious inaccuracy is that Olsen did not provide recorded accounts about anything. These were attributed to

an un-named source by Minister Findlay in March 1915 and later by Inspector Sandercock of New Scotland Yard in July 1916 by means of a typed police statement which Olsen signed. The later police statement contradicts Findlay's statement to the Foreign Office which Olsen had never seen.

Mr O'Sullivan is impressed by the Epilogue which he refers to as "a week's text from the most notorious of the Diaries..." However, the text dealt with in the Epilogue does not originate in one of the diaries. It originates in one page of the police typescript dated 1911 which is reproduced in the book. A typescript prepared by the police is not a diary.

Mr O'Sullivan writes that Casement was "spied on for over a year..." This is true but the period of surveillance was much longer. Indeed, my calculations show a period of about 33 months, from sometime in 1913 until he left Germany in 1916.

Paul R. Hyde

A Casement Challenge!

I wish to take up Jack Lane's challenge in June's *Irish Political Review* where he reviews Paul Hyde's book, *Anatomy of a Lie*, under the headline, "*The Gauntlet Is Thrown!*" Jack concludes his piece by writing how "the response of those in a position to attempt a rebuttal would be interesting" and something which should come from "a variety of authors (who) have sought to authenticate the diaries".

I am one such author who has written an 800-page book on Casement, now in its 3rd edition. It encompasses all his diaries (the 1910 and 1911 in full) and a biography under the title *Roger Casement: The Black Diaries—with a Study of his Background, Sexuality, and Irish Political Life*.

Before I start my response to the challenge, I have to advise I understand Paul Hyde's book has been withdrawn by the publishing company as actionable descriptions of certain Casement authors have been brought to its attention.

I however have no such complaint as Paul Hyde studiously avoids addressing anything I have written, both in my books—one also on Casement in Germany—and, since 1999, countless articles, speeches and letters. He does make two cursory (and baffling to readers) mentions of me. On p. 23, to a list of Casement

books, he adds just "Dudgeon's 2002 volume" and again on p. 104 he reveals my 2nd (paperback) edition which he says is only available on Kindle. In both cases, he gives no book title nor even my Christian name.

I am used to being ignored, even unpleasantly attacked as by my rival author Angus Mitchell, and subject to criticism in the *Irish Political Review*. It is hard to say whether the attacks are because I am an Ulster Unionist, given I query Casement's misunderstanding of my community. Like Casement I know the territory—he got it wrong and hastened partition, now a century old. Or being gay and written off as *parti pris* and in Angus's words one who "uses the Black Diaries to update the queer geographies of Ulster and to re-imagine Northern Protestant nationalism as some high camp drama driven by a cabal of queer crusaders". For either reason, Paul's refusal to engage, even to acknowledge me, means he does not deal or have to deal with any of my arguments, assessments or evidence. Perhaps I know too much given there are some 10,000 facts in my book plus some reasonable speculation, being an historian not a lawyer and only 1,000 facts or assertions or in Paul's.

I pick up the gauntlet having spent the intervening months researching some of those assertions and contradictions while reading the continuing discussion of the book in the *Irish Political Review*. Indeed I wrote at length for Paul Hyde's website on one well-known contradiction about Casement diarying that he stayed at the Cosmopolite Hotel, in Iquitos on 31st August 1910 yet is evidenced as going to live elsewhere. Not a word of my detailed explanatory exposition appeared, only the two concluding sentences.

The diaries incorporate perhaps 20,000 facts, mostly minor, but each still requiring research, imaginative writing or vigorous manipulation from other texts. Forgery theorists have concentrated on perhaps a score of discrepancies and confusions which on inspection can be reasonably explained. Hyde's thesis is that the typescripts came before the manuscripts although work on both might have coincided. Typists either copy manuscript material, are dictated to, or, rarely, create text mentally as they type. There is however not the tiniest fragment of evidence of any such forgery in official records. To ensure any evidence was eliminated even in the form of instructions or payments, let alone research itself, would leave a paper trail. But the Brits are mighty clever. Silently it all went.

Hyde's central and novel assertion is that because there is, in his view, no evidence outside official records of the diaries in manuscript being seen before Casement's execution, the typescripts which did so exist must have been forged first. By virtue of this assertion the whole edifice apparently crumbles and nothing can be believed.

He makes great play of a statement in the 1959 Home Office report on the diaries (TNA HO 144/23481 'Treason: Sir Roger Casement: Report of Working Party on the Casement Diaries: proposed transfer to the Public Record Office'). The statement is from a memo of 6th March 1959 which says in its Annex A, "There is no record on the Home Office papers of the diaries or the copies having been shown to anyone outside the Government service before Casement's trial." That statement (on his pp. 41 and 81) is heavily relied on as evidence of absence of evidence of the diaries existing before, at least, the trial if not the execution.

On inspection, that statement adds up to very little. It says there is no record in the Home Office's own files of the diaries being shown to anyone outside government before the trial which started on 26th June 1916. There are however two sets of files that have been made public since 1959 and which the Home Office could not, and did not take cognisance of in its remarks. They are the recently made public Scotland Yard (MEPO) files and the Security Service (KV) files. In both, detailed mention is made of the diaries being in existence and in the government's hands from 25 April 1916. There is also evidence of certain people seeing diary manuscripts or photographs of manuscripts before the execution in those files and elsewhere.

Those outside government who saw manuscript material in some form include US Ambassador Walter Page, American journalist Ben Allen, John Quinn in the United States, Rev. John Harris and Henry Massingham, editor of *The Nation*.

It is true that nowhere do they or anyone else set down precisely what they saw and what form these volumes took. Even the top officials write varied descriptions but the police repeat the particular items were taken from an Ebury Street hoard of Casement material after being brought in to Scotland Yard by a Mr Germain following the arrest. One record (MEPO 3/2415) says there were three diaries and a ledger, an address book and memorandum book extracted. Contrary to another Paul Hyde assertion, this time in *History Ireland* (November 2016) there were also 23 books in the Germain trunks. Indeed there were

over 100 books eventually returned to his cousin Gertrude Parry (NLI 10763/24). The address book seems to have gone back into the pile and ended up also being returned to Gertrude.

One official writing in haste to another and knowing well the level of knowledge of the recipient does not relate repetitively and precisely details of the matter in hand in order to provide historians and barrack room lawyers, a hundred years on, with an exact account or description of things passing through their hands or minds.

Hyde, despite saying that British officials cannot be trusted, in contradiction, frequently avers that certain government documents can be accepted as true and accurate. I take everything with a pinch of salt. For example, I agree with him that the witness statements recorded in Christiania in 1916 for possible use at the trial are at times unconvincing and suggest more dislike of Casement's companion Adler Christensen than anything else. I would however dispute two other facts he asserts on the same subject. He says his mother Henriette had not seen her son since 1906 but she states on 18th July 1916 that she saw him in 1914 and 1915 (TNA HO 144/1637).

Similarly he discounts Adler's remarks recorded on his visit to the British Consulate in Philadelphia in 1916 which were then written up by the police to be signed as a statement (which is standard police practice). In the event, as when he betrayed Casement in 1914 in Norway, Adler changed his mind and did not sign. But a key part of what he said, that he had met Casement in South America before they connected up in New York in 1914 is confirmed by a document written by

Casement while in Germany (NLI 17023). The fact that Adler was a thoroughly deceitful and unreliable person whom Casement could not fault despite evidence from someone like John Devoy tells you something of his judgement.

Another area I was sceptical about is Casement's denial of the diaries while in prison or almost the opposite Serjeant Sullivan's reporting the prisoner's defence of his homosexuality. Neither happened. Sullivan admitted he was wrong. Casement's solicitor George Gavan Duffy, who tried desperately to stop any such discussion makes it plain Casement said nothing on the matter. Duffy was well aware of what might emerge having looked over three suitcases of his documents in London in 1915 and presumably destroying everything.

For evidence of Casement's homosexual status, people will have to read my book. Outside the diaries, there are no definitive accounts of sexual activity beyond the Norwegian witness statements and those of Adler. All of course are derived from British records, which if not permitted to be taken account of, or if disputed in every respect, as is the case with diary deniers, leaves only historical assessment of what has come our way in Casement's papers, his behaviour patterns, the considered views of others and the absence of evidence of heterosexual activity. These are normally private matters, unfathomable to outsiders. Casement simply wrote it all down. Better for his *aficionados* to accept that reality and then argue for his political foresight and accuracy.

Jeffrey Dudgeon
15 September 2019

Casement: *Typescript Tensions*

To clarify the position I have taken on the recently published and yet more recently withdrawn book, *Anatomy of a Lie* by Paul R Hyde, I wish to make a number of points. I have been prompted to do this especially on account of various matters raised by Jack Lane in his ongoing *Seen, Unseen and Disappeared* articles.

My position on the so called Casement "Black Diaries" is not especially new or radical. It is just a contemporary iteration of the position espoused since, to be exact, 1956 by a number of forgery proponents down to the present day. These have included Prof Alfred Noyes; *The Accusing Ghost or Justice for Casement* (1957), Dr Roger McHugh; *Roger Casement, The Public Record Office Documents,*

Threshold (1960), (a 30 page paper); Dr. Herbert O. Mackey; *I Accuse* (1959) (a pamphlet), *The Secret History of the Forged Diaries* (1962); *The Forged Diaries* (1966), Mairead Wilson; *Roger Casement: A Reassessment of the Diaries Controversies* (2000 and 2005, Athol Books, a pamphlet); and Kevin Mannering, whose provocative and interesting public talks were reported on in *Irish Political Review* during the first decade of the present century.

In *The Riddle of the two Casements*, a paper published as part of a collection of papers from various authors published by the Royal Irish Academy in 2005 as *Roger Casement in Irish and World History*,

Angus Mitchell tacked the Diaries' controversy. This paper was based on his contribution to a similarly named conference in May 2000, also organised by the RIA. He continued: "...*It is not hard to envisage that from these diaries they either interpolated existing diaries or manufactured a new set with the sex centred narrative*". So we can see that in the year 2000 Mitchell was open to the same conceptualisation of forgery as the one outlined by the various writers listed above.

This viewpoint considers the Diaries to have been originally the personal diaries of Casement, which he took with him on his investigative voyages to Africa and South America. Having been impounded sometime between late 1914 and early 1916, they were doctored by persons unknown working for the British State, so that they came to include incriminating material which portrayed him as a mentally unstable degenerate, a loon obsessed with a certain male body part.

PERFECT SOLUTION

The process involved the addition of small amounts of material and the deletion of other parts. Thus large amounts of apparently incriminating material could be conjured into existence quickly. It was the perfect solution for the position the British found themselves in with regard to Casement. Here was a heroic man of high principles who had betrayed the Empire by siding with the Germans. How could he have done such a thing? The very thought of it was deeply disturbing and upsetting. However, now an explanation was at hand. He had been deranged all along and there was proof.

The book *Anatomy of a Lie* proposes, just as the above-mentioned writers and researchers, that in regard to the Diaries, forgery was done. But how it conceptualises the forgery was done is very, very different. It proposes that forgery was done *AFTER* Casement had been executed on 3rd August 1916 and that the bound volumes now known as the Black Diaries did not exist up to the time of Casement's execution.

I have proposed already an explanation for the bound volumes not being shown around at the same time that photos and typescripts were being shown. It is that there would have been a danger that a person with some forensic knowledge and training might get a chance to inspect the handwritten pages up close and detect something suspicious. When inked writing is erased with fluid and then allowed to dry and the blanked space is then written over there is a change to the chemical composition of the paper which modifies

how ink is absorbed into it. Such changes can be detected under magnification. In short, the volumes would have looked dodgy up close so they were kept away from being inspected.

So, you do not need to propose that the bound volumes did not exist in order to explain the non appearance of the bound volumes at the critical time coming up to the date of execution.

Even today, it is close to impossible to receive permission to view the bound volumes at the National Archives, Kew. Instead you are offered a viewing of monochrome microfilm in the negative.

How helpful!

However, I would suggest this coyness is far from pointless.

GREAT RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

The book *Anatomy of a Lie* contains some great research and analysis, as has been referred to by me in recent contributions to this publication. However, by the same token, there are also serious flaws. By hawking about a flawed analysis, you present your opponents with a stick to beat you with. Why indulge in such self-sabotaging behaviour?

Rationality and objectivity define the ground the forgery proposition rests upon. Concede on that and all is lost.

You can get away with all sorts of flawed analyses, skewed thinking and untenable theories when you are the Establishment and you have the promotional machinery of academia and mass media at your disposal to beat the drum on your behalf. However, when you are not the Establishment, you enjoy no such luxury. You have to labour uphill while shirking no challenge. If you make a mistake you will be made to pay for it, for you operate in an essentially hostile environment.

That typescripts, not backed up with photographic representations of handwritten material, were what was circulated furtively in 1916 is fanciful and implausible. The notion that the photographs referred to by various writers down the years were photographs of typed pages is not tenable and is, frankly, laughable.

The book refers to a 1959 Civil Service document regarding what was shown to the US Ambassador in London in 1916. The book utterly misinterprets the relevant wording:

"The Ambassador was given photographs of two passages from the typescript" (History of the Casement Diaries. March 1959 Working Party PRO HO 144/23481).

The only sensible interpretation is that

the Ambassador was shown photographic copies of handwritten diary pages which corresponded with a typescript already in his possession. A quotation from the 1955 biography of Reginald Hall, the animating force behind the circulation of the material, by a former assistant confirms this obvious interpretation:

"As some American newspapers were championing Casement, Thomson had some pages of the diary photographed and showed them to Dr Page, the American Ambassador..." (*The Eyes of the Navy* (1955), p113—Admiral Sir William James).

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

That an introductory chapter has been contributed to the book by that most prolific of Casement writers and researchers, Angus Mitchell, does add to the book's prestige. Mitchell's contributions to debate on Casement's legacy have been colourful and varied.

An article from Nigel Jones in the *Guardian*, dated 28th February 1998, was titled *The Killing of Roger Casement*. Two Casement writers, Roger Sawyer and Angus Mitchell were interviewed. Explaining the origin of the Diaries Mitchell says:

"He had to be destroyed, and not just physically. Casement had the ear of the highest people in the US at a time when London was trying to bring America into the war. They knew he was homosexual, but lacked positive proof. So they used Casement's genuine papers, which they had seized in 1914, to concoct the forgeries. It was a comparatively straightforward dirty trick, and they had 18 months in which to do it."

In reality all the alleged evidence that Casement was gay had passed through the hands of the Intelligence services. To his relatives, friends, and associates the notion of him being in some way sexually outside the norm was outrageous.

In *The Brazilian Journal of Irish Studies* (2009) in a paper titled *Unframing the Black Diaries of Roger Casement*, Mitchell writes the following:

"Through the early 1960s the controversy raged without end in the columns and letters page of the *Irish Times* and was only brought to an end with the return of Casement's body to Ireland in 1965. Behind the scenes, President de Valera closed down all official discussion of Casement. Talk of the diaries was silenced in the national press and the "forgery theorists" were driven underground."

The reality was much less dramatic. The controversy made occasional appearances, mostly in the letters page of *The Irish Times*, in the early 1960s. It appears a deal had been done behind closed doors,

prior to the return of the remains to Ireland from the yard of Pentonville prison in 1965. That deal, it seems, was that the Irish Government would not push for an investigation of the Diaries following on from the return of the remains and State Funeral. Dr. H.O. Mackey was discouraged personally from pursuing the matter by President de Valera.

The following year Dr. Roger McHugh, a leading forgery proponent, was made the first holder of the Chair of Anglo-Irish Literature and Drama at University College, Dublin. In *The Connacht Tribune* for 5th May 1966, there was a notice of a meeting of the Galway Literary Society for the following day in the Warwick Hotel, Salthill, at 8:30pm. The meeting was to hear a lecture on "*The Diaries of Roger Casement*" from Professor Roger McHugh. Forgery proponents had not been "*driven underground*".

In "*Phases of a Dishonourable Fantasy*", Field Day Review (2012), Mitchell claimed:

"In February 1922, in a peculiar moment of shared history, Michael Collins visited the House of Lords with Casement's prosecutor the Lord Chancellor, Lord Birkenhead, F.E. Smith, to authenticate the Black Diaries... The implication of these actions is that, at the foundation of the Irish Free State, Collins officially accepted the authenticity of the Black Diaries and that this acceptance was part of a secret deal struck in the diplomatic shadows of the negotiations. This would explain why the Irish government remained so ambiguous about the authenticity of the diaries for many decades afterwards."

The reality is that there is not a shred of evidence Michael Collins ever "*authenticated*" the Diaries. Whatever his faults, he was steeped in the revolutionary republican tradition in which those whose activism had brought them to an appointment with the hangman were honoured. To collude with the British in the calumny of an executed republican martyr, for somebody such as Collins, would be about as dishonourable as it was possible to be.

PROVENANCE

That the book discusses the provenance of the Diaries is good. But what about the provenance of the *Typescripts-only Theory* itself, which *Anatomy of a Lie* proposes? Where did that come from? Who first came up with it? What was their agenda? As the Romans asked *Cui bono?* (To whom is the benefit?) Could it be there is some hidden element operating behind the scenes which, deliberately or otherwise, seeks to hobble the pro-forgery camp with a skewed and inadequate theoretical template?

Among possible culprits we find Angus Mitchell, conniving space aliens, MI5, The Aubane Historical Society and Irish America or a combination of some or all of the above.

Tim O'Sullivan

Jewish Rights

I think that some readers may believe in a level playing field for all humanity and that each human has rights and responsibilities. Moses came down from a mountain with a set of rules, which if followed would save a lot of grief. The French Revolutionists preached *liberte, egalite efraternite* which poorly reflected the Ten Commandments.

But the idea that we are all equal, but some are more equal than others seems to have many followers.

In the 1890s the French Army Captain, Alfred Dreyfus, was framed and found guilty of passing military secrets to Germany. He was paraded in front of about four thousand troops, the buttons and epaulettes torn from his tunic, and his sword broken. The punitive ceremony was known as *Degradation*. He was sentenced to imprisonment, and a formerly abandoned prison—a Hellhole on "*Devil's Island*", off the South American coast—was re-opened for his sole benefit where he was expected to die.

A vile press campaign preceded the trial and continued after it, with calls for Dreyfus's execution. Dreyfus was Jewish, and anti-Semitism was the driving force of his persecutors, who were, largely, Catholic.

Early in the following decade, the Novelist, Emile Zola accused named persons with falsifying the evidence against Dreyfus, and, following investigation, his conviction was quashed and Dreyfus was restored to his rank in the French Army.

He served France in the First World War and lived on to die, his honour vindicated, in 1935. Emile Zola died shortly after writing "*J'Accuse*" in defence of Dreyfus, and it is suspected that he was murdered.

In 1905 the French Republic returned to its secular roots and the pretensions of Catholic bigots got no concessions from the State, though they didn't disappear.

Another French Officer, Andre Serot, fared worse than Dreyfus. Serot served in the Second World War against the Nazis and with the United Nations in Palestine afterwards. He was a friend of Count Folke Bernadotte, one of two Swedish diplomats who saved the lives of many Jews from the Nazis.

Bernadotte's credentials were such that the United Nations chose him to negotiate peace between Jews and Arabs in Palestine. Bernadotte never carried arms nor were

United Nations soldiers who travelled with him armed. In September 1948 Bernadotte and Serot were shot dead by a gang of Zionists acting under the orders of a Mr. Shamir, who later became head of the Israeli Secret Service "*Mossad*", and later served two terms as Prime Minister of Israel.

The United Nations Security Council condemned the murders and, when the bodies of Count Bernadotte and Colonel Serot were flown into Paris, there to pay their respects were, amongst others—

UN Secretary General *Trygvie Lie*
US Secretary of State *General George Marshall*
UK Foreign Secretary *Ernest Bevin*
Canadian Prime Minister *McKenzie King*.

There are no statues in London of Count Bernadotte, though I could show you one to Sweden's other Hero, Raoul Wallenberg who saved Jewish lives.

No essays by Britain's ex-Prime Minister Gordon Brown on the heroism of Bernadotte, though one on Wallenberg

No plays by Henry Jackson Society Star Douglas Murray about Bernadotte but one about Wallenberg.

Neither Bernadotte nor Colonel Serot were anti-Semitic or their names would be better remembered. They are names that have been erased by supporters of those who murdered them, so that Colonel Serot and Count Folke Bernadotte are *non-persons*, and to record their names is a *thought crime* in the Orwellian Dystopia which Gordon Brown, Douglas Murray, their NEO-CON cronies, their paid, presstitute propagandists and polemicists have created.

The character assassination of Jeremy Corbyn, however, is part of a tradition—the bogus "*Zinoviev Letter*" of 1924; MI5 smears of "*Soviet Agent*", Harold Wilson; "*Soviet Agent*" Michael Foot, still peddled by *The Times*.

Even Ed Milliband, whose father served in the British Navy in the Second World War, was accused by *The Daily Mail* of having inherited a hatred of Britain from his father. The *Daily Mail* supported Fascism, Italian and British, as well as Nazism, until the outbreak of war with Germany in 1939 and Italy in 1940.

But it is only now that the charge is made that Jeremy Corbyn personally, and the Labour Party generally, are anti-Semitic.

And it is made by accomplices of those who murdered Colonel Serot and Count Folke Bernadotte.

Donal Kennedy

"Life springs from death: and from the graves of patriot men and women spring living nations. The defenders of this realm have worked well in secret and in the open. They think they have pacified Ireland. They think that they have purchased half of us and intimidated the other half. They think they have foreseen everything, think that they have provided against everything; but the fools, the fools, the fools! —they have left us our Fenian dead, and while Ireland holds these graves, Ireland unfree shall never be at peace."

Padraig Pearse's graveyard oration for O'Donovan Rossa, Glasnevin, 1915.

"Free States, like all others, may possess dependencies, acquired either by conquest or by colonisation; and our own is the greatest instance of the kind in modern history. It is a most important question how such dependencies ought to be governed."

John Stuart Mill.

"Mr. Haldane: "The mother of Parliaments does not coerce her children".

An Irish Member: "We do not accept that statement."

House of Commons Debate, 14th May 1900 on the Commonwealth of Australia Bill.

Clair Wills—Part 12.

In her book, *Lovers and Strangers: An Immigrant History of Post-War Britain*, published by Allen Lane, London, 2017, Clair Wills sets out her intentions clearly:

"This book is an attempt to describe the migrant worlds which came into being in Britain in the 1950s and 1960s and the characters who lived in them. And like the migrants themselves, in order to write about them I have had to forego the reassuring structures of standard national, public narratives and even the established chronology in which the past leads to the present and eventually the future. The series of miniatures I offer here are close-ups of the disorienting and exhilarating novelty of the metropolis for the rural and small-town migrant, a kaleidoscope of the fragmentary experiences of metropolitan migrant life. But they are also accounts of the ways in which those experiences intersected and began to converge with the main current of British politics and society, and change it in its turn."

For Wills, her ambitious account takes in—

"the Windrush generation", "people from the Caribbean, but also Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Italians, Maltese, Cypriots, Indians and Pakistanis, plus the largest immigrant group, the Irish, who alone arrived at a rate of approximately 40,000 every year during the 1950s."

As Wills rightly points out that, though—

"Britain—together with the rest of Europe—was going through a period of

crippling austerity in the late 1940s and early 1950s, it was also in desperate need of labour. And it was primarily for this reason that the new settlers from Europe and the former colonies were tolerated, and in some cases even encouraged."

What fairly amazed me was that the traffic wasn't only one way. As Wills explained:

"Throughout the late 1940s very large numbers of Britons packed on trains out of London, and the boats out of Liverpool and Southampton, intent on making the move to Canada, Australia and New Zealand... Over 650,000 people left Britain, mainly heading for the white Commonwealth countries, during the 1950s. All over the world, people were looking for a better break."

Wills finds herself disturbed by how the new arrivals were seen by their host country.

"Yet what has struck me most forcibly while writing this book is the disappearance, buried under the rhetoric, of any sense of the migrants as ordinary people. The near-universal contemporary focus on them as *unlike* us, as strangers, aliens and outsiders" (The italics are by Wills).

Yet, later on, she does show how different some of the immigrants were, as in the case of leisure—especially in the dancehalls. In a *Guardian* review that is quite perceptive John Kampfner, an immigrant himself and a powerful journalistic and cultural voice, reflects thus:

"When it came to the dancing ritual of a Friday night, some dancehalls were so

alarmed by the success rates of young black men with white women that they imposed colour bars, either overtly or tacitly.

"The habit among Caribbean men of making an entrance was one that riles their English peers. From the smartly tailored suits, the trousers high-waisted, wide-legged and cuffed, the braces, the two-tone shoes and the pork pie hats, to their confident insistence on jive and swing rhythms on the ballroom dancefloor, they were bound to enrage their rivals" (21st August, 2017).

It is hard to know whether the Irish went to these exotic dancehalls but their own were quite distinctive. It was the era of the great Irish bands, who played both in England and at home in Ireland. They were hugely successful and Wills comments on how well-known they were to their audience that they sometimes took cassette tapes from the Irish immigrants back home to their people. It is hard to believe, but these bands, with some great singers, eventually found success in the USA where again Irish immigrants were to be found in their hundreds of thousands. The result was a huge upsurge in interest in Irish singing and music which had an impact on other musical forms. That this has continued to the present day is hugely impressive, with bands like U2 having a world-wide audience.

Wills is not a fan of histories of post-war Britain because she believes that they have focused on a few aspects of the story:

1. "the initial, distrustful, encounter with the strangers on their arrival in the late 1940s;
2. the rise in ethnic tensions, culminating in racially motivated riots in 1958 and
3. the subsequent development of restrictive racial legislation intended to curb immigration of non-whites."

Of course Wills herself is not a historian and thereby one has to be careful about her assertions. She says that "*contemporary historians*" frame their narratives in a too constrictive style owing much to how post-war politicians wanted them to see things through their "*framework*". Unfortunately she does not name these historians and so one cannot judge her indictments. Her conclusion is that:

"we have ended up with a largely 'public history' emphasizing the politics of racial prejudice, assimilation, integration, multi-culturalism and, most recently, the failure of multi-culturalism."

Roy Foster, 9th September 2017, reviewed her book for *The Irish Times*. He began by stating that:

"The author of this book about people who cross borders is something of a border-crosser herself. Clair Wills is a distinguished *literary* scholar who has migrated into social *history*".

Foster then goes on to write about Wills's former books—which take up all of two sentences! *Lovers and Strangers'*, according to Foster—

"despite its quixotically Mills and Boon title, draws on these diverse interests to paint an absorbing, substantial and often scintillating picture of immigrant Britain after 1945. Richly empathetic, it comes at a poignant moment in British history.

Her approach owes much to imaginative literature—she begins with the beautiful opening to Muriel Spark's *The Girl of Slender Means'*."

This is Foster being pure contrarian.

He wants his readers to know that Wills really is not to be taken seriously as she is from the literary tradition and his quip about Mills and Boon is seriously outrageous. Foster writes about "*imaginative literature*" but isn't that exactly what literature is? And how many adjectives does he need to describe anything, he makes do with three in the above piece. Foster states that Wills's book opens with a quotation from Muriel Spark but that is untrue. Wills starts with a long quotation from the sociologist Ruth Glass whose work she uses throughout her book.

The next quotation is from V.S. Naipaul, the Indian writer who now wishes to be known as Sir Vida—once his knighthood was announced in 1990. Of course he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2001 and announced in 2011 that women writers produce little but "sentimental tosh" which drew a fair amount of criticism but his comment was dismissed by the Writer's Guild which said it would not:

"waste its breath on them".

One cannot accuse Naipaul of becoming right-wing in his later years as he always was thus. He has also criticised Islam with a growing fanaticism and he has castigated E.M. Foster, and the economist John Maynard Keynes "*for their homosexual activities*". His comments about the Welfare State are inexcusable.

Wills uses a paragraph from Muriel Spark's novel *The Girl of Slender Means'* published in 1963 as her third quotation. Foster slyly castigates Wills for not using among her vast trawl of sources, one he claims he is familiar with—J.M. O'Neill. I confess that is not a name with which I was familiar with and neither were any of my friends—all of whom know a great

deal about Irish literature. I ended up googling O'Neill and found that he was born in Limerick in 1921, worked as a bank clerk, went to London and ended up running a bar. He also travelled to Nigeria and Ghana and back in London fell on bad times and died in Limerick in 1999. Whether his novels or plays were any good I cannot tell but maybe some of my readers would know more and be able to advise me.

Back to Wills herself:

"The story of post-war immigration is indeed in part a story about race. The account I offer here begins in the late 1940s, as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation operations were being wound up in Europe, and the newly formed NHS" (National Health Service) "began seeking Continental, Irish and, later, Caribbean workers. It ends in 1968, a landmark year, when the Labour Government under Harold Wilson effectively ended the right of Commonwealth citizens to enter Britain by pushing through emergency legislation (in three days) limiting entry to those whose parents or grandparents were born here. By the late 1960s the immigration debate had become limited to a debate about race, and colour, whether articulated by Enoch Powell, the Race Relations Board, or the British Black Panthers, in ways which would have been inconceivable twenty years before."

Wills also names the "*Legal milestones*" such as the 1948 *British Nationality Act*, the *Commonwealth Immigrants Act* of 1962 and the 1965 *Race Relations* legislation which impacted hugely on many people at the stroke of a pen.

"Domestic political issues also intervened, such as trade union struggles to maintain control over the shop floor and to bar immigrant labour, the growth of far-right groups and the Notting Hill riots, the 1964 Smethwick election result, which saw a safe Labour seat overturned by the Conservative Peter Griffiths, who ran on an explicitly anti-immigration ticket, or the rise of Enoch Powell."

"Griffith's slogan was: *If you want a nigger for a neighbour, vote Labour*'. His party denounced his campaign and two years later he lost."

In the foregoing analysis, what I found disturbing was the extent the Trade Unions were involved in pitched battles almost to keep out cheap immigrant labour and then seeing the latter get the lowliest/dirtiest jobs. There is another review of this book in *The Guardian*, on 16th August 2017, by Sukhdev Sandhu, a very distinguished journalist, critic and writer who lives in New York and London. About these immigrant workers, he shares "*two heartbreaking quotations*", one of which I would like to share. It is by H.L. Morrow

and it is his description of Irish workers on the mailboat to England:

"Wretched looking. The song knocked out of them. As they stumbled on board I noticed why: Each wore a label—like stock cattle. 'British factories', it said, simply. As if on their way to be spam-canned."

Sandhu commends Clair Wills for her monumental achievement.

"...*Lovers and Strangers'* is brimming with new archival sources, careful cullings of governmental documents and oral histories—the book encompasses poetry and fiction as well as sociological accounts... The book ends in 1968, before the era when sectarianisms flourished and identities splintered."

Yet Sandhu has a complaint and that is that Wills "*overemphasises how monocultural Britain was prior to the arrival of these migrants*". But he himself began his review by revealing that:

"going home can be disconcerting. Over the last few years, whenever I have returned from New York, where I live, to Gloucester, where I grew up, what has struck me most—more than the rundown state of the local library, the decamping of the local newspaper to posher Cheltenham, the ailing, asthmatic feel of the town centre—are its ethnic transformations. Neighbourhoods that in the 1970s and 80s seemed like havens of timeless Englishness augmented by a few Asian convenience stores and smoky cafes vibrating to militant reggae are now full of Romanian grocers and Polish bakers....A Commonwealth city has morphed into a European city..."

In truth, my memory is playing tricks on me. For Gloucester, like so many cities across the country, has long been a hub for Europeans. My father used to work alongside Poles and Hungarians at an aeronautics factory and still laughs about the speed at which they ripped open their pay packets to buy Friday night beer at the local pub... The briefest memory-delve brings up stories of Italians and Maltese—and Scottish, many of whom had moved to this sleepy West Country city after the second world war. They were hidden in plain sight, their whiteness obscuring the centrifugality of their lives."

Sandhu rightfully congratulates Clair Wills on a job well done and for her "*unifactory zeal*". With such beautifully written prose, it is no wonder that Sandhu won Critic of the Year at the British Press Awards. Though the Catholic joke is so overdone—nothing could make me repeat it—nevertheless this is a review worth reading.

Julianne Herlihy ©

To be continued.

Remembering What Didn't Happen

A few months ago I wrote a rather perfunctory review in *Church & State* No. 135 (First Quarter, 2019) of a fanciful Oxford University book called *Forgetful Remembrance: social forgetting and vernacular historiography of a rebellion in Ulster*, assuming that, with its central notions of pre-remembering and pre-forgetting—which make nonsense of history as a possible subject of coherent and fact-based knowledge—it would itself quickly be forgotten without having been noticed: except perhaps by Eoghan Harris as a piece of gibberish to get his weekly hand-out from the *Sunday Independent*. I should have known better: that the phantasmagoria organised by pre-remembering and pre-forgetting was tailor-made for the revisionist task of laying Irish history waste. And I should have remembered that Oxford University exercises hegemonic influence on academic life in Ireland.

The book is admiringly reviewed in the current issue of the pop-history academic magazine, *History Ireland*. It is "a book that breaks out of the fortress of History as it has been studied in the halls of the academy", the reviewer says. But in fact it dwells entirely in history as it has been written in the halls of the academy. It concerns the main events that happened in eastern Ulster in 1792-8, as written about in the academy, and it is the groundlessness of the academic writing that gives it scope to play with notions of "repressive erasure, prescriptive forgetfulness, forgetting that is constituted in the formation of a new identity, structured amnesia, forgetting as annulment, forgetting as humiliated silence".

I have always assumed that for something to be forgotten it must first have happened. But what is said here to have been subjected to a complex and devious process of forgetting is something that did not happen.

The thing that did not happen is that the Ulster Presbyterians were Irish nationalist Republicans in 1798 and that they transformed themselves into anti-Irish, Unionist Monarchists after being defeated in 1798, and that they then engaged in self-deceptive mental devices for the purpose of conjuring away the consciousness that they had undergone a profound process of transformation which was a process of degeneration.

I first encountered Ulster Protestants in the mid 1960s. They were very different from us—us being Slieve Luacra Catholics. Ulster Catholics, allowing for accent, were very similar to us.

The doctrine was that the Ulster Protestants were in historical fact part of a general Us of nationalist Ireland but that they had been conditioned to think that they were not. A "false consciousness" had somehow been imposed on them. They had a consciousness that was in conflict with their being. It did not come from what they really were. In all that they said and did they were acting a part.

I had come across people who were acting a part. There were none in Slieve Luacra that I can recall. Everyone there had to be what he was. But I had come across people acting a part pretentiously, aspiring to be what they were not, and imitating the thing that they aspired to be. I had come across them in London, in painfully extreme form around the Irish Club—Irish in the clumsy process of becoming English, or being stage-Irish in order to find a niche for themselves amongst the English. So I knew what false-consciousness was like. But I could see no trace of it in the Ulster Protestants.

They were a British strain which, whether they made a point of it or not, had developed self-sufficiently in eastern Ulster from the Plantations and migrations of the early 17th century. They were not acting a part. Pretending was something they were not at all good at. They were not sophisticated. They were blunt and straightforward, perhaps because they lacked the subtlety to be anything else.

I decided to find out how they had come about, and about the Northern Ireland in which they were confined. I could find nothing in books—least of all in the publication called *Irish Historical Studies*. So I did an extraordinary thing. I read their newspapers, which were all conveniently available in the newspaper Library in the Shankill Road, and in the Linen Hall Library at the city centre.

I spent months going daily to the Shankill Road Library and had lunch every day in a nearby café at which I consumed the entire menu—which consisted of tea, bread-and-butter, and a dish of mushy peas. It was not a dump. It was a business. And it was the most systematic adaptation

to poverty that I have ever seen.

I found out about the development of the Ulster colony from its newspapers and pamphlets—from its polemical literature.

Academic history in Ireland aspires to transcend the polemical reality of life. English history revelled in it—or it did until very recently. Clarendon's *History Of The Rebellion*, on which centuries of ruling class politicians were trained, is a vast polemic, written by a central participant of the event which it describes: the abortive English rebellion of 1640-1660.

I could find no trace in the newspaper and pamphlet literature of Protestant Ulster in the 1790s and the first generation of the 19th century of the event which Beiner supposes to have happened and to have been falsely remembered or deviously forgotten by later generations.

The first reference to that supposed event that I came across was a piece of academic writing by A.T.Q. Stewart of Queen's University. I read it about fifty years ago. Its subject was the *Transformation Problem*—the problem of how the Ulster Presbyterians, who were Irish nationalist Republicans in the 1790s, and who tried to make a revolution in 1798, transformed themselves into Unionist monarchists in the course of a generation after failing.

I took it for granted that the Presbyterians were in the 1790s what he said they were. I never dispute received knowledge hastily. But I was not finding in the newspapers of the 1790s the thing that Stewart supposed to have existed. The actual Transformation that I found was on the other side.

The Irish nationalists of 1798, the opponents of the Act of Union, were the Orangemen. The Irish nation which the Orangemen defended was the aristocratic Anglican stratum on which the Irish Parliament was based.

A wealth of pamphlet literature defending the Irish Parliament was published in Dublin in 1798-9. It was virtually all Orange in character. Some pamphlets threatened armed resistance to the Union Bill. Others predicted that, if the Bill was carried and the Parliament was abolished, the Irish would rise up and sever their relationship with England—which, of course, is what happened.

And the 1798 Rebellion! The main part of it was not a planned Rebellion at all but a provoked response by Catholics (Irish) in the South to the terror directed against them. In the West there was a battle

between the British Army and a small French Army. The Presbyterian movement in the North mounted only a couple of skirmishes in Antrim and Down.

The Government—the British Government, which had always been the Government of the independent Parliament of Ireland—broached the question of Union in September 1798 while it was still in the process of suppressing the 'rebellion', and some United Irish leaders in the North immediately expressed support of it.

The "*transformation*" did not happen in the course of a generation. It happened overnight. And it did not express a change of heart by Ulster Presbyterianism, but only an adaptation to a basic change in the structure of the state.

The Orange Order accused the Government of adopting the United Irish programme when it proposed the abolition of the Ascendancy Parliament. And, as far as Presbyterian Ulster was concerned, that was pretty well the truth of it.

The Ulster Presbyterians made their first appearance in history in 1649 as Constitutional Monarchists. The Belfast Presbytery recognised the son of Charles the First, who was executed by the Cromwellians, as King Charles the Second, and drew down on themselves the wrath of Cromwell's Secretary of State, John Milton, the Biblicalist Fundamentalist, and author of the line, "*New Presbyter is but old priest writ large*".

A hundred and fifty years later they were still Constitutional Monarchists. This was made clear by resolutions adopted at Parish Meetings. What they wanted was that the British Constitution should be made operative in Ireland through a reform of the Irish Parliament.

Instead of reforming, that Parliament criminalised the demand for reform and banned the Volunteer movement through which the Parliament had gained its independence in 1782.

The sheer unreasonableness of the position adopted by the handful of Anglican aristocrats who controlled the Parliament presented the Presbyterians with a dilemma. Many of them persisted in demanding reform and organised conspiratorially because open Volunteering was made illegal, but the conspirators did not change their demand to one of national separatist republicanism.

They resorted to conspiracy as a stubborn response to provocatively unreasonable government. Conspiracy implies rebellion. It was a tricky situation. The domineering attitude of the Anglican

aristocracy produced a condition of flux in which there was temptation to adopt Utopian revolutionary ideals. A few went that way, but in the main the Presbyterian body just hung on. The rebellion that was implicit in conspiracy was precipitated by state terrorism. To say that it went off at half-cock in the North would be to overstate the matter greatly. And, as it was being suppressed, the Government proposed that the Ascendancy Parliament should be abolished and Ireland should be brought directly within the system of the British Constitution. The Presbyterians got what they wanted. The Orangemen threatened national rebellion.

Could a reader of Beiner's book get any idea from it that this is what happened in 1798 in the North?

Beiner, as far as I recall, never, in all his 700 pages, says what he thinks happened in 1798, even though that is the subject of all the devious modes of remembering and forgetting that he writes about. It is all just implied. And what is implied is that the Ulster Presbyterians were Irish Republican separatists who were defeated, submitted mentally and spiritually to the enemy, and engaged in self-deception in order to become Unionists.

Or, as the *History Ireland* reviewer puts it: "*Once the rebellion was defeated, strategies of oblivion were encouraged through the instrumental use of history to sanitise understanding*".

Who devised and implemented this strategy of oblivion by means of historical falsification? There was no Ulster Presbyterian University. The middle class went to Glasgow for higher education. They felt at home in Glasgow, where their Church was the State Church.

The Presbyterian College in Belfast, BRA, was conducted by the Rev. William Bruce. Bruce conducted a correspondence with William Drennan, who is often said to be the founder of the United Irishmen. Drennan perhaps verged on a kind of nationalism, but he had moved to Dublin and was out of touch. And Bruce did not preach rebellion, or a stubborn adherence to reform in defiance of the Government.

The main newspaper was the *News Letter*. It was owned and edited by Henry Joy. Joy was a political colleague of Bruce in holding the ring against the United Irish development. I know of nothing published by Joy or Bruce that could be seen as playing around with memory in order to induce complex forms of forgetting.

(In order to see what a strategy of

oblivion looks like, see how the War of Independence is dealt with by Professor Keogh and his colleagues in Cork University, especially in their handling of the Six Counties.)

Presbyterian Ulster took to the Union as a matter of course while the Orange Order resisted it. The official Irish nation of the 18th century was Anglican, and militant Anglicanism defended itself against the Whitehall proposal to abolish its Constitution—and militant Anglicanism was Orangeism. And that is a very awkward fact of official Irish history.

I cannot say definitely that no Presbyterian pamphlet against the *Union Bill* was published. But I have read scores of the Orange pamphlets in defence of the Irish Parliament published in Dublin in 1798-1800.

Whitehall saved the Irish Parliament from subversion and invasion only to abolish it. And the Irish Parliament in its desperate hour of need was as adamantly anti-Catholic as it had been in the moment of its glory in 1782.

The Orange movement failed to prevent the Union. In the long run it became Unionist, with the purpose of preserving as much as possible of the Protestant Ascendancy structure of the Irish Parliament against the subversive influence of British politics. But the fact that, in the critical period of 1798-1800, and for some years after, Irish nationalism, in the sense of defence of the Irish Parliament, was Orange, is something which historians do not care to record, still less to dwell upon. And Beiner makes no mention of it.

Robert Emmet, in his speech from the Dock in 1803, made a puzzling remark about the Judge who was trying him, which I took to mean that the Judge was a defector from the cause. It put me in mind of some East European events in the mid 1950s, in which reform movements were broken up under Soviet pressure by causing some to defect and to exercise power against those who stood firm—or of the relations between Treatyites and Republicans in 1922.

And a number of pamphlets were published in Dublin in 1804 or 1805 in which Protestant gentlemen complained about having been arrested in 1803, held in abominable conditions for a period, and then released without charge.

The meaning I got from these things was that Emmet thought that he had been part of a movement of substantial Protestant gentry opposed to the Union, but found himself being prosecuted by some of those

gentry who had defected to the Union, and that the complaining gentlemen were Protestant Repealers who were given rough handling by the Government in order to show them that the Union regime was in earnest and they had better get inside with it.

The Anglo-Irish were in the 18th century Irish nationalists of a particular kind. They became Unionists in the 19th century after their nationalism had been defeated. If Beiner had investigated the devices of remembering and forgetting in that Anglo-Irish development, and later developments that followed from it, he would have been dealing with something real.

The title of A.T.Q. Stewart's piece about the disturbing transformation of Presbyterian Ulster is *The Transformation Of Presbyterian Radicalism In The North Of Ireland*. It has been widely referred to since 1970 but has never been published. It is a Queen's MA Thesis of 1956. I read it in the early 1970s. The term *Radicalism* was taken to be synonymous with nationalist Republicanism. I showed that there was no transformation of what did not exist, and I have not looked at it since.

Radicalism is a word without definite meaning. Its meaning as an adjective, *radical*, is given to it by the noun which it qualifies.

The United Irish in the North were radical reformers of the 1691 settlement. They were Royalists of what was called *'The Revolution'*. Their position did not involve repudiation of William of Orange. They wanted to broaden the base of the Parliament established by William beyond the clique of aristocrats that controlled it. They wanted it to become national in a fuller sense by a controlled admission of Presbyterians and Catholics to it. They wanted what Grattan wanted. What Grattan failed to achieve within the Parliament, they tried to achieve by exerting popular pressure from outside. When Parliament refused to reform, and criminalised the reform movement, things fell apart.

Persistence with the reform movement by conspiratorial methods after Parliament criminalised reform was futile. The desired reform could only have been achieved by Parliament.

There was no equality of oppression between Presbyterians and Catholics. The Presbyterians were scarcely oppressed at all. They had been developing self-sufficiently for almost two centuries outside the official structure of things. When it became clear that their reform project could only be prosecuted by

revolution, and that revolution would not achieve what they aimed for, they pulled back from the implications of conspiratorial organisation. And then, in the condition of chaos brought about by the Parliament, the Union Bill came to them as a gift from the Gods.

*

The Orange movement opposed the Union vigorously in 1798-1800. It became Unionist after the establishment of the Union. But Presbyterianism remained opposed to Orangeism even after Orangeism became Unionist. It opposed it in an attitude of disdain. Presbyterianism was discreetly middle class. Orangeism was a vulgarly demonstrative combination of the aristocracy and the populace. And the civil society links of the Presbyterians were maintained through Freemasonry, which indulged in no public displays as the Orange Order did.

The Freemasons, as far as I could discover, were founded in Scotland for the purpose of holding society together against the divisive influence of individualist Bible-reading as the supreme authority. I assume the Presbyterians brought it with them from Scotland to Ulster. It was active in the United Irish movement, and kept itself at a distance from Orangeism throughout the 19th century. It has an imposing building in Arthur Square, which is I suppose the notional centre of Belfast as it is named after Lord Chichester. But Belfast, not being a Plantation town, is uncertain about its centre.

There had to be a practical accommodation between the Masons and the Orange Order when they were driven together by the Home Rule Bills, but the disdainful Presbyterian attitude towards the Anglican Order was kept up in many families, and seems to have been very assiduously maintained in the Stewart family. And this disdain blinkered Stewart as a historian.

I crossed swords with him vicariously, so to speak. I never met him. He was a "Reader" at the University and I was a common labourer who presumed to write about matters that were his preserve, so there could be no meeting. My communication with him was very much at second hand. He was irritated by my description of Northern Ireland as an undemocratically-governed region of the democratically-governed UK state. If he had shown that my description was wrong, I would have thanked him and left Northern Ireland behind me. He refused to support the movement to bring the Six Counties within the democracy of the state, but gave no reason against. He lived in antiquated Presbyterian middle class disdain through-

out the War, dabbling in marginal issues.

Beiner continues the dabbling. But what is his purpose? It seems that this very big book about obscure corners of Ulster, a history on which considerable industry was expended, was launched in Israel. Roy Foster was flown in for the occasion. (We were not invited, so we cannot say if he made any further comments on the Aubane Historical Society.)

Beiner is an Israeli historian, born, bred and educated in Israel. One would have thought that there was ample material in the construction of the Jewish state as a British colonial project, and the destruction and forgetting of the Palestinian population, for the exercise of Beiner's endeavour in the field of remembering and forgetting, of forgetting but still remembering, of simulating and dissimulating, of constructing a storehouse of oblivion, etc.

Was his decision to immerse himself in these obscure Irish affairs his way of evading memory?

Beiner's wide-ranging researches—

"benefitted from the support of the Irish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences (which sponsored a fellowship at Trinity College...), the National Endowment for the Humanities (through a fellowship at the Irish Studies Center at the University of Notre Dame), the Israel Science Foundation (grant 810/07), the Balassi Institute..., and the Gerda Henkel Foundation (which funded a Marie Curie fellowship at the University of Oxford)..." (pv).

A book with such patronage must be admitted to be a classic.

I don't think it will be widely read, but it will be widely known that it is there and that important people in the knowledge industry have read it and that will suffice. It is reassuring to the notion that the Presbyterians were Irish nationalists in 1798, and that, even though they sold out their principles and swore loyalty to the Crown in exchange for the half-Crown, the faith to which they were faithless must still be there in their unconscious to be worked upon, and at least to make them squirm uncomfortably under the force of debating points.

How Andrew Boyd would have welcomed it! Boyd was a good Protestant who, with the aid of the Communist Party was true to his heritage from 1798. He was an influential figure when he rejected the Communist Party and became the controlling Editor of the Constitutional Nationalist, essentially Hibernian, *Irish News*. And it was through his efforts that

A.T.Q. Stewart's Thesis got currency. He gropes for sound historical material which could be used to lever open the Presbyterian unconscious but could not find it. He closed his mind to the historical materials dredged up and published by Athol Books. And he was unable to construct a big book about what was not there and lard it with plentiful historical irrelevancies, as Beiner has done.

It is remarkable that he does not appear at all in Beiner's book—at least he is not Indexed.

As far as I recall Boyd made much of the Rev. Henry Montgomery. So does Beiner. So did I. Montgomery remembered the Rebellion when he became Moderator of the Synod a generation later. His brothers were involved in it. His family suffered from its consequences. He refused to apologise for it.

He became theologically unorthodox, discarding the Trinity. The Rev. Henry Cooke insisted that Presbyterian clergy must subscribe to the doctrine of the Trinity. Montgomery seceded from the main Church and set up a Remonstrant Synod. Boyd had the idea that there was an inner connection between theological orthodoxy and Unionism. I showed that there wasn't. Beiner concedes that there wasn't.

There was perhaps an inner connection between theological orthodoxy and Conservatism in politics. But that is an entirely different matter. A Liberal political stance within the life of the Union state is no less Unionist than a Conservative political stance.

A generation after 1798, the Rev. Cooke was inclined to underplay the Presbyterian effort at rebellion, while the Rev. Montgomery was inclined to overplay it. Montgomery, as a 'Radical' within the Union, found people who had been United Irishmen congenial, while Cooke as a Conservative reformer did not.

Both of them were active in politics in the late 1820s, when Catholic Emancipation came on the agenda of the Union state. Beiner writes:

"The liberal Presbyterians... favoured Catholic Emancipation, and were even willing to co-operate with O'Connell in struggles for tenant rights, but were apprehensive of the aggressive mass politics displayed in Catholic nationalist campaigns and stopped short of supporting Repeal. Liberal unionists were typically reluctant to accept loyalist determination to forget Protestant participation in the rebellion..." (p236).

"Catholic emancipation" was not

merely about Catholics. The Test Act which excluded Catholics from Parliament also excluded Dissenters. Beiner uses the term "*Protestant*" much too loosely in this matter. "*Protestants*" for this purpose were Anglicans. Other Protestants were Dissenters from the state religion and were excluded from Parliament by the Test Oath. The Irish Catholic body was the battering ram that broke Parliament open. And O'Connell was in alliance with the centre of Protestant dissent at Exeter Hall in London on the issue.

Beiner leaves the impression that Cook opposed Emancipation. It would be surprising if, as a Dissenter, he had done so. My recollection from going into this about 30 years ago is that he supported it, since it had come up a practical issue in Union politics, but would not have been unhappy if it had not come up.

Emancipation was followed three years later with the 1832 Reform, which enfranchised the middle class. What I recall is that the Conservative interest in Belfast regretted that the general franchise Reform had not come before Emancipation because the reformed Parliament would not have admitted Catholics.

O'Connell tried to transfer the momentum of the Emancipation movement into a Repeal movement. According to Beiner, he—

"made overtures to liberal Presbyterians, referring to the experience of 1798 in Ulster in order to ask for their support for the repeal of the Act of Union. Cooke in turn evoked the sectarian atrocities committed against Protestants in Wexford, which had become engrained in loyalist memory..." (p235).

Beiner does not say directly what Montgomery's response was: only that he stopped short of supporting Repeal, because of concern about the mass Catholic politics of the Emancipation campaign.

The decisive rebuttal of O'Connell's approach to the Northern Dissenters, was delivered by Montgomery, with his long Open Letter of rejection that was published in both of the Belfast papers. It was vicious.

O'Connell had made the approach with flattery:

"Smarting under your degrading adulation, I was disposed to exclaim...—'What foolish thing have I said, what wicked thing have I done, that *he* should praise me!' Last week, however, you washed away the stain of your approbation, by a torrent of abuse" (*Montgomery's Letter To O'Connell*, Feb. 1831. Athol St. Edn. p16).

"The liberal Dissenters of Ireland... who had been the zealous advocates of Catholic emancipation, and who are at present no less united in the great cause of a rational and effective Reform, promptly threw off the incubus of your praise; and amply proved, that whilst they are the uncompromising friends of liberty, they are equally the determined enemies of anarchy and confusion. Their Address [of loyalty] to the Lord Lieutenant, coming from men of intelligence, property, and moral responsibility—...from men who have never fawned or crouched; who have never concealed one opinion, religious or political, which they ever entertained, or feigned one sentiment which they did not feel; such an Address, at such a time, gave the first death wound to your destructive projects. Had it emanated from Orangemen, it might have been regarded as the offspring of party hatred, had it proceeded from the Established Church, it might have been represented as the work of those who desired to perpetuate a selfish monopoly; but coming from the liberal Dissenters of Ireland, the hereditary and proverbial assertors of freedom, whom you have endeavoured to represent as participating in your sentiments, it operated like a talisman upon your chimerical agitation, and dissolved the charm by which so many of the people have been held in delusions..." (p17).

That is the authentic voice of the Northern United Irishmen, thirty years on.

(Beiner indexes a number of references to the influence of the French Revolution on Ireland. He does not note the immense influence exerted on Belfast in the 1790s by its apparently destructive effect on the Catholic Church. Protestant enthusiasm for Catholics rested on the assumption that the Roman Church was over and done with. But Drennan's sister, Martha M'Tier, observing the behaviour of Catholics around their newly built Chapel in Belfast, began to suspect that this was not the case. She wrote to Drennan that she feared a Catholic revival which would claim back the country. Dissenters faced with O'Connell were caught between two attitudes in a rapidly changing situation.)

*

The '98 Rebellion was in substance a Wexford affair, where it had not been prepared for, rather than an Ulster affair, where it had been prepared for elaborately but where it did not happen for lack of a coherent purpose. Cyril Fall, a Unionist historian of the old order, says that Antrim and Down were "*practically untouched*" by it. Beiner finds this "*a preposterous description... reminiscent of the Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy definition of the earth as 'mostly harmless'...*"

He is amazed that, in 2013—

"it was still possible for 20 leading experts to collaborate on an authoritative history of Ulster in which 1798 is covered in only two sentences and its legacy left unmentioned..."

This is in a book edited by Liam Kennedy which I have not read, but it seems accurate.

"inattention" to the Northern rebellion, says Beiner, "has a long history. The disregard shown by prominent historians for the northern area of the rebellion—as opposed to the obsession with the rebellion in Wexford—was first advanced by Richard Musgrave immediately after the events and was widely shared by his contemporaries, even by his critics..." (p605).

It was so for the very good reason that there was War in Wexford, and in the North a few half-hearted skirmishes from which most of the conspiracy stayed at home, and then settled down comfortably within the Union after Whitehall got rid of the enemy.

What would have been the purpose of the rebellion in Antrim and Down, if it had

been carried through? What was the enemy against which a reform conspiracy was organised? The Irish Parliament. The Northern gesture towards rebellion was in the nature of a protest.

Wexford is remembered because it was a major military event, a War. It has been said that it was because of the kind of war it was that the Northern Rebellion was called off. I think that the influence of Wexford on Antrim was grossly overstated. Antrim was having second thoughts before anything happened in Wexford. It was wondering what it had committed itself to.

In Wexford a war was extemporised in response to State terror. I don't know that it has ever been satisfactorily explained how this came about. A (current) commemorative plaque near Rosslare is in need of clarification:

"T'avance pace an livertie, an,
w'oute vlynch ee garde o'
generale reights an poplare
vartue ye pace. YEA."

Brendan Clifford

impression that this was all happening somewhere down South, but it is a very big South compared to maybe four Counties in the North which is occupied by the most Protestants.

Then, in the *Bulletins*, I read the town Omagh is being attacked by the RIC/English soldiers. My mother was a 17 year old girl in 1919 and she spoke of the RIC/English troops house raids on her own home. Somehow I mix this up with the War-of-independence period. But now I realise she had been talking of 1919.

(The Black and Tans were later to raid their home twice in the middle of the night during the War of Independence.)

I had been thinking only of Soloheadbeg and, with a Protestant school education, I was well isolated from Irish history.

Later, as a 14 year old working in the shipyard, I heard bits of conversations.

Someone's father is strolling along Royal Avenue in central Belfast, relaxed and with his hands in his pocket when a mixed RIC/soldier patrol comes into view. As he is about to pass it, he is suddenly hit in the mouth by a rifle butt. He wasn't aware you were forbidden to hide your hands in your pockets in case you were concealing a revolver. The fact that he was a Protestant didn't matter.

The RIC are patrolling Protestant areas and they are mostly Southern men. Some of their barracks have been under siege as it is suspected they will enforce the *Home Rule Bill*. Out of one of the barracks, in Protestant East Belfast, come shots through the slits in the steel shutters and two Protestants are dead.

One day my father is talking of his time as a 19 year old. He was born in 1900 and now in 2019 I know what he was talking about when he mentions armoured cars and tanks in the streets of Belfast, with a plane or two flying overhead. He mentions the police/soldiers don't seem to know one person from another. He is riled by this as a Protestant but Protestants, I gather, take as little notice of these activities and even join in with the suppression and persecution of Catholics. So 1919 suppression also operated North, I come to realise.

So much for the Unionist education system.

1916 wasn't necessary, they say, and the War of Independence could have been achieved constitutionally. Then surely England's 1919 war of suppression should never have happened but that crisis handled constitutionally.

W.J.Haire
6.9.2019

Lest We Forget

Though Most Of Us Never Knew!

You search the Internet for incidents related to 1919 Ireland and what do you get but Soloheadbeg and the killing of two RIC men. But read excerpts from the Irish Bulletin, appearing in the Irish Political Review and you get this huge panorama of RIC and English troops and their assault on the 32 Counties of Ireland.

So much of the English military machine is pouring into Ireland during 1919 that civilians find very little room left on the England to Ireland shipping routes because of soldiers and their equipment taking up the space. 60,000 soldiers are already in Ireland and more are arriving all the time.

People suspected of Republican sympathies are being assaulted, arrested and jailed on a daily basis. Farmers' markets are not being

allowed to function; the printing presses of newspapers are being wrecked or having their vital parts taken away; shops are raided and part of their stock is stolen or looted. A whole town like Fermoy undergoes a wrecking process by soldiers in mufti.

Now the message is you don't have to be Republican to be a target, only Irish. One case involves an Englishman who comes to the aid of a woman who is being battered by RIC members. He is then set upon himself.

Imprisonment is wrecking the health of many of the arrested and they are carried on stretchers to the nearest infirmary.

Some of it seems surprisingly modern with aircraft overhead in surveillance of *illegal* gatherings below.

Irish language classes are banned; Gaelic sporting events are cancelled by the British authorities; posters on wall mentioning Dail Eireann are torn down; Sinn Fein offices are continually raided; Republican flags are publicly burnt by the English military. All of this happening from Cork to County Down.

With Soloheadbeg as the only marker for the year 1919 you only have two *poor* RIC killed in what is reported as a reckless and irresponsible act by rebels.

Coming from the North I got the

'Constitutionalism' And An O'Casey Song For A Collins Execution

Seán O'Casey penned quite a number of songs in protest against Britain's 1914-18 Imperialist War against Germany, particularly targeting and lampooning John Redmond's 'Constitutional Movement' that was supporting and recruiting cannon fodder for that War.

But who today ever draws attention to the fact that these songs even existed? How come that all those pundits, who wax lyrical about O'Casey's critique of Connolly and the 1916 Rising, stay deadly silent on his anti-British verse?

Feather's from the Green Crow: Seán O'Casey 1905-1925 was a volume edited by American academic Robert Hogan and published in 1963—but it has long since been out of print. Yet, among the invaluable services performed by Hogan, was his rescue of such marvellous O'Casey ballads from the archives. Most of them had been published by O'Casey himself in his 1918 collection entitled *Songs of the Wren*, and they represented a powerful propagandist contribution from him to the anti-Conscription campaign. As Hogan observed: "*The satiric songs frequently comment upon World War One, for O'Casey regarded Britain's part in it and Britain's attempt to recruit in Ireland with a cold and satiric eye*".

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

When O'Casey himself republished it himself, in his 1934 collection *Windfalls*, he wrote in his Preface:

"Finally came the crash of the guns in the Great War, and England's hurried and agitated recruiting campaign in Ireland calling on Irishmen of goodwill to go out and fight for little Catholic Belgium. *The Grand Oul' Dame Britannia* was written, printed as a 'nix job' by

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

Letter submitted to *Sunday Times* (Ireland edition) on 2nd September (unpublished)

A Modest Proposal!

In his column yestareday (Sunday Times, 1 Sept.) David Quinn castigated RTE and the Irish media generally for remembering the horrific events of August 1969 in the North and reproducing black-and-white images of it from the time. This, he wrote, served only to antagonise the Unionist community and further damage relations already strained by Brexit. Such historic events, he proposed, were best passed over in silence.

This is a strange proposal indeed, not least as the British quality media was awash with reminiscences and reflection on those events, complete with contemporary images. I might mention the splendid series just begun on Channel 4 by renowned film historian, Frank Cousins, on the film narrative of the conflict. David Quinn's proposal would mean that while Irish views were stilled in the interests of relations with Northern unionists, British views would define our memories.

I would suggest a far more practical and fruitful way of building relations with Ulster Unionism would be an Irish government initiative on Harland and Wolff. These shipyards, once the pride and very basis of unionist industrial heritage, now employ just 170 workers compared to 30,000 in the 1960s. They are threatened with final closure and sell-off for scrap value, with the British Tory government rather bizarrely pleading EU state-aid rules for why they cannot intervene. Should not the Dublin government, as an act of goodwill, step in by establishing a semi-state company to buy the yards with a commitment to preserving that mighty industrial heritage and developing the undoubted modern enterprise potential the yards still possess?

Philip O'Connor

friendly printers, and circulated among the various National Societies" (Hogan, p 131).

See http://free-magazines.atholbooks.org/ipr/2007/IPR_November_2007.pdf for a selection of six such anti-Redmondite "*Songs against Sommetry*" penned by O'Casey.

Prior to '*Songs of the Wren*', and not included in that 1918 collection, there had also been a 1917 anti-Redmond song, penned by O'Casey, whose first performance his biographer, Christopher Murray, related as follows:

"It was something of an occasion, held in the Empire Palace of Varieties (now the Olympia Theatre), Dublin, on Sunday, 25 November 1917. Proceeds were for 'Necessitous Children and the Poor'. An advertisement prominently displayed in the programme announced that O'Casey's 'The Story of Thomas Ashe' was 'On Sale Everywhere'... O'Casey featured again, in offering with Michael Smyth a satirical song he had written with Fergus O'Connor but not published, 'The Constitutional Movement Must Go On'. He and Smyth delivered it as Members of Parliament, in frock coats, top hats, gloves and, of course, boots. It mocked John Redmond's Irish Party (the song title deriving from Redmond's declaration after the 1916

Rising), and concluded topically:

'But when Lloyd George will threaten
Irish with conscription
We'll stop him with our gas, led on by
John
And the 'Freeman' will write a grand
description
For the Constitutional movement must
go on.

Chorus: And on and on and on for
ever more.'

Droll rather than hilarious, this was well received..." (*Seán O'Casey—Writer At Work*, 2004, pp 110-111).

Just how well received it was, becoming part of Republican folk culture, is revealed in the recently published anti-revisionist history by Lorcan Collins, *The War of Independence 1919-21—The IRA's Guerrilla Campaign*. The author relates an episode in the life of Michael Collins's team of executioners, drawing on their Witness Statements to the Bureau of Military History:

"When the GPO and Four Courts garrisons surrendered in 1916, the Volunteers were held captive in the grounds of the Rotunda Hospital. A certain Captain Percival Lea-Wilson

continued on page 26, Col.2

Does It Up

Stack ?

Switzerland and Ireland:

"Life is not a matter of holding good cards but of playing a poor hand well".

An old Irish proverb.

The comparison of Switzerland and Ireland is important for Ireland because of the background in each case of centuries of strife and war. Switzerland is half the area of Ireland and a lot of that area is up in the Alps. Switzerland maintains a population of about six and a half million people as compared with a population of about four and a half million in Ireland.

Switzerland does not seem to maintain as many politicians as Ireland does. And police are much less evident in Switzerland than are Gardaí in Ireland. But there is a huge CCTV surveillance system all over the country. When we were coming back to Switzerland from Milan, we were both impressed that nobody came to check out our passport but we had been told by our Irish friend working in Milan that colour of skin was the biggest factor in being questioned. Sure enough after passing a few towns, the train was boarded by three Swiss police/customs people and without any kerfuffle they immediately went to the sole African looking lady and asked for papers and, on receiving none, she was quietly escorted off the train.

Every town and village in Switzerland is connected by rail, and in some cases by cog-railway or cable cars, and by walking trails. Many towns and villages are not accessible by motor cars or by buses. Zermatt, for example, is accessible only by railway and has no motor cars. To provide a taxi service from the very modern and efficient and clean train station, they use specially constructed electronically-powered little vans which are about one metre 45 cm wide so that they can pass each other on the narrow street. They also have horse-drawn carriages. In the vans, they sit three people on each of two benches, knees almost touching. All the luggage is stored in the back. And the driver is in front next to a hump which probably conceals the batteries. A seven seater—simplicity and efficiency all in one.

That is typical of Switzerland where commonsense is paramount. Walking is everywhere the preferred means of locomotion. Big motor cars are to be seen in places like Zurich—quite a few Porsches and, in one very exciting case, a most beautiful Ferrari. But elsewhere cars are few enough but there are taxi cars, trolley-buses and trams in plenty in the big cities.

Over 75% of Swiss electricity is generated from natural sources—mostly hydroelectricity powered by the water from melting snows. When there is surplus electricity, it is used to pump water up to lakes specially constructed so that the water can be used again. Every fall of water is used. This is not the case in Ireland where only about 25% of electricity comes from natural sources. Very many sources to generate hydroelectricity are ignored in Ireland. Most Irish electricity is made from Heavy-Fuel-Oil and from coal and turf: therefore an electric-powered car in Ireland is run ultimately on that precise source. Of all fuels, diesel had been shown to be the most economical and the most friendly to the environment, despite the propaganda otherwise.

In Switzerland, agricultural tractors tend to be small and diesel-powered. The fields under cultivation are very similar in size to Irish fields and there are noticeably less hedgerows in Switzerland but there are lots of screens of wild flowers and other vegetation maintained at the bottom of all the mountains which can be seen from the trains. Whenever land in Switzerland is difficult to cultivate, trees are grown as well. And, in the countryside, trees are very strategically grown to hide factories. Factories are built individually in the countryside near to a railway. I did not see anything like the industrial estates which we have in Ireland. It is common in Switzerland to see apartment housing for factory workers built, it seems, as part of the factories and it makes for a better quality of life when there is no commuting required for work. Many of the apartment blocks have vegetable garden plots next to them so that people are able to grow their own food.

On the farms, there was a mixture of corn, hay, grassland and vegetable growing and herds of cattle—quite small in comparison to Ireland. On the green hills of summer, there were sheep and goats. There was also pig farms where they were kept in specially constructed concrete units. Even though Switzerland is renowned for milk chocolate, which was invented there, it was surprising passing

through the countryside to see only small herds of cattle but of course that is again coming from the perspective of Ireland where herds today are absolutely massive. Everything was very clean and orderly and somewhat quaint in this modern age.

The countryside was farmed and groomed in such a careful manner that every view is a tourist attraction. There are no old pallets nor bedsteads blocking muddy gaps as there are in some places in Ireland. There are no dirty-looking clumps of nettles anywhere to be seen, and certainly no visible signs of weed cultivation, such as occur in Ireland where the cultivation of noxious yellow *buachaláns* seems to be a County Council industry along our roadsides. I remember when I was young that, if a Guard was seen to be cycling towards our rural abodes, there was a huge hue and cry from our parents and that was to go out and immediately start cutting those yellow weeds. There was a fine imposed on farmers if they were found on their land but no Guard ever turned up and eventually we were ordered to stand down!

Let us face it; Ireland is not at the races as far as tourism is concerned. Ireland has no regard for the preservation of views and vistas. In Zurich, Lucerne and Geneva the 'old town' is preserved carefully and glass and concrete buildings are not permitted in the 'old town' areas. There are six- and seven-floor glass and concrete buildings in these cities but they are allocated in areas away from tourist amenities and out of sight of tourist vistas. Out on Lake Lucerne, for example, sailing in a beautiful steamer—you look back at the city and what you see is the pitched slated roofs of the 'old town', with here and there a Church spire.

There are modern concrete and glass buildings also but you cannot see them. They are hidden behind the magnificent railway station buildings. Care has been taken to preserve the architectural heritage of whole towns and of large city centre areas. The resulting tourist product is a most valuable national asset in Switzerland. As it would be for Ireland, if planning authorities were not influenced by greedy developers to effectively destroy Ireland's urban heritage by the inappropriate siting of glass and concrete brutalist architectural buildings everywhere.

Switzerland has played its cards very well. It is half the area of Ireland and, of that area, at least one-third consists of mountains. There are no coastal waters teeming with fish. Switzerland has turned

its mountains into a huge tourist product and it has done this by constructing and maintaining a complete railway network reaching into every town and village in the Confederation.

Mountains and valleys did not stop the development of tourism. The St. Gothard and Simplon tunnels are famous and there must be thousands of tunnels throughout the mountains of Switzerland. Even the great Matterhorn has a cog-railway inside the mountain, just specially to take tourists up to a restaurant and viewing platform near the top and constructed so carefully that nothing is seen from below. It also has three cable car systems going up and down the mountain throughout the day from early morning to 9 pm, with no noise pollution whatsoever.

It does not stack up that our Government is not taking advantages now of the zero interest rates to borrow for Capital Projects (and for capital projects *only*), so as to vastly improve our tourism offering and for improvement of our rail system.

Hills are an asset and not an obstruction. For example, there should be several tunnels through the hills surrounding Cork city. A road tunnel through the hill west of Mount Desert to Blarney, and to connect the Southern Ring Road to all the Northern Ring Road. A Rail tunnel within the hill north of the River Lee from Inniscarra to Sunday's Well, to Blarney Street, to Patrick's Hill, to Silversprings, to Glanmire and eastwards to Dungourney and to the middle of Youghal. A rail tunnel from Ballincollig to Model Farm Road, CIT, and CUH, to UCC and under College Road, Gillabbey, Barrack Street, Douglas Street, Old Blackrock Road, to Blackrock with a branch to Cork Airport, Carrigline, Ringaskiddy etc. all underground constructed by means of tunnelling and boring technology.

Ireland borrowed 89 billion euros to dig the Banks out of a hole of their own making. Is it not possible now to borrow 100 or 150 billion euros for these and for other productive purposes? The hills north and south of Cork could be an advantage with modern tunnelling technology. Instead of building never-ending tall skyscrapers—the latest proposal that has got planning permission is for 37 stores high; and it is at the entrance to the beautiful harbour of Cork, the views of which will be completely cut off from the South Mall in the city. Surely we can do better than that for ourselves and more important for our future generations.

Michael Stack ©

O'Casey

continued

subjected the prisoners to a barrage of abuse and aimed his ire in particular at two signatories of the Proclamation, Thomas Clarke and Seán MacDiarmada. Frank Henderson, who had served under Clarke and MacDiarmada in the GPO, described Lea-Wilson's action that night as 'savage'. Liam Tobin, who... witnessed Lea-Wilson abusing his comrades, 'registered a vow' to himself that he 'would deal with him at some time in the future'. After the First World War, Lea-Wilson left the British Army, rejoined the RIC and became District Inspector (DI) for Gorey. He appeared to be making life miserable for the local people including the IRA. Michael Collins's Chief of Intelligence, Liam Tobin, and the Deputy Assistant Director of Intelligence, Frank Thornton, came down from Dublin on 12 June 1920 to shoot the DI. After three days in the company of three local IRA Volunteers they decided that the best time to shoot Lea-Wilson was in the morning, after he had collected his mail and newspaper from the 9.35 am Dublin train... On 15 June ... the two Intelligence men,

together with Joe McMahan and Sean Whelan, waited for their quarry who 'opened his newspaper and was reading its headlines as he walked towards the place of execution'. The ambushers fired a number of times... As they fled from the scene, Thornton started to sing a song written by Seán O'Casey, which mocked John Redmond, 'The Constitutional Movement Must Go On', and the rest of the men joined in the chorus" (p 115).

Whelan's Witness Statement had indeed concluded:

"When the Inspector fell dead, about fifteen or twenty yards from our car, he must have been hit at least a dozen times, but just to make sure we hit him again as he lay stretched full length on the footpath. We left him his mails and gun to show it was an execution and not a hold-up. As we reloaded our guns... we collected the Inspector's morning paper—it was the 'Irish Independent'. Thornton started to sing 'The Constitutional Movement must go on and on and on for ever more'. We all joined in the chorus as we sped away..."

Just one example of the excellent use made by Lorcan Collins of BMH Witness Statements!

Manus O'Riordan

LAUNCHES:

Eamon Dyas:

Starving The Germans

Volume Two of *The Evolution Of Britain's Strategy During WWI*

Jack Lane

The so-called 'Treaty' and the so-called 'Civil War'

jacklaneaubane@hotmail.com

To be launched on
Friday
8th November

at

The Ireland Institute (Pearse House)
27 Pearse Street
Dublin 2
(near Trinity College)

Now Available: IRISH FOREIGN AFFAIRS, SEPTEMBER 2019

- Editorial: This World and the Next: Britain and the Jewish Question
- Macron and Kramp-Karrenbauer: vive la différence? by *Andrew Watt*
- Britain versus Russia: Battle for the Caucasus 1918-20 by Pat Walsh
- The Durnovo Memorandum to the Tsar, February 1914.

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

USA continued

soldiers, committing fiendish atrocities. But I found that the German soldiers are like all other young boys forced to go to war: round-faced, innocent, bewildered, not understanding what it was for—excepting to obey orders or be court-martialled—dreading and fearing, fighting against their will, hoping that the hideous thing would soon be over and they might return to normal life." (*Ibid*, p.p 348/349)

Clarence Seward Darrow (1857-1938) was an American lawyer who became famous in the early 20th century for his involvement in the Bill Hayward trial; the Leopold and Loeb murder trial and the Scopes "Monkey" Trial. He was a leading member of the American Civil Liberties Union, and a prominent advocate for Georgist (single tax) economic reform.

In speeches and writings he advocated the closed shop and unrestricted freedom of expression, and opposed capital punishment, Prohibition, protective tariffs, and the League of Nations.

In 1895, Darrow published a pamphlet *The Rights and Wrongs of Ireland*.

SOCIALIZED GERMANY Frederic C. [Clemenson] Howe

New York, September, 1915

"MUCH of the material for this book was ready for publication in the fall of 1914. It is the product of rather intimate knowledge of German life during the past quarter of a century. When the war broke out the manuscript was laid aside to await its termination, but as the contest wore on and the extraordinary resources of Germany were disclosed, it seemed to me the book should be published, partly as an explanation of the efficiency of Germany, but primarily as a suggestion of a new kind of social statesmanship which our own as well as other countries must take into consideration if they are to be prepared to meet the Germany which, in victory or

defeat, emerges from the war.

"For the "German peril" is only in part a military peril. It is a peace peril as well. The real peril to the other powers of Western civilization lies in the fact that Germany is more intelligently organized than is the rest of the world. The individual German receives more from society. He is better protected in his daily life. The gains of civilization are more widely distributed than they are with us. His dignity and his personal liberty are on a different, and from our point of view on a lower, plane than in America and Great Britain, but his daily and hourly needs, and those of his wife and family, are better cared for. And the individual man is more efficient. He is better prepared for his work. He enjoys a wholesome leisure life. He is assured protection from *la misere* in old age.

"It is my belief that Germany had just reached the beginning of her greatest achievements. Had not the war intervened, the next generation would have seen her competitors in industry, trade, and commerce outdistanced at an accelerated speed that would have soon left them far and possibly permanently in the rear.

"If this is to be averted, new ideas of the obligations of the state must animate our legislators. There must be an abandonment of the old conception that the only business of organized society is to protect the individual from domestic and foreign aggression.

"There must be a wide extension of public ownership, a greater control of the aggression of privilege and property, a big programme of social legislation, a change in our system of education, and the exclusion of privileged and business interests from the long ascendancy which they have enjoyed in our political life. It required the war to make this clear to Great Britain. It should shake us from our complacency as well." (*Socialized Germany*, Frederic C. Howe, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916-342 p.p.)

Frederic Clemson Howe (1867-1940) was a member of the Ohio Senate, a Georgist (advocate of a single tax), Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of New York, and published author. He was also President of the League for Small and Subject Nationalities.

In 1919, Howe was targeted during a bombing spree, but was unharmed. Howe was the subject of vitriolic attacks by the business interests and was portrayed as a 'Red'. Because his ideas were extracted largely from policies and practices in Imperial Germany, Howe was purged from the American consciousness.

There is every possibility that Socialized Germany was read by James Connolly, who lived in the United States (1903-1910) and would have been familiar with Howe's earlier book *Why War*.

Irving Stone (1903-1989) was an American writer, chiefly known for his biographical novels of noted artists, politicians and intellectuals; among the best known are *Lust for Life* (1934), about the life of Vincent van Gogh, and *The Agony and the Ecstasy* about Michelangelo. Apart from *Clarence Darrow for the Defence*, which contains major episodes of labour life in the US, he also wrote *Adversary in the House* based on the life of Eugene Debs and centred on his marriage to Kate Debs who seemed to have been so hostile to Debs's socialist activities threatening her sense of middle-class respectability : a dilemma 'modern' labour leaders don't have to contend with!

Connolly and German Socialism, Brendan Clifford,

80 pp, ISBN 0 85034 106 X. Athol Books. April, 2004. £10.

Connolly's views on World War I, have now been reduced to a matter of mere academic interest. Always too relevant to current affairs for academics ever to have taken an interest in them.

Look Up the
Athol Books

archive on the Internet
www.atholbooks.org



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 37 No. 10

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

World War I and the U.S. (Clarence Darrow and Frederic C. Howe)

"During the early years of the World War he [Darrow] had been an ardent pacifist, by 1917, like most of the American pacifists (with the exception of his friend, Eugene Debs, who was to go to Atlanta Penitentiary for opposing the entry of the United States into the war), he [Darrow] regretfully had been swept to the conclusion that it was no longer sensible to be pacifist.

(Clarence Darrow for the Defence, Irving Stone, A Four Square Book, 493 p.p., 1966, p.p 348/349)

"For two years he had maintained that America must remain neutral, but by the time the s.s. *Lusitania* had been sunk and he had been shown a number of German atrocity pictures, he, too, was saying in interviews that America must join up to destroy the 'Beast of Berlin.'

"War years [1914-18] are bad ones for a man with a lust for justice. Even though the United States had not been attacked and was in no conceivable danger, the nation was caught in a paroxysm of fear which suspended all judgment and paralysed the legal apparatus. Under the Espionage Act of 1917 and the Sedition Act of 1918 almost two thousand American citizens, including editors, clergymen, educators, had been sent to prison for terms of ten to twenty years for declaring that America did not belong in the war, for offering evidence that the manufacture of war supplies were looting the public funds of billions of dollars, for suggesting improvement or change in governmental tactics, for criticising an act of the Congress or a departmental bureau.

"Several thousand other native-born Americans were clubbed, horse-whipped, tarred and feathered, beaten with an iron cat-o'-nine-tails for declining to buy Liberty

bonds or subscribe to the Red Cross, for challenging the operation of the draft, for promoting a World Peace League, for making 'disloyal' comments in their own homes. Meetings of university students, of Bible students, of socialists, pacifists and irate farmers were broken up by enraged mobs of self-appointed 'espionage agents.' Judges and juries alike were caught up in the dementia, and the country suffered its most complete suspension of civil liberties since the War between the States.

"Then in the spring of 1918 the government of England decided that there was need further to consolidate and strengthen American sympathy for the British. They cast about to learn which American best understood the mass of his countrymen and to whose voice the greatest number of American people would listen sympathetically. They choose Clarence Darrow.

"From the moment he closed behind him the door of his flat in the Midway [Chicago] until he returned to that front

door some four months later he was the guest of Great Britain. He was wined and dined in London; he met the great and near great. H. G. Wells who, when asked by an interviewer how he had enjoyed his stay in America, had replied, 'Well I met Clarence Darrow!' Introduced to England's literary figures. He was thrilled because Frazer, author of his beloved *Golden Bough*, treated him as an equal; he discussed the McNamara case with Keir Hardie; he discussed labour, socialism and conservatism with the best minds in England; then he went to France and Belgium to watch the war in action. But search as he would for these atrocities allegedly committed by the German soldiers, he could find none, nor evidence that any had been committed outside the offices of the British Propaganda bureau. When he was tendered an official farewell in London by representatives of the government he did not tell them that their efforts had been in vain, that the sights he had seen had made him once again profoundly pacifistic.

"He returned to Chicago in October, where he made only one speech. The meeting was held in a torrential downpour, which led him to remark that it was only fitting the meeting should be held in the Baptist Church. To an audience expecting a fight talk peppered with tales of German horrors, Darrow instead made a standing offer of one thousand dollars to anyone who could bring forward evidence of a French or Belgian child whose hand had been cut off.

"I had gone over hating the German warriors because they had been press-agented as the most horrible, bloodthirsty

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>

continued on page 27