

# IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

September 2019

Vol.34, No.9 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.33 No.9 ISSN 954-5891

## Slightly Constitutional!

When anti-Treaty Sinn Fein, re-formed as Fianna Fail, entered the Treaty Dail in 1926, under ambiguous circumstances, for the purpose of breaking the Treaty from within it, Sean Lemass said that it acted as a "slightly constitutional" party. That was entirely appropriate to the occasion.

The strictly constitutional party, Cumann na nGaedheal (which became Fine Gael a few years later) was constitutional under British law. It had won the Treaty War with British weapons and British propaganda support in 1922-3, and it had won the General Election of 1923 with the intimidating power of British militarism hanging over the electorate.

As the British threat receded, and Britain itself fell into political confusion, the spirit of the Irish electorate revived and there was a resurgence of anti-Treaty voting. But the Treatyite Government tried to hold onto power by making it a condition, not only of entry to the Dail, but of contesting Dail elections, that candidates must take the Treaty Oath in advance.

This raised the prospect of representatives of a majority of the electorate being excluded from the constitutional politics of the Treaty state. It was therefore appropriate that the representative of the majority should only be slightly constitutional—constitutional enough to get a foothold within the Treaty Constitution for the purpose of breaking it.

Fianna Fail has now repudiated its anti-Treaty, slightly constitutional, origins as defenders of the Republic established in January 1919 on the foundation of the Election of December 1918. This was done in effect under Bertie Ahern and was decisively confirmed by Micheál Martin. The repudiation was not done by Proclamation supported by reasons. It was announced discreetly in letters to the press by party intellectual Martin Mansergh.

*continued on page 2*

## If Boris Johnson Succeeds?

The bewilderment at Boris Johnson's election as British PM is palpable. The English have lost their marbles. Leaving the biggest market in the world, setting out on their own, hoping to compete like a minnow among whales etc., etc. I would not be surprised if Fintan O'Toole has needed counselling because of it. It is madness and bound to fail. Or is it?

Nobody doubts that England—and it is England—is taking a step into the unknown. But it's not a first. Breaking with Rome 500 years ago was a bigger risk that breaking with Brussels as it is today. The Pope had his battalions then—and a lot more going for him.

John Milton reminded Parliament of England's destiny in 1643: "*Let not England forget her precedence of teaching nations how to live.*" That is the spirit that motivated the break with Rome, and England did not forget her precedence: she has spent the period since doing just that.

*continued on page 5*

## August 2019 Brexit Summary

During late July and the first half of August the main Brexit issues have been Boris Johnson's victory in the Tory Party, his preparations for crashing out of the EU at the end of October, and tactical speculations about how to prevent that. In Ireland Timmy Dooley of Fianna Fail was publicly reprimanded by his Party Leader for questioning the Government's position on the Backstop. There have also been

some extraordinary Brexit-related developments in the strange world of the Irish media.

### BRITISH DEVELOPMENTS

As expected Boris Johnson won the Tory leadership contest, but he won with a higher margin than expected (92,153 to 46,656, nearly 2 to 1). His purge of Remainder members of the May Cabinet

also included staunch Brexiteers like Liam Fox and Penny Mordaunt, who had supported Jeremy Hunt. To the chagrin of the anti-Brexit media in Britain he appointed Dominic Cummings, by all accounts the mastermind of the Leave campaign in 2016, as head of the political advisors to his Government. The message of these initial moves is that the new Prime Minister is determined to avoid the paralysis that engulfed Theresa May's Government.

*continued on page 6*

## Text CONTENTS

Page

<b>Slightly Constitutional!</b> Editorial	1
<b>If Boris Johnson succeeds?</b> Jack Lane	1
<b>August 2019 Brexit Summary.</b> Dave Alvey	1
<b>Readers' Letters: Kid Gloves For An 'Elderly' Bigot?</b> Manus O'Riordan	3
<b>À Propos Sean O'Casey SONGS . . .</b> Jack Lane	8
<b>LEST WE FORGET (4).</b> Extracts from <i>Irish Bulletin</i> . British Acts Of Aggression, 4th October - 17th October 1919 (ed. Jack Lane)	9
<b>Es Ahora.</b> Julianne Herlihy (Martin Mansergh And His Insights Regarding The EU)	15
<b>Snapshots Of The North.</b> . Wilson John Haire	17
<b>Casement, The Congo, Belgium And The Great War.</b> Brendan Clifford	18
<b>More on the Seen, the Unseen and Disappeared.</b> Jack Lane	22
<b>A Scotsman, an Englishman, an Irishman, and Casement Diary Discretion.</b> Tim O'Sullivan	24
<b>Unchanging Times: Press Gangs and Press Gags.</b> Donal Kennedy	25
<b>From All For Ireland To All For Wine—One Healy's Odyssey.</b> Manus O'Riordan	26
<b>Biteback: A Bowdlerised Letter.</b> Dr Brian P. Murphy osb (What the <i>Sunday Independent</i> left out!)	29
<b>Does It Stack Up?</b> Michael Stack (Infrastructure Ireland)	30

*Labour Comment*, edited by **Pat Maloney**:  
The New Capitalism: Downgrading The Working Class!  
 (back page)  
Not Enough Migrants To Keep Pay Down: Central Bank  
 (page 27)

But we haven't done with slightly constitutional politics. Far from it.

Fine Gael, having failed to keep anti-Treaty Fianna Fail out of the Dail, lost its majority in 1927, but clung on by chicanery until 1932. There was a peaceful transfer of power in 1932. But it was a peaceful development within the Dail that was sustained by balance of power outside the Dail. Fianna Fail had a revived IRA as its backstop, and the Free State Army that had won the Treaty War was no longer fighting fit.

The hard men who had won the so-called Civil War of 1922-3—who had brutalised the Republican areas into submission but not surrender—were not there anymore. They were Collins's men. They were eager to get the 'Civil War' over with as quickly as possible in order to begin stepping across the stepping-stones that would dismantle the Treaty by use of the degree of state power which the Treaty accorded to the Free State. But, when Collins got himself killed, probably by accident, on his wild escapade in West Cork, they found that Collins's colleagues in Office had no intention of carrying out his policy. The stepping-stones were left to grow moss. So they mutinied.

It was a discreet mutiny. The Mutiny of the Free State Major-Generals was in that respect rather like the Curragh Mutiny. Not a shot was fired in either case, and nobody was prosecuted, but both had consequences. The consequence for the Free State was that its Army became demoralised and without a national purpose, that the IRA revived, and that Fianna Fail became the stepping-stone party.

If the Cosgrave Government had not vacated its offices in 1932 there would have been an authentic Civil War which it could not hope to win.

(Britain, having fallen under 'National Government', would have been in no condition to come to its support. National Government in the party-political British state is unnatural government, weak government, confused government. And Britain and the Free State were not allies under a Treaty arrangement. The Free State in the Treaty War was not an ally of Britain but a British instrument.)

Cumann na nGaedheal, disabled by having clung to power for too long without a reputable purpose, remade itself after the 1933 Election (which it lost again) as

Fine Gael. It remained Treatyite, and it became Fascist. It was Fascist in support of the Treaty which Fianna Fail was breaking.

It was also the party of the intelligentsia. It had some very high-powered academic intellectuals in its ranks. (There are none of comparable quality in the Universities today.)

Professors Michael Tierney of Dublin and James Hogan of Cork were convinced that there was an imminent danger of Communism coming to Ireland through the Fianna Fail Party, because of its dependency on the IRA. So they threw themselves into developing a fascist mass movement, free of the trickery of Parliamentary politics, in order to save Ireland from Communism.

They saw De Valera as the Irish Kerensky—who would be used for a while by the Communist IRA and would then be discarded. This appears absurd in retrospect, but in the circumstances of the time there was more reason for it than there was for the present day Professor Keogh's vision of a Fascist takeover which he had at the burning of the British Embassy in response to the Bloody Sunday shootings in Derry.

Fine Gael opposed the 1937 Constitution as a recipe for Presidential dictatorship—which was absurd. It went along with neutrality in the World War, which enabled it to slip back into constitutional mode. In 1948 it went Republican and formally left the Commonwealth, which Fianna Fail had never participated in. And it engaged in a campaign of intensive anti-Partition propaganda without having a clue about how anti-Partitionism might be put into effect.

The 1956 IRA Campaign was the outcome of that propaganda.

The 1956 Campaign had the form of a military invasion. The main invading force drove through unopposed to North Antrim and stopped there. It was a responsible act, in that it did not attempt to incite the Catholic community to rebellion, but by the same token it was pointless. (On the Border to the West there was some conflict and Sean South was killed.)

The Fianna Fail Government took militant Republicanism in hand in the south and pacified it. Charles Haughey was the Minister who dealt with it.

Fourteen years later Haughey was prosecuted by Jack Lynch on a charge of gun-running for the IRA. The form of the charge was not explicit but that was

generally understood to be the substance of it. The prosecution failed to present any evidence on which an honest jury could convict. But Lynch, supported by Fine Gael, treated the Not Guilty verdict as perverse. Haughey was a gun-runner for the IRA—that continues to be repeated as a historical fact by Professor Roy Foster, who now seems to be acting under the direct sponsorship of the Department of External Affairs.

But what was the IRA at the moment when the charges were laid? In the early Summer of 1970 there was a residue of the 'Official IRA', which had disarmed and become constitutional. It pretended to exist still. As part of that pretence it offered some provocation to the Loyalists in Belfast in August 1969 (in the context of the Siege of Derry), but it was nowhere to be seen when the trouble came.

The Provisional IRA was waiting to be born. It was a possibility resulting from the mass expulsions from the Official IRA in its passive adaptation to the Treaty. It was gestating through the Winter and Spring of 1969-70. But its birth was a consequence of the Arms Trials, not a cause. The prosecution of Haughey and the Kellys precipitated the formation of the Provisional IRA, as a specific product of the Northern Ireland situation.

The Fianna Fail Government had rounded up the IRA after its 1956 escapade. There was no dissent from those who fourteen years later were charged—or not charged—with IRA activities. In fact, Charles Haughey was the Minister responsible for that Government measure. (It should be added that there were also Ministers who Lynch did not dare send for trial.)

So what were Haughey, Blaney and Boland up to?

They knew that Northern Ireland was a dysfunctional part of the British state. Haughey said so explicitly. And only a simpleton could have regarded it as functional. It was so constructed that it could not settle down into a constitutional routine.

The 1937 Constitution asserted a right of sovereignty over it, but it let the implementation of this right wait on opportunity.

The right could not be implemented by invasion. Collins somehow had got the notion that it could. He acted in May 1922 as if he thought Northern Ireland was a free-standing body, a little state in itself. Possibly he had been given that idea from his friend Birkenhead, to encourage him

## Kid Gloves For An 'Elderly' Bigot?

One of more bizarre defences of the English bigot Bruce Arnold - from criticisms of the anti-Irish vitriol he had spewed in the *'Daily Telegraph'* this July 31—was voiced by Eoghan Harris in the *'Sunday Independent'* on August 4. Harris moaned that *"The Irish Times"* waxed indignant about backstop critics like the elderly English expat Bruce Arnold."

What on earth has Arnold's age got to do with the issue? Arnold hits 83 this September. In the *'Irish Times'* on October 10, 2009, Harris felt no constraints of age in robustly defending his false "history" of the supposed "ethnic cleansing" of Protestants from Cork, when challenged as to his "facts" by John A. Murphy, then in his 83rd year. Harris did, however, end with a whinge: "I ask your readers to reflect on Prof Murphy's motives in distorting my contribution. This is his second personalised letter since I was appointed to the Seanad."

Five years previously, in the *'Irish Times'* on October 28, 2004, Bruce Arnold had himself attacked Murphy, his senior by a decade, in the following language: "I am tempted to call his 'free-thinking mentality' flabbiness when it fails to recognise the difference between whatever it is he means and the more rigorous discipline of the Protestant mind."

Not just an English bigot, but a Protestant sectarian bigot to boot.

**Manus O'Riordan**

to by-pass the Dail Government and sign the 'Treaty'. But, when he made war on Northern Ireland, he found that it was just a piece of the British state, and that the Northern Ireland apparatus was only a decoy, backed by the British Army.

But that Northern Ireland apparatus, which was entirely of Whitehall's devising, made it an unstable political region. It was unstable because it had no politics—it had only the local governing of the Catholic community by the Protestant community. It was essentially no more than a communal policing of Catholics by Protestants. And this was bound to lead to mass Catholic discontent that would sooner or later lead to a kind of rebellion.

The rebellion came in August 1969, when a catholic demand for a couple of minor reforms were met by Loyalist assaults on the Bogside and West Belfast.

It is impossible to measure the weight of the different influences in the causing of the subsequent Catholic insurrection of August 1969, but the sovereignty claim of the South, as expressed by Taoiseach Lynch's inflammatory speech, had something to do with it.

The Northern Catholic community had been given reason by Dublin to look to Dublin for support. And Dublin gave them support in the first instance—though it failed to put a force into Derry to protect the Bogside when the besieged community

begged it to do so in August 1969: a fateful omission which forced Catholics to look to their own military development.

Dublin established a relationship with the Defence Committees that sprang into being in the North. John Kelly became the more or less official liaison between the Defence Committees and the Dublin Government.

And then, suddenly, out of the blue, he was charged with something like treason by the Taoiseach, and Haughey along with him, and Captain James Kelly who had been acting under the authority of his Colonel, who had been acting under the authority of his Minister, in all that he did.

All were found Not Guilty on the basis of the evidence. Any other verdict would have been perverse. But the State (the Government plus fine Gael plus Labour) put it about that the jury had been got at and that the guilty men had got away with it.

That was how the Republic severed its relations with the Northern Defence Committees. It was done in the most provocative way possible. Northern Defence was deprived of its Southern hinterland and was obliged to take its own course. And that was how the Provisional IRA was born.

The Arms Trial cut the Northern nationalist community adrift from the Republic. But the Republic still main-

tained its sovereignty claim over the Six Counties, denying the legitimacy of Britain's Northern Ireland regime. And it denounced the War declared by the Provisional IRA in terms which suggested that it still considered itself the legitimate authority on war and peace in the North. It neither revoked the sovereignty claim nor did anything to enforce it. It held to the *status quo* of 1937-68, even though that *status quo* was in ruins.

John A. Murphy, then a lecturer now a Professor at Cork University, praised Jack Lynch a few years later for saving people like himself from themselves. The shock of the Arms Trials alienated Northern Catholics from the South, brought them to their senses and saved the state. That is, it brought the Murphy cohort to a sense of what they really were—small-time Republican *poseurs*, in secure jobs, living the life of the spirit in fantasy terms.

The fact that Lynch could bring no evidence to support the charges laid against Haughey etc. was a thing of no consequence to them. He saved them from their idle fantasies and offered them an evil genius as a scapegoat—Haughey.

In 1970 we suggested that the Unionist community should be treated as a distinct nationality and negotiated with on that basis, the the sovereignty claim should be deleted from the Constitution as it was clear that the State had no intention of acting on it, and that the British regime in the Six Counties should be treated as a provocative perversion of democracy since it was excluded from the political system by which the British state was governed. Professor Murphy had nothing to say on these issues then. Silence was golden. Forty years later he thought it safe to say that, yes, there did seem to be two nations in the North.

The watershed moment in the South was the week following the Bloody Sunday massacre. Under the immediate emotional impact of the event, semi-official plans were made for a mass convergence of the nation on Newry the following weekend. If those plans had been followed through with a will, the British Government would possibly have been stimulated to do something on the lines of what it did 26 years later. But the Southern Establishment spent the second half of the week calling off what it had started in the first half.

Our view of Bloody Sunday at the time was that it was an *administrative massacre* to test the will of the Nationalist com-

munity. It was expected that they would return to quiescence after a hiding. That kind of thing had often been done in the Empire, which had only just been wound up. And the Prime Minister, Edward Heath, was the last with direct Empire experience. The occasion for the massacre seemed to be a shot fired by the Official IRA, which was a rogue element in the situation and had not yet been disciplined out of its world of fantasy revolution by the Provisionals.

The War then ran its course for the next quarter century without ever being recognised as a war by Dublin, though it was known to be so by the British Army. In the South Jack Lynch won a great election victory by abolishing rates and undermining Local Government and the economy.

Haughey kept the state functional by not entering a defence of carrying out Government policy at his trial. (It appeared that Blaney and Boland were not tried because they would have entered that defence. Instead their promising careers as Ministers were ended.) He built up a strong base in the Fianna Fail membership, ousted Lynch, and, without ever gaining a clear party majority, revolutionised the economy, convinced the EU that Ireland was not a British attachment, and quietly took part in the moves that led to the Good Friday Agreement.

The brief Haughey periods of Government were an exercise of virtuoso statesmanship, achieved against the hostility of Party elders. Reynolds made a brave attempt to continue it, but then the Lynchite blinkers were put on again.

There is now much talk of the British party-system breaking down. That remains to be seen. But the Free State party system—pardon the Northern usage!—actually has broken down. Fianna Fail under Ahern and Martin has remade itself as a Free State party. It has rejected its anti-Treaty origins, which were the source of its vigour for three generations. It has repudiated the hegemonic status which it exercised as the anti-Treaty party, and has become Tweedledee to Fine Gael's Tweedledum. And it seems to have done this as a matter of bizarre principle under the Smart Alecry of Cork City Republicanism.

Fianna Fail was the national party of the Irish state, as the Tory Party was of the English state. Fine Gael was the alternative Party. This was a structural fact. Fine Gael won the 'Civil War'; but did not know what to do with its victory because it had

not fought for an ideal. It had no separate ideal from the half of Sinn Fein that opposed the 'Treaty'. It only fought the anti-Treatyites to ward off a British reconquest. In the course of doing so it lost the run of itself and went to self-destructive extremes.

It does not have the resources—the historical background—to be the hegemonic national party. It has been thrust into that position by the self-castration of Fianna Fail.

After the IRA made the Good Friday settlement, it told the South that it would be OK to repeal the sovereignty claim. The claim was repealed. The Six Counties became a region of a foreign state in Irish constitutional terms.

While the claim stood, and a war to give effect to it was being fought in the North, the Southern state disowned the war and no Taoiseach ever went North to tell Nationalists what to do in the predicament in which they found themselves.

But, now that the North is part of a foreign country on which the South makes no claim, a Taoiseach goes to West Belfast and offers to dissolve the state which he was elected to govern, and to make a new state on British lines.

It appears that he is willing to drop the Gaelic heritage—language and culture—to make Unionists feel at home in the New Ireland. The offer is that Ireland will be a 'Little Britain' with no national language and no distinctive culture.

'*Slightly constitutional*' is the word for it.

Varadkar forgets that his new Ireland would have to be accepted in a referendum in the South, as well as the North. And whether that would happen is debatable, to say the least. De Valera always understood that he had a choice to make between Britishising Ireland to attract Unionism, or undoing the British legacy in line with Irish national traditions. He quietly chose to do the latter, putting unity on the long finger. In this unspoken policy he was faithful to Irish tradition.

However, it is most unlikely that Unionism will drop its traditions and destiny any time soon. Varadkar's appeal is likely to fall on deaf ears.

And this on what seems to be the eve of Brexit, when Nationalist Ireland should be discovering—or re-discovering—what it is to be European!

The offer to dismantle the state and remake it to Unionist, or British

specifications, made without protest from the political elite, is proof that the State, in its official aspect, has lost all conviction in itself. And what power of attraction can there be in a state that has been overcome by doubt about itself.

Loss of conviction by the Irish State in its own values has led to its being taken in tow by Cosmopolitan/Californian values, thereby increasing the differences between itself and Ulster Unionist society.

Unionist Ulster has remained itself while nationalist Ireland has flitted from one side of it to the other. Will Varadkar now undertake to repeal homosexual marriage law and end abortion on demand in his new British Ireland?

It was never the case that the Ulster Protestants were deterred from joining the South by what they saw as its excessive Catholicism. Religion was a debating point. They would not join the Irish state because they were British by historical origin and by current orientation, and so they remain unimpressed by the collapse of Catholicism in the public life of the Irish state and the emergence of Californianism in its place.

They have themselves no need of Californianism, and it does not increase the status of nationalist Ireland in its eyes that it does have a need of it.

Would Varadkar undertake to restore marriage as a social institution designed for the production and rearing of children in order to facilitate political unification? Or is homosexual marriage, a novelty invented the day before yesterday, now a universal Human Right in his eyes, which must be imposed at all costs?

The unmaking and remaking of states is not a serious political business. The proper business of politics is the governing of states.

Sinn Fein engaged in the proper business of politics when it supported war on the perverse mode of government imposed by Britain on the Six County region. Partition was not what caused the war to be fought, although ending it was the aim of the war in the first instance. It was the Northern Ireland system that provoked the war, and that enabled it to be fought for 28 years. The Adams/McGuinness initiative changed the aim of the war, brought it into line with its cause, and enabled it to be brought to a successful end by establishing an authentic apartheid system for the two national bodies in the Six Counties.

The Good Friday Agreement consolidated Partition by acknowledging national

divisions and giving both sides a veto. The new structures worked because 'reconciliation' was not their purpose. Reconciliation belongs to domestic life.

The new structures worked when Sinn Fein displaced the SDLP and established a working relationship with Ian Paisley.

Things began to go awry when Martin McGuinness died, and Sinn Fein became a major Dail Party and acquired a Southern leadership that was increasingly detached from the Party's origins in the Northern War.

Sinn Fein, under the leadership of Mary Lou Macdonald, became a creature of cosmopolitan fashion. There was an opening for Sinn Fein to fill the political space being vacated by Fianna Fail, but it went in the opposite direction.

Mary Lou said the War of Independence had not been worth fighting—look at the claustrophobic, theocratic, misogynist, priest-ridden, homophobic abomination that it led to! She would not tolerate the idea of future unification as the extension of the existing Irish state.

Varadkar does no more than repeat her. It is the vision of aliens.

And yet there is an opportunity for movement of a very different kind.

The Republic, outside its Smart-Alec political elite, is bustling with entrepreneurship under the stimulus given to it by the disgraced Haughey. Harland and Wolff, the pride of Unionist Ulster, has been bankrupted by political and commercial bungling.

Boris Johnson, the friend of Ulster Unionism, refuses to nationalise it.

The enterprise is now a shadow of its former self, however it helps to maintain an engineering tradition in the North. Its Trade Unions demand nationalisation to create a breathing space to re-launch the enterprise. Apparently it has been in administration for nearly a year and, during that period, it was unable to accept new orders. Potential bidders were put off by the fact that there were negotiations with a purchaser. However the proposed new owners pulled out at the eleventh hour. And now there are no orders in hand, to provide continuity while new owners are sought.

The Unions are right in saying that there is a sound economic case for nationalisation. (Whether the enterprise should be privatised again after restored profitability, is a moot point! It will be recalled that a Labour Government went down this route: nationalised the Yard

and many years later it was sold again by Margaret Thatcher.)

The Tory 'friends' of Ulster Unionism have the refused nationalisation route. Bizarrely, they cite EU State Aid rules in justification!

If the Irish Government is seeking a way to win Unionist hearts and minds, here is one staring them in the face: Buy Harland & Wolff and establish a semi-state company to run it. There can be little doubt that the EU would see the sense in such a project, which is far more to the point in Northern Ireland's future than any 'Backstop', and commit financial support to it.

If the Irish Government wants an avenue into the heart of Ulster Unionism, saving Harland and Wolff provides it!

## Boris Johnson

continued

It may not be able to do it as powerfully today as hitherto but listen to any debate in the House of Commons on Foreign Affairs and that spirit is alive and well. The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak at present. But who can predict how cookies will crumble in international affairs? And the crumbling might even be worse than before, but if England is playing a determining part in, it she will be "*happy and glorious*". And what else matters?

England has been very successful in making Ireland rethink itself and its history in the last half century via its Oxbridge agencies. That must be a model on how to do so with others and to teach them who and what they are—which is sometimes unknown even to themselves, it appears!

Does size matter? There is another, smaller state, a mere sprat compared with England, that did not even exist 70 years ago and is now one of the most powerful forces in the world—Israel. How has it done that? It also has a destiny, one that is much older than the one that England gave itself a mere half a millennium ago—and that is its secret weapon.

And there are people directing education here who still think history does not matter!

What has England to offer the world? Milton spoke in the context of proposing the right to divorce. Nobody can doubt but

that Boris Johnson represents a libertarian England that might make Milton blush, one that is its precedent for the world.

But his most crucial appointment—the job of managing the House of Commons—was given to Jacob Rees Mogg, an old-fashioned Catholic. Between them, Johnson and Mogg represent quite a broad comprehensive spectrum of how people might be taught to live. It's a wide choice.

*The Catholic Herald* was pleased to report that:

"The Boris Johnson era has already had one unexpected consequence: Blessed Pope Pius IX is being given his due in Parliament. The Prime Minister has appointed the Catholic Jacob Rees-Mogg as Leader of the House of Commons. At Rees-Mogg's first official appearance he was welcomed by another Catholic MP, Edward Leigh, who described Rees-Mogg as "a fellow ultramontane Catholic. I am not sure that many people here know what that means, but my Hon Friend knows—perhaps luckily." Rees-Mogg replied: "I share my Right Honourable Friend's admiration for the late Pope Pius IX." Incidentally, one useful intercessor for the PM is St Boris of Kiev—whose feast day, July 24, was the day Boris of Westminster took office" (1.8.2019).

And it turns out, for good measure, that Johnson was baptised a Catholic (though he became an Anglican in his early years).

One can hardly imagine sentiments like Rees-Mogg's being expressed by a leading member of the Irish Cabinet in the Dáil. We are talking here of Papal Infallibility, Syllabus of Errors, 38 Encyclicals—the whole shebang.

Not even a Healy Rae would risk that—even a bishop would hardly dare do so today. But has Ireland found an alternative destiny to sustain itself?

**Jack Lane**

## Correction

August *Irish Political Review*  
Editorial, *England As It Is*  
Page 5, Column 1, Line 3:

the word *bankruptcy* should  
read *anarchy*:

A thoroughgoing democracy  
would always seem to exist on the  
verge of anarchy, as the British does  
now.

## Brexit Summary

continued

Johnson has set the UK on course for crashing out of the EU on October 31st. Along with appropriate funds, he has given Michael Gove the job of managing preparations for that crash out. He has replaced Oliver Robbins, Theresa May's Brexit sherpa, with a civil servant experienced in diplomatic relations with the EU, David Frost. Frost is politically neutral on the side of Brexit whereas Robbins, according to the Brexit camp, was politically neutral on the side of preventing it. As described in a tweet (8 August) by RTE Europe correspondent Tony Connelly, in his first conversation with EU officials in Brussels Frost was asked whether the Commons would accept the Withdrawal Agreement if the Backstop was removed; his answer was *No*. Johnson is thus playing hardball and the response is most unlikely to be a climbdown by the EU.

Prime Minister Johnson has brought fresh ideas to Brexit in less publicised ways. A series of tweets from Tony Connelly on 8th August, summarising his interpretation of the Irish Government's position, indicate a definite shift in the British position. Whereas the Joint Report agreed by both Brexit negotiating parties in 2017 committed to preserving the Irish "all-island economy", the Johnson Government has only committed to "no infrastructure at the border". Likewise, the UK is now rejecting the level-playing field provision of the Withdrawal Agreement, which the EU had seen as a buffer against a low-regulation Singapore emerging on its Western flank. This may explain some of the vehemence with which the Tory Right opposed Theresa May's Deal.

Another area where Johnson seems to have torn up the Tory script of pre-Brexit days is domestic economic policy. Gone is the focus on austerity and in its place is fiscal expansion. Sajid Javid, the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, has clear instructions to increase public expenditure as a means, not only of easing the shock of a No Deal Brexit, but also to prepare the ground for a General Election. An interesting straw in the wind in this context is the emergence of an unlikely candidate, Gerard Lyons, to replace Mark Carney at the Bank of England.

In an opinion piece for the *Daily Telegraph* on 9th August Lyons argues that monetary policy should be loosened "to improve the quantity of lending to the UK economy". He also considers that "Deal or no deal there is a good case for more overt fiscal activism in the UK". Lyons, known to be close to Johnson, may not get the job but the ideas he is airing seem to be influenced by a new economic doctrine, Modern Monetary Theory (MMT) usually associated with thinkers on the Left. It would be a sad irony if Johnson were to steal a march on the Corbynite Labour Party by implementing an economic theory which seems tailor-made for a Labour Government.

### TACTICAL SPECULATIONS

Since Johnson became PM, there has been a rash of speculative articles in the *Guardian* and similar papers on how No Deal can be stopped. Now designated as "the rebels", the cross-party forces opposed to Brexit are engaged in a frantic effort to forge an effective strategy. Space prevents me from describing the full extent of the tactical discussions but the pattern seems to be that the speculation is feeding into the changing tactics of both sides. Because the Government is hanging on with a majority of one, all sorts of permutations are possible.

Based on an *Observer* article, *Cross-party schemes drawn up to prevent a Johnson no deal* (August 11), the discussion may be summarised as follows: No Deal could be stopped by forcing the PM to request another extension to EU membership; Government legislation could be amended to achieve this, but the Government could refuse to introduce any legislation; Commons Speaker John Bercow could allow backbenchers to seize control from the Government and pass their own laws, but this would entail a departure from precedent; the law requires that two weeks after a successful No Confidence vote, if efforts to form a new Government fail, there must be an Election, but the law is unclear on whether Johnson could refuse to resign or whether he could set an Election date after Britain had left the EU; some rebels are canvassing for the Queen to sack Johnson following a successful No Confidence vote but this would entail a major break with Constitutional practice; forming an alternative Government presents the rebels with a problem because the obvious choice for alternative Prime Minister, Leader of the Opposition Jeremy Corbyn, would not receive support from the Lib Dems or the rebel Tories.

Questions that underlie all of the speculation are: should there be a General Election? and who would win it? It is a fair bet that, in a campaign fought on the ground of choosing between Brexit or endless deadlock, the Conservatives would win with a solid majority. The Labour Party blew its chance of capitalising on the divisions in the Tory Party by failing to support the May Deal. There is also a possibility that, in such a crucial Election campaign, with Johnson standing on a clear pro-Brexit platform, Farage might agree a pact with the Tories; it was the presence of a Brexit Party candidate that prevented the Conservatives from winning the Brecon and Radnorshire Bye-election.

Under the Fixed-term Parliaments Act Johnson needs the support of two thirds of MPs, a number he may find difficult to muster, before he can call an early General Election. Because of that, a successful vote of No Confidence could be a welcome development from his perspective. On the question of whether an Election date should be set *before* or *after* October 31st, only advisors with long experience of politics and access to accurate logistical information about the state of play in the constituencies, would be in a position to hazard a judgement. From this distance, it seems a difficult decision. However, it should be borne in mind that, once Brexit becomes an irreversible legal reality, opposition to it will mostly evaporate and the majority of the UK electorate will rally behind a position of making the best of it. From that point on, from the perspective of the Johnson Government, it will be possible to negotiate with the EU unhampered by a truculent and powerful internal opposition.

#### DOOLEY'S MISTAKE

Here in the Republic the only recent development worth noting was the manner in which the TD for Clare, Timmy Dooley of Fianna Fail, needed to be reined in by the Party Leadership for stating:

"The stand off with our nearest neighbour is as a direct result of Taoiseach Varadkar's failure to engage in basic diplomacy over the past 2 years" (Tweet, 30 July 2019).

Dooley's mistake was to faintly echo the nonsense that Eoghan Harris has been spewing in the *Sunday Independent*. Had the statement been allowed, there was a danger that British representatives would see it as a weakness in the Irish position on the Backstop (and consequently as a weakness in the defences of the EU). The incident underlines the risks when influen-

tial sections of the media identify with British interests while the interests of the Irish State lie with the EU.

#### MEDIA MOVES

Brexit is upsetting a pattern of Irish media commentary that has been dominant for decades. It is becoming increasingly difficult for Irish opinion-formers with a British orientation to make their pitch, now that the paths of Britain and Ireland are diverging. In recent weeks this has been conspicuous in the cases of Bruce Arnold, Eoghan Harris and Fintan O'Toole, but arguing for retaining a close relationship with Britain is no longer the only show in town.

Other Irish journalistic voices have recognised Brexit as a positive opportunity for Irish development, economic and intellectual, away from the dependency effect of the old colonial relationship.

For those of us in the Irish political community who have argued that many of the leading voices in our media elite harbour a pro-British bias that is beyond ridiculous, it is only necessary to quote from an article by Bruce Arnold published in the *Daily Telegraph* on July 31st, and rest our case. Arnold states:

"This is tough right now, being a proud and loyal British subject who has lived in, and loved, Ireland for more than 60 years... Yet again we face a crisis of democracy, with little Ireland and the huge EU refusing to recognise the democratic decision of the UK to leave the European Union. The ridiculous country in which I live is helping Europe in this abuse."

The wonder is that Arnold has occupied a position of considerable influence in Irish politics for so long. In December 1982 controversy erupted when it transpired that the then Taoiseach, Charles Haughey, had ordered phone taps to be placed on Bruce Arnold and Geraldine Kennedy. Whatever about Kennedy, in retrospect it is clear that in vilifying Haughey, Arnold was acting in accordance with his notion of the British interest.

In his column of August 4th, Eoghan Harris tried to minimise the damage caused by Arnold by referring to him as "*the elderly English expat*", but Harris himself is a liability to the West British cause in Ireland. Speaking of the way that Timmy Dooley was treated by Fianna Fail he said:

"Martin [the Fianna Fail Leader] should have supported Dooley's democratic right to query Leo Varadkar's abrasive tone in talking to the UK—asked some belated questions of his own about the backstop."

The real story there is that Micheal Martin, having been unwise enough to heed Harris on the subject of Brexit, urgently needed to distance himself from him. If ideologues like Harris didn't occupy positions of influence, it just might have been possible to hold a political debate about the Backstop. As it was, Harris *et al* are now rightly viewed as defenders of the British position on that subject. Being fixated on the 50-year old feud between the Official and Provisional wings of Irish republicanism, Harris is possibly unaware that the logic of his intervention in the Brexit debate was the breakup of EU solidarity. Thankfully there was never any real danger of that occurring.

Fintan O'Toole belongs in a different category to Arnold and Harris as he is more representative than they are. He is representative of the Irish cultural elite but also of the *Irish Times* itself, a newspaper that occupies a central position in contemporary society. An article by O'Toole published on 2nd August had the title: "*Fintan O'Toole: Ireland can stop a no-deal Brexit. Here's how*". In it he proposed that the seven Sinn Féin MPs in the North should resign their seats and allow representative celebrities to take them. These would then vote against No Deal at Westminster.

O'Toole's initiative reflects a depth of apprehension currently being experienced by a section of the Irish elite as a crash-out Brexit seems increasingly likely. The apprehension is less about economics and more about the collapse of a project to increase British influence in Ireland. The following extracts, with most of which I concur, explain why the proposal was rejected.

"Now, here's the gist of O'Toole's scheme. As Sinn Féin doesn't take its seats at Westminster, where the Conservative/DUP alliance just about has a majority, it should resign its vacant mandates and allow a cross-community bunch of folk from the north of Ireland to take them over and vote solely on Brexit.

Once business is completed, and they've sufficiently subverted Johnson's aspirations, these temporary seat-warmers will step down. Voilà, a plan so cunning even Blackadder should have no response.

Except it's harebrained. And the column itself reads like something a student would post on a blog, with the greatest of respect towards students who post on blogs" (RT, 5 August: **Bryan MacDonald**, Irish journalist working in Russia).

"I canvassed four senior Labour party Remainers in confidence about O'Toole's

suggestion in order to test whether they would support such a move.

One of them, an MP for 18 years, thought it was "bonkers" and hopelessly flawed. Three, who admired both the notion and the kindly rationale which informed it, rejected it as wholly impractical.

One, a former cabinet member who sits in the Lords, said there was no certainty that seven votes would make a difference, given the fact that a number of Brexit-minded Labour MPs will surely defy the whip by voting with the government. Anyway, asked another, an ex-minister, what precisely would "O'Tooled MPs" be voting for? A deal? If so, what deal? Revocation of Article 50? Dissolution of parliament? He said: "They are likely to be blindsided by unforeseen events."

Three of them pointed to the difficulty Sinn Féin would face in trying to "sell" what seems like a complicated plot to voters in Northern Ireland. "As good as it sounds," said one, "there is likely to be more of a down-side than an up-side for Sinn Féin."

The most enthusiastic of the four, a leading Remainer propagandist, told me: "It would be marvellous if it could be organised but it seems like a very complicated procedure to explain to constituents. It would also be considered by Brexiters and, to be honest, many Remainers as well, to be a cynical interference with parliament. I can imagine loud complaints about Sinn Féin undermining British democracy. And who knows where that might finish? Quite possibly in renewed civil disturbance in Northern Ireland?"

It strikes me, despite O'Toole's entertaining stratagem and his genuine wish to prevent a no-deal scenario becoming a reality, that my British quartet of interviewees are correct.

A good column but bad politics." (IT Letters, 7 August)

*Roy Greenslade*, British media expert living in Donegal

"The fact is that the British government and the British parliament cannot agree with the EU a viable framework for delivering Brexit.

So long as this is the case, we will face the prospect of a crash—irrespective of the theatrics at Westminster." (IT, 7 August)

**Mary Lou MacDonald**,  
Sinn Fein Leader

"It was a totally unrealistic plan, relying on too many variables and requiring long-time political opponents to agree on the complexities of Fintan O'Toole's proposal, and it took no account of the predictable backlash from within the British parliament" (IT Letters, 8 August)

**Enda Fanning**,  
Sinn Fein member

So the proposal had little to commend it. It was not, as Roy Greenslade stated, a good column with bad politics, but bad politics, period. Surprisingly it received a strong editorial endorsement, so it reflects bad politics on the part of the *Irish Times* as a publishing entity.

Not to end on a sour note, I should emphasise that it would be untrue to bracket all journalists writing for the *Irish Times* as subscribers to the West British project, for want of a better term. The paper regularly publishes articles and letters from writers who see Brexit as an opportunity. One such is the Berlin correspondent, *Derek Scally*. A recent

piece from him headed, "*The British are deluded about Germany's fear of a no-deal Brexit*" (10 August) concludes with the following paragraph.

**"But what is being done to shore up Irish minds? Where is the palpable boost in language teaching, the big spend on school and cultural exchange or even financing to rebroadcast, with subtitles, other EU countries' news? Done well, Brexit is a unique chance to connect with European culture and liberate Irish intellect from centuries of British cultural captivity. Done badly, or with the usual *béal bocht* approach, Brexit will push Ireland into a total eclipse of the mind."**

Dave Alvey

## À Propos Sean O'Casey SONGS . . .

Some years ago, somewhere, I came across a collection of O'Casey's compositions around WWI. This was included, though not under his name, but it was in the same genre/spirit as the others and I suspect it was his. It was written when the propaganda made a special point of fighting for Christianity!

### We're fighting now for Christianity!

(Air: "Killaloe")

Sez John Bull to Pat one day,  
As he came along the way,  
I'd like to tell you all about the war,  
For as I boss '*the show*,'  
Small Nations all should know,  
The causes that I'm really fighting for;  
Well I found that Kaiser Bill  
Was an anti-bilious pill  
I couldn't stand his '*swank*' and vanity,  
So I started making war,  
And when they asked '*What for?*'  
I say I'm out for Christianity!

*Chorus:*

For all the little Nations,  
And all my poor relations,  
For every grade of real humanity!  
I've the Jingo, Japs and Jews,  
And the Kaffirs and Hindoos,  
They're fighting now for Christianity!

I've got every class and clan,  
I've got every race of man,  
From Esquimaux to foolish Irishmen,  
There's Arabs, Jews and Japs,  
And some flat-nosed Negro chaps,  
Who'll prove to all that I'll be boss again;  
Mike O'Leary from Macroom,  
And Sheikh Haffi from Khartoum,  
Have enlisted in the cause of sanity,  
There's the Ghurkhas and the Sikhs,  
And the Mongos and the Mikes,  
All fighting now for Christianity!

*Chorus:*

There's Dagos and Fijies,  
And now I've got Chinese,  
There's Cannibals and Hottentots  
galore,  
There's men from God knows where,  
With feathers in their hair,  
To stop the Hun from landing on our  
shore;  
So Pat my cordial friend,  
I'd like the war to end,  
Or else 'twill drive me to insanity,  
It's for '*Faith and Fatherland*,'  
That all the Allies stand,  
For we're fighting now for Christianity!

*Chorus:*

I've Freemasons on my side,  
Who you know are true and tried,  
You've heard of Viviani on the sly,  
Who tried to stop the sun,  
If he couldn't stop the Hun,  
And put the stars from shining in the  
sky;  
It's a just and blessed war,  
Though' slaughter I abhor,  
For I couldn't '*stick*' the Kaiser's vanity,  
So Pat my gallant son,  
Now's the time to get your gun,  
For we're fighting now for Christianity!

*Chorus:*

"Sliabh Ruadh"

## LEST WE FORGET (9)

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 4th, '19.

DATE:- Sept. & October	29th	30th	Oct. 1st	2nd	3rd	4th	Total.
Raids:-	53	1	14		2		70
Arrests:-		7	2	5		1	15
Sentences:-		1	1	1		1	4
Proclamations & Suppressions:-	3	4	3	1	3	2	16
Armed Assaults:-	1	2	1		200		203
Courtmarshals:-				1			1
<b>Daily Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>309</b>

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29th, 1919.

Raids:- Police and Military raided upwards of fifty houses in the neighbourhood of Berrings, Co. Cork. The house at Dysart, Co. Roscommon of Mr. Denis J. Kelly, Vice-Chairman of the Roscommon County Council was forcibly entered by police during his absence and searched. In the same district the houses of Messrs. John J. Geoghegan and Patrick Murray were similarly raided and searched.

Proclamations and Suppressions:- Markets were suppressed in many parts of Co. Tipperary, including the fairs arranged to be held at Carrick-on-Suir, Nenagh, Clonmel, all of which towns were occupied by large bodies of troops who prohibited the farmers from bringing supplies to the townspeople. The sufferings of the poor throughout the entire county are now very great as hardly any food or fuel is allowed to reach them.

Treatment of Prisoners:- Miss Catherine McCormack of Carron, Co. Clare, was released from Mountjoy jail, Dublin, in broken health. Twenty-six political prisoners from Cork jail where they had been in solitary confinement for nine months, were removed to Mountjoy Jail, Dublin, some of them in a state of collapse.

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30th, 1919.

Raids:- Military and police raided and took possession of the Ballalley at Laffanbridge, Co. Tipperary, where handball contests were about to be held.

Arrests:- Denis and Daniel Looney and John Scanlon, all of Donoughmore, Co. Cork; Owen McCarthy Firmount; Timothy Connell, Kilmartin and Daniel Moynihan, Ballycunningham, all in Cork County were arrested on a charge of endeavouring to obtain arms. Michael Aherne, Clonakilty, Co. Cork, was arrested on an unknown political charge and brought to Cork jail.

Sentence:- Charles Gildea, Derry, was fined £3 for defending himself against a detective who overpowered him and searched his pockets.

Proclamations:- At Loughinisland, Co. Down, the English Military authorities proclaimed a Republican meeting. A large body of English troops raided and suppressed a sports meeting at Thurles, Co. Tipperary, in which town the usual weekly market was also suppressed. At Dundrum, in the same county, a fete to procure funds for carrying on the local schools was suppressed by large forces of military and police fully armed.

Armed Assaults:- Armed police suddenly attacked the local band at Newmarket, Co. Cork, which was parading the streets of the town. Many of the bandsmen were seriously injured. Police and military fully armed held up country folk bringing supplies to Thurles, Co. Tipperary and, having overpowered them, searched them.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 1st, 1919.

Raids:- At Midleton, Co. Cork, armed police raided twelve houses. The houses of Mr. E. T. Keane and Alderman J. Nowlan, Kilkenny, were raided by military and police.

Arrests:- Alderman James Nowlan, President of the Gaelic Athletic Association was arrested by military and police at Kilkenny City in the early morning. Mr. E. T. Keane, Editor of the "Kilkenny People" was similarly arrested.

Sentences:- Christopher Quigley, Lower Gloucester Street, Dublin, was sentenced by Courtmartial to 12 months imprisonment for procuring arms.

Suppressions:- A hurling contest at Tulla, Co. Clare, was proclaimed and suppressed by military and police. A hurling contest at Toeni, Co. Tipperary, was also suppressed. At Newcestown, Co. Cork, an Irish Language

festival was suppressed by English military and police who raided and occupied the ground.

Armed Assault:- At Ballynahinch, Co. Down, Rev. Fr. Denis Cahill was surrounded by armed police and being overpowered had his pockets searched.

**THURSDAY, OCTOBER 2nd, 1919.**

Arrests:- Five men whose names have not transpired were arrested at Bochel, Tannaghmore, Co. Down, for taking part in a proclaimed language festival.

Sentences:- William Shaughnessy, Cathedral Street, Ennis, Co. Clare, was tried by courtmartial at Limerick and was sentenced to 17 days imprisonment with hard labour for endeavouring to procure arms.

Court martial:- Mr. Richard A. Johnston, University Hall, Earlsfort Terrace, Dublin was tried by courtmartial at Ship Street Barracks, Dublin, on a charge of possessing parts of a revolver and five cartridges.

Suppressions:- Military and police raided the printing works of the "Sligo Nationalist" dismantled the machinery and suppressed the paper.

**FRIDAY, OCTOBER 3rd, 1919.**

Suppressions:- The weekly corn market in Cashel was prevented by the British Authorities last Wednesday. The marketers had sent in a request for a permit which was refused. In reply to a request for a permit to hold fairs and markets, Nenagh U.D.C. received notice from the Co. Inspector of the R.I.C. that none would be allowed. Persons bringing butter to the market in Carrick-on-Suir were held up by armed police.

Armed Assault:- The market in Carrick-on-Suir, Co. Tipperary, was prevented by members of the army of occupation.

Militarism:- British military have requisitioned the use of the Bantry Guardians Board-room, and have informed the Guardians that they should hold their meetings elsewhere. Hand-printed posters calling on the people to support the Dail Eireann Loan were torn down by the police.

Raids:- W. O'Grady, Hairdresser, Wicklow, having failed to remove a full-page advertisement of the Dail Eireann Loan, which was adhered to the window, the Constabulary raided the premises and completely defaced it with their penknives. They warned O'Grady of the consequences of placing another in the window. British military raided and searched a drapery establishment in Rostrevor, Co. Down.

**SATURDAY, OCTOBER 4th, 1919.**

Suppressions:- The Lord Justices refused a permit for the holding of a fair in Clonmel. British military and police were posted at the entrances to the town to prevent any attempt to hold the fair. British military and police also occupied the approaches to Thurles and turned back the people who were bringing pigs to the fortnightly market.

Arrest:- Charles Bradley, Herbert Street, Belfast, was arrested on a charge of having in his possession a canister of gunpowder and 59 pinfire revolver cartridges for which he had no licence.

Sentence:- Tried on above charge, Charles Bradley was fined 40/- and costs.

**THE FOLLOWING ARE ACTS OF AGGRESSION COMMITTED IN IRELAND BY THE MILITARY AND POLICE OF THE USURPING ENGLISH GOVERNMENT - AS PUBLISHED, IN THE DAILY PRESS - for Week ending OCTOBER 11th 1919.**

<b>Date:- October</b>	<b>5th</b>	<b>7th</b>	<b>8th</b>	<b>9th</b>	<b>10th</b>	<b>11th</b>	<b>Total.</b>
Raids:-		3	2	3	13	1	21
Arrests:-	2		2	7	1		13
Court martials:-	3			3	1		7
Sentences:-	3	1	10	6			20
Armed Assaults:-	1	63	20		1		85
Proclamations & Suppressions:-	3		1	4		3	11
Suppressions of Newspapers:-				2			2
<b>TOTALS:-</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>159</b>

**MONDAY, OCTOBER 6th, 1919.**

Arrests:- - Aherne, Kilmartin, Co. Cork, was arrested. He is to be charged, along with six others already in custody, in connection with the alleged shooting of a Constable in Berrings, near Cork, last Sunday. Richard Higgins, Sallins, Co. Kildare, Secretary to Prosperous Sinn Fein Club, was arrested and conveyed in military motor wagon to Mount-

joy Prison, Dublin.

Armed Assault:- Armed soldiers in uniform attacked the private residence of Charles Culhane, President, Sinn Fein Club Thurles, at midnight, and smashed the windows with the butt ends of their weapons.

Sentences:- Tried by a District courtmartial at Belfast on

October 5th, on a charge of drilling in Co. Fermanagh on 13th July, Daniel Mackle, Redhills, Co. Cavan, was sentenced to 5 months' imprisonment. James Kelly, Derry, was sentenced by a court martial to 91 days' imprisonment with hard labour, mitigated to 30 days, for possessing firearms. His brother Hugh Kelly, received a similar sentence on the same charge. Both have been in custody for six weeks already.

Suppressions:- Markets have been stopped by armed British forces at Carrick-on-Suir and Nenagh. At Templemore, the corn was not allowed to be delivered at the stores.

#### **TUESDAY, OCTOBER 7th, 1919.**

Raids:- A large force of armed military and police raided the Killarney Printing Works on Monday evening. They seized private correspondence, photographs, printing orders and everything containing Irish-printing. An exhaustive search was made of the premises. The premises of the Manager, Killarney Printing Works, Mr. M. Doyle, were also raided. Armed police raided the Macroom Sinn Fein Hall thinking a meeting was on. Some documents were taken.

Armed Assaults:- A boy named Coll was shot by police in Banbridge, Co. Down, yesterday. His condition is precarious. During a raid on his residence, Mr. M. Doyle and Mrs. Doyle, were subjected to a personal search. Nothing incriminating was found. Armed police from Bantry, Co. Cork, and the surrounding districts, assembled at Knockeve, and, barricading the road, held up and carefully searched several motor cars. During a raid on Macroom Sinn Fein Hall, a number of young men, including T. McSweeney, (Terence MacSwiney, J.L.) M.P., for Mid. Cork were searched by police.

Sentence:- Matthew Devine, Kiltiernan, Roscommon, a farmer, was fined for having a rook rifle in his possession without a permit, and the weapon was handed over to the British military authorities.

#### **WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8th, 1919.**

Suppression:- Armed military and police occupied the approaches to Thurles to prevent cattle coming to the monthly fair.

Raids:- On Saturday night police made a fruitless raid on the residence of Patrick Hogan, Carrigahorig, Co. Tipperary. This is the fourth raid within a month. Military and police searched the house of Michael Lehane, Scart, Bantry, Co. Cork, but found nothing.

Arrests:- Patrick Griffin, Listowel, and Brian Shanahan, Tipperary, were re-arrested on release from Mountjoy Jail, on charges of damaging cell furniture during the recent revolt for political treatment.

Militarism:- Eamonn Corbett, Craughwell Co. Galway and Cormac Hurley, Bandon, Co. Cork, each sentenced to five years imprisonment for offences against D.O.R.A., have been temporarily released from Maryborough Gaol,

in broken health. They were both borne on stretchers to Queen's Co. Infirmary. P. Whelehan, Toomevara, Co. Tipperary, was released in broken health from gaol. Owing to another breach by the British Government of the agreement made with Irish prisoners that they would be accorded political treatment, the prisoners in Mountjoy Prison, Dublin revolted last Sunday morning. They barricaded their cells and withstood a siege by police and warders for several hours. They were eventually overpowered and all (about 45) placed in hand-cuffs.

Sentences:- Eight young men were remanded by Mr. Starkie, R.M., Cork, on suspicion of being connected with the attack on British military in Fermoy on September 6th. Patrick Griffin and Brian Shanahan, mentioned above were both remanded for a week on the above charge.

Armed Assault:- Dunmanway, (Cork), hurlers, on their way to play the Bantry team on Sunday, were stopped by British military and police at Knockloe.

#### **THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9th, 1919.**

Suppressions:- Police and military raided the offices of the "Weekly Observer" Newcastle West, dismantled the machinery and suppressed the paper. No reason was given. The "Southern Democrat" published in the same office will not be able to appear. Letters addressed to Dail Eireann, Sinn Fein, Cumann na mBan and the offices of the Prisoners Dependents' Fund, have been held up for this week in the G. P. O., by the English Government officials, without notice to the owners of the letters.

Court martial:- E.T. Keane, Editor, "Kilkenny People", was tried by Courtmartial at Cork for having arms in his possession. Alderman J. Nowlan, Kilkenny, National President G.A.A., was tried by the same Courtmartial for the illegal possession of a revolver and cartridges. John Tevlin, Carnacoss, Co. Meath, was tried by courtmartial at Ship Street Barracks, Dublin, on charges of having arms and ammunition in his possession. Finding will be promulgated.

Arrests:- Frank Nevin, Kinnitty, was arrested and brought to Birr Police Barracks on Monday. Three men were arrested in Rosscarbery, Co. Cork, on charges of unlawful assembly and drilling. Edward Gilmore, Lisburn, has been arrested and conveyed to Belfast. While walking in Phoenix Park, Dublin, on Tuesday, Richard Davis and his brother were arrested and taken to the Bridewell. Davis was imprisoned in connection with the bogus "German Plot".

Raids:- Police searched the premises of Messrs. Begley, Castle Road, M. Herlihy, Bridge Street, and W. O'Brien Stanton's Lane, Bandon, but found nothing.

Sentences:- Michael McArdle, Henry Street, Castleblayney, was sentenced to four months' imprisonment for an alleged assault on a policeman who was arresting a prisoner. For the fifth time John J. Madden was remanded in custody by Major Dease in Limerick gaol in connection with the shooting of police in Lorrha. Four men were

remanded in custody in connection with the shooting of police at Knocklong.

**FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10th, 1919.**

Court martial:- Joseph Martin, Portumna, was tried by a Court martial at Cork, on a charge of having in his possession a copy of the official organ of the Irish Volunteers. The decision will be promulgated. He has been five weeks in prison without trial.

Arrests:- Patrick Hegarty, Tobacconist, Foyle Street, Derry, was arrested and conveyed in a motor lorry direct to gaol. No charges has been preferred against him.

Raids:- British military and police searched the premises of Mort O'Shea, draper, Glengarriffe, Co. Cork. They seized postcards and papers. They also raided a number of houses outside the village.

Armed Assaults:- While passing the Police Barracks, John Lehane, Scart, Co. Cork, was arrested, taken into the barracks and there searched by police. They found nothing and subsequently released him.

Militarism:- The police forces in Ireland are releasing instructions in the use of hand grenades and American automatic pistols. Those weapons are being added to their usual equipment which consists in batons, rifles, bayonets and revolvers.

**SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11th, 1919.**

Militarism:- After a visit to the political prisoners in Mountjoy gaol, the Lord Mayor of Dublin stated he found 39 in handcuffs and 4 in hospital. The police are practising hand grenade throwing in Tipperary.

Arrests:- John Lehane, Scart, Co. Cork, was arrested in connection with a recent address at Ballydehob.

Suppressions:- The October Fair in Nenagh, Co. Tipperary, was suppressed by British military and police. The Ivy Dance Class, Nenagh was refused a permit to hold practise dance classes.

Proclamation:- By an Order in Council, a new D.O.R.A. regulation provides that in any area in Ireland the competent military authority may require every person to remain within doors between such hours as may be specified.

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 18th 1919.

Date:- October	13th	14th	15th	16th	17th	18th	Total.
Arrests:-	1	3		1		1	6
Suppressions:-	6	4^	2	3	1		16^
Court martials:-	1	1	1		1	1	5
Sentences:-	1	1	3	4	3	2	14
Militarism:-	2		2	1			5
Raids:-	1		2	9	1		13
Proclamations:-	1	1		5			7
Armed Assaults:-	2		2	1	*	2	7
<b>TOTALS:-</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10^</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>6*</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>73</b>

^ Besides wholesale suppressions.

\* Total number not available.

**MONDAY, OCTOBER 13th, 1919.**

Arrest:- Alec MacCabe, M.P., for South Sligo was arrested by a large force of police in Sligo. The Mayor of Sligo called at the gaol to see him but was refused entrance.

Suppressions:- An Aeridheacht at Finglas, Co. Dublin, yesterday was suppressed by British military and police. It was for the purpose of raising funds for a new Catholic Church in the parish. Castleblayney police went round the town and tore down posters advertising the Dail Eireann Loan. Carrick-on-Suir and Nenagh (both in County Tipp.) markets have been again prohibited. A Sinn Fein meeting, comprising 1,000 people, was suppressed at Ballinasloe, Co. Galway, on Saturday by a force of 400 R.I.C. with two Inspectors, two County Inspectors and 76 soldiers with rifles, bayonets, and grenades in support. The Most Rev. Dr. Fogarty, Lord Bishop of Killaloe, writes to the press

to say that a letter from him to Michael Collins, M.P., enclosing a cheque for £100 was never delivered. His Grace states:- "No one can safely consign a remittance through that branch of the public service". (i.e. the Post Office).

Armed Assaults:- As a football match was about to begin at the Finglas Aeridheacht the British forces arrived and took possession of the ball. Great excitement prevailed when the police drew batons and cleared the field. Fortunately no one was seriously injured. During the suppression of a Sinn Fein meeting at Ballinasloe mentioned above, the police made several assaults on the people. Men, women, and children were knocked down in the rush, the police using their batons freely. Two men were injured about the head and had to receive medical attendance. Traders had to close their premises, the

windows of some having been broken. The excitement lasted for about one hour and a half.

Court-martial:- Richard A. Johnston, National University, Dublin, was tried by court-martial on a charge of possessing a revolver and cartridges without a permit.

Sentence:- Johnston was sentenced to one year's imprisonment with hard labour.

Militarism:- A military lorry conveyed a quantity of the shop goods seized in May last by the military and police and returned them to the Misses. Sharkey, Strokestown. They had been kept in Boyle military barracks, and consisted of drapery, newspapers, tobacco, and cigarettes, etc. Nearly all the articles are in a very damaged and unsalable condition. The Lord Mayor of Dublin again visited the political prisoners in Mountjoy gaol, Dublin, yesterday. He found 38 of them still in handcuffs, and learned that none were allowed to go to Mass on Sunday.

Raids:- The police raided the Sinn Fein Hall and outhouses in Castleblayney, Co. Monaghan. They commandeered two bandoliers, an Irish Republican flag, and a hurley.

Proclamation:- A meeting on the Irish Transport Workers' Union was proclaimed in Clonmel, Co. Tipperary.

#### **TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14th, 1919.**

Arrests:- John O'Farrell, Athlone, was arrested while visiting an aunt in Walker Street, Armagh. During a Raid on his residence in Athlone a revolver and ammunition had been found. Stephen Wyse, farmer, Coxtown, Gort, Co. Galway, with an employee, James O'Rourke, have been arrested. A revolver had been found in a raid on Wyse's house.

Sentence:- Alec MacCabe, M.P., for South Sligo, arrested last Saturday was charged with "unlawful assembly" advocating the buying of Dail Eireann bonds. He was remanded in custody until Friday.

Proclamation:- Another extension of the powers of the D.O.R. Act as applied to Ireland is proposed.

Court-Martial:- Michael Aherne, Clonakilty, Co. Cork, was tried by an English Court-martial on a charge of having in his possession documents, the publication of which might cause disaffection. Police tore down Dail Eireann Prospectus posters in Waterford during the night. Nenagh Ivy Dance Club class have suspended their bi-weekly practice dances owing to proclamations. A deputation waited on Captain Williamson, consisting of Tipperary magistrates in connection with the restrictions of fairs and markets in Tipperary. Capt. Williamson replies that "the fairs and markets in Tipperary did not interest him in the slightest. All he had to do was if requested to send out soldiers to help the police.

Before coming there he had written to Dublin asking the policy of the Government and the answer he would give magistrates. He got a telegram from his Commanding Officer stating that no useful purpose would be served by receiving a deputation, as question was one for the Government". There was no postal delivery at Sinn Fein

Headquarters or Eireann offices yesterday. Since Saturday only one letter has been allowed through by the Post Office. Telegrams from the country have also been delayed.

#### **WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 16th, 1919.**

Militarism:- 46 Sinn Fein Prisoners are still on hunger strike in Mountjoy Prison. 36 are in handcuffs, and 8 in hospital. Police from the surrounding districts assembled at Youghal, Co. Cork, for bombing practice.

Sentences:- Messrs. Griffin, Shanahan and O'Meara, recently released from Mountjoy gaol, were fined 40/- each for damaging their cells during the recent strike for political treatment made by the prisoners

Raids:- A party of police under Head Constable M'Grath raided Selskar House, Wexford, the residence of Dr. J. Ryan, M.P. for South Wexford. They made an Exhaustive search but found nothing.

Armed Assaults:- Police entered the Sinn Fein Club at Kilbrittain, Co. Cork, and ordered the dispersal of the meeting. This was refused, and the police returned to the barracks for their rifles. When they returned they fired two shots and in this way succeeded in dispersing the crowd. Armed police while endeavouring to stop a dance in the Young Men's Hall, Cloughjordan, used their batons and a few people were injured.

Court-martial:- Francis Neville, Kinnitty, King's Co., was tried by an English Court Martial at Ship Street Barracks, Dublin, for having four rounds of rifle ammunition in his possession. Neville stated that he had got them from soldiers from time to time. The decision will be promulgated.

Suppressions:- The Monday fair in Cloughjordan was prevented by British soldiers. The usual practice dance in the Young Men's Hall, Cloughjordan was stopped on Sunday night by police.

#### **TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16th, 1919.**

Militarism:- Six more prisoners have been removed from Mountjoy prison to the Mater Hospital, Dublin

Proclamations:- An order purporting to be made under the Crimes Act of 1887, and signed by General T. Shaw, Commander-in-Chief of the Army of Occupation and Ian MacPherson, Chief Secretary of Ireland, was published yesterday, proclaiming Sinn Fein, Sinn Fein Clubs, Irish Volunteers, Cumann na mBan, and the Gaelic League, in the City and County of Dublin. This is the fourth area in which organisations have been suppressed.

Arrests:- W. M. Swanton, Chemist, Berehaven, Co. Cork, was arrested on Tuesday for displaying notices in his shop window in connection with the Dail Eireann Loan.

Sentences:- Refusing to give bail, W. M. Swanton was remanded in custody for 8 days to Bandon Petty Sessions.

Armed Assaults:- Police searched J. Ryan, assistant at Messrs. Fogarty Bros., Nenagh, Co. Tipperary.

Raids:- J. Ryan, mentioned above, had his bedroom raided and searched by the police. Police raided the house of Mrs. M' Aroe, Lisbellow, and seized Sinn Fein literature and stationery of the Irish Assurance Company for which her son is agent. All newspaper and printing offices in Tralee were raided yesterday by British military and police. Exhaustive searches were made, but nothing was found. The following are the offices searched:- "Kerryman" and "Liberator"; "Kerry News", "Kerry Weekly Reporter", and "Killarney Echo", "Kerry People", and the "Kerry Sentinel" printing works.

Sentences:- Patrick Clancy, Killaloe, Co. Clare, was sentenced to two months imprisonment with hard labour for "unlawful assembly". J. E. Kelly, J.P., Heath Hall, Newry, was fined for possessing a gun without a permit. Philip Cormack, D.C., Graiguefochane, Co. Tipperary was fined £8 for having a double barrel shotgun without a permit.

Suppressions:- A permit for the holding of a fair in Templemore, Co. Tipperary was refused by the "authorities". A dance in Templetuohy village, Co. Tipperary was suppressed by British military and police on Sunday night. The Town Improvement Committee, Portumna, Co. Galway, have been refused a permit for a coming fair.

#### **FRIDAY, OCTOBER 17th, 1919.**

Suppressions:- The annual Convention of Sinn Fein, to be held yesterday in the Mansion House, Dublin, was suppressed by British military and police. Over 120 armed police took possession of Dawson Street, in which is situated the Mansion House. Three Companies of British military armed with rifles, bayonets and Lewis guns, also took up a position in Dawson Street. Armoured cars patrolled the city. Police were also stationed in the vicinity of Harcourt Street, where are the Sinn Fein Headquarters. They were withdrawn about 10 p.m.

Armed Assaults:- Any people attempting to enter the Mansion House were "held up" by these armed forces, and refused admission unless they stated on what business they wished to see the Lord Mayor.

Raid:- Armed police raided the residences of B. Stapleton Templetuohy, Co. Tipperary, but found nothing. This is the second raid on this house recently.

Sentences:- Alderman James Nowlan, Kilkenny tried by an English Courtmartial at Cork, on October 8th, on charges of possessing a revolver and ammunition without a permit, was sentenced to one month's imprisonment.

Sentences:- E. T. Keane, Editor "Kilkenny People" Kilkenny, tried by English Court Martial at Cork on October 8th for possessing a revolver and cartridges was sentenced to one month's imprisonment. Joseph Martin, Portumna, Co. Galway, tried by Court Martial at Cork, on October 9th, for having a "seditious document" in his possession, was sentenced to 5 months' imprisonment with hard labour.

Court Martial:- W.A. Clancy, D.C., Clifden, Co Galway, was tried by an English Court Martial on charges of possessing a revolver and ammunition, swords and bayonet. It was shown that these weapons were left behind by an actor and military officer who stayed in his house. Some of them were stage weapons. The result will be announced later.

#### **SATURDAY, OCTOBER 18th, 1919.**

Sentences:- For "unlawful assembly" and for advocating the buying of Dail Eireann Bonds, Alec McCabe, M.P., was sentenced to 9 months' imprisonment with hard labour. An R.I.C. Pensioner named Mullane, Ratcliffe, Co. Sligo, was sentenced to three months' imprisonment in default of finding bail for having "seditious literature" in his house.

Court martial:- For having a "seditious document" in his possession, E. Blythe, M.P., for North Monaghan, was tried by a British Court Martial at Ship Street Barracks, Dublin. The accused repudiated the "document" in the course of his "trial". The decision will be promulgated.

Armed Assaults:- While returning from the theatre with two friends, D. V. Rushton, an Englishman, was assaulted by a policeman. The policeman was striking a poor woman when Rushton interfered. It was then he was assaulted by the policeman. Rushton was struck in the face several times, his glasses being smashed. Two other policemen stood by, impassive spectators of the whole affair.

Arrest:- Stephen O'Connor, New Street, Macroom, was arrested, relieved of literature, believed to refer to the Dail Eireann Loan, and then released.

## **Irish Bulletin**

**A full reprint of newspaper of Dáil Éireann  
giving war reports.**

Published so far:

Volume 1, 12th July 1919 to 1st May 1920. 514pp.

Volume 2, 3rd May 1920 to 31st August 1920. 540pp.

Volume 3, 1st September 1920 to 1st January 1921. 695pp.

Volume 4, part one. 3rd January 1921-16th March  
1921. 365pp.

Volume 4, part two: in preparation

¤ 36, £30 paperback, per volume  
(¤ 55, £45 hardback)

POSTFREE in Ireland and Britain

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

"I know perfectly well how difficult it is, if meetings are held at the one time all over the country, to have any special force that can cope with them. I can quite understand that. But, in the circumstances of this country, does any sane person think that the way to do it was to go and put on blue shirts, to put on a sort of semi-military garb and come out with the proclamations and statements made by General O'Duffy, which were intended to usurp power here? Was that the way to do it? The proper way to do it was this: to give every support that could be given to the government and the forces at their command to keep order."

Eamon de Valera. Dáil Eireann, 12 October 1933.

"Before 1939 Ulster was too often in the position of reminding Great Britain that she also was one of the great family of the British Commonwealth and Empire. During this war Great Britain and the Allies have had reason to be grateful for our insistence on remaining in the family group... We have never doubted that you are necessary to us... We hope that you now realise that we are necessary to you."

Sir Basil Brooke, 27 April 1944.

## Martin Mansergh and his insights regarding the EU

When Martin Mansergh wrote in *The Irish Catholic*, April 4th 2019, about *The Commonwealth Conundrum*, this Column did an analysis of it in the July *Irish Political Review*. Now that he has turned his attention to looking at the EU in the same paper on 1st August 2019, under the headline *Welcoming a realistic union*, I felt a certain obligation to look at his cogitations and ascertain his deliberations. But, as with Mansergh when he wrote about the Commonwealth, he began with his thoughts on a book published in 2017, Fergal Keane's book *Wounds: A Memoir of War and Love* (published by William Collins, London) and so, with his new article on the EU, I find Mansergh again beginning with reflections on another book, first brought out in 2012, *The Cardinal's College: Christ Church, Chapter and Verse* by Judith Curthoys, (Profile Books Ltd, London).

But, as always with Mansergh, there are these flourishes that can throw someone—not of his background—off completely. After mentioning the book, he writes of a Professor of Early Christian Studies and Tutor in Theology, Professor Mark Edwards, who he states wrote the "opening article—cum editorial" which "ruminates about Brexit". And this in a 2012 book! But of course Mansergh is being studiously obscurantist here, because he begins his article thus: *"The 2018 Annual Report of Christ Church Oxford where I was at college, 50 years*

*ago arrived recently"*. And it is in this report that the Edwards article appears. Mansergh does go on to write about "a recent history", and that is the one by Judith Curthoys. As he writes:

"Christ Church is one of those institutions, which are both academic and ecclesiastical, with the Cathedral of the Diocese of Oxford at the back of the front quadrangle. It was founded by Cardinal Wolsey, who oversaw the building of the Great Hall and *refounded* by Henry VIII" (Italics—JH).

There is a world of history in that italicised word, indicating how slippery Mansergh is in gliding over the 'Glorious Revolution', which could be rightly categorised as *Brexit 1*. How his cousin—by marriage—Elizabeth Bowen would be proud of such slipperishness as she expounded in her last novel *Eva Trout*.

One of those things that always surprised me about Bowen was her infamous description in *Seven Winters* of the Dublin of her youth, with its pealing Catholic bells which she saw as "incontinent". Yet she lived in Oxford for a good part of her life and never thought to put that description on the pealing bells there. Perhaps, when they were Protestant, she didn't mind, but I remember being there for a couple of weeks of research and being nearly demented by their constancy.

As Martin Mansergh mentions *The Cardinal's College* by Judith Curthoys, I found one very good review of it in the *Spectator* in 2012 by Michael Howard,

with the heading *'A law unto itself'*. He begins with a little verse by W.H. Auden reminiscing at a Christ Church gaudy half a century ago:

"One could meet any day in Society  
Harold Acton, Tom Driberg or Rowse:  
May there always, to add their variety,  
Be some rather Odd Fish at the House."

Howard, a senior Tory politician, who was Leader of the Conservative Party and Leader of the Opposition from November 2003 to December 2005, readily accepts that Auden himself was "something of an odd fish himself". It seems that I am going to be following Bowen's intrusions right through this article! Howard states that:

"Christ Church itself has always been an odd fish in the Oxford pond: large, rich, something of a law unto itself. For one thing, it is not one institution but two: a Cathedral with its own Dean and Chapter, and a distinct but not separate college. They are collectively known as Aedis Christi, the House of Christ, hence 'The House', and never, but never Christ Church College."

Howard accepts that the "original college, *founded* and laid out with renaissance magnificence in 1525 by Cardinal Wolsey was still born when its founder was disgraced". But King Henry VIII had a loyal servant in Thomas Wolsey, Lord Chancellor of England and Cardinal Archbishop of York, who was trying for a way to get the Pope's support in annulling the marriage of the King and Queen Catherine of Aragon. He didn't succeed and was ordered to London for Treason and died along his journey. With Wolsey's death, the buildings were only three-quarters complete and were to remain so for 140 years.

In 1531, the College was itself suppressed, but it was "refounded in 1532 as King Henry VIII's College by Henry VIII, to whom Wolsey's property had *escheated*". The latter term is a nice one for confiscation.

"In 1546, the King who had broken from the Church of Rome and acquired great wealth through the dissolution of the monasteries in England, *refounded* the college as Christ Church as part of the reorganisation of the Church of England, making the partially demolished priory church the cathedral of the recently created Diocese of Oxford."

There is an oddity in this history of Christ Church, because it is—

"the only academic institution in the world which is also a Cathedral, the seat of the Bishop of Oxford. The Visitor of Christ Church is the reigning British

sovereign—currently Queen Elizabeth II and the Bishop of Oxford is unique among English bishops in not being the Visitor of his own Cathedral."

I find it strange that we in Ireland are out to rid not just educational establishments of any Catholic footprint, but everything else as well. Yet look at Trinity College, Dublin and see how it still maintains its Protestant origins. And over in England, where the Irish elite look now for all its guidance, they manage not to see the elephant in the room!

But back to Michael Howard's *Spectator* review and his no-nonsense take on the origins of Christ Church.

"The original college, founded and laid out with renaissance magnificence in 1525 by Cardinal Wolsey, was still-born when its founder was disgraced. It was resuscitated by Henry VIII in 1547 to provide a home for a Cathedral in the newly established Oxford diocese, two for the price of one, enabling that dissolute monarch to save money for his wars. The Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral governed both establishments. There were no 'fellows' only students... Not until the mid 19th century did the students emancipate themselves, set up their own governing body and create a college like all the others.

But they still did not call themselves 'fellows'. They proudly remained students of Christ Church and have been so ever since... By the 19th century Christ Church had become the natural home for the ruling classes (by the end of the century it had produced 11 prime ministers) and as the ruling classes grew to include the cotton kings and railway tycoons of the north, the House expanded to accommodate them as well."

The College did not allow women to enter until the 80s but as Howard reflects:

"Like the ruling classes themselves, the House has always had an instinct for survival. Auden concluded his gaudy address with the hope

'that all the investments on which her Income depends may be wows.

May she ever grow richer and richer  
And the gravy abound at the House'."

And Auden got his wish: Christ Church is the second wealthiest of all Oxford's Colleges. As can be gleaned from those writing about Christ Church, sometimes the dates are out of alignment but I leave them as I find them.

The term "*gaudy*" means "*annual feast or entertainment esp. college dinner for old members*".

Martin Mansergh after some initial

remarks about Roman rule comes to the nub of the argument, seemingly being made by Professor Mark Edwards and that is:

"the consternation in academic circles—arising partly from a real sense of loss and partly from its exposure of our negligible influence on those whom we have educated."

He is referring to Brexit but isn't the notion that ongoing influence on former students is going to be lost through the former a bit odd? Or indeed a bit off?

It is only when Mansergh comes to the new Commission President-designate, Ursula von der Leyen, that he waxes lyrical stating that she is:

"a progressive Christian Democrat of a high calibre with long political experience and an ability to communicate in many languages."

In the August edition of the *Irish Political Review*, Jack Lane wrote also about der Leyen and her programme, which contains two new radical proposals. As he stated, '*The Irish Times*' didn't even refer to these. The proposals were that the European Parliament should have the—

"power of initiative i.e. to initiate legislation for the EU; and that half of the Commission Ministers should be women, which means she decides who should be a Commissioner, not the Member States".

These are radical steps but the Member States surely would never concede such power and der Leyen's early initiatives will end up gathering dust in some office cabinets somewhere.

Where Mansergh is insistent is that der Leyen is no longer entertaining any thoughts of a United States of Europe and for confirmation of this new position he relates an interview she gave to *Le Monde* on 20th July 2019. Her reply which Dr. Mansergh has thoughtfully translated for us is this:

"It had matured and become more realistic. At the heart of the European Union, unity dominates in diversity. It is something different from federalism and it is the good way, in my opinion."

Lost in translation—perhaps?

Also Mansergh strikes out the notion that der Leyen "*until recently German defence minister*" wants a "*European Army*". But no—what she wants now is "*an army of Europeans, i.e. among the willing*". But anyone who had been

watching der Leyen would know that she is a super hawk in the same way that America's John Bolton is.

At the press conference announcing her nomination, European Council President Donald Tusk noted "*von der Leyen's intentions to retain Commission First-Vice President Frans Timmermans during her administration*". And therein lay a very pointed jab at der Leyen, which very definitely puts her on notice.

After all she is not shy of interfering with other countries and Tusk was perhaps thinking of her foray into Poland's affairs when she hailed the "*healthy democratic resistance of the younger generation*" against the Polish Government. The Poles rightly saw it as instigating an attempt to overthrow the Government and there was uproar. And, while the German media mostly ignored the incident calling it "*a mere slip of the tongue*", it was agreed by all that "*German—Polish relations were severely damaged*".

Former British Secretary of State for Defence Sir Michael Fallon noted in 2019 that Ursula von der Leyen had been "*a star presence*" in the NATO community, and "*the doyenne of NATO ministers for over five years*". It is easy to predict that the European army might well be a project that will have its run again with such a Commissioner.

Mansergh's article near the end dips into a working thesis that the British are now bringing hard policies to the EU thinking they will then renegotiate but it is my opinion, contrary to Mansergh, that they are only show boating with their "no-deal" rhetoric in order to "*to procure, they believe, negotiating advantage*" with the EU. Well—time will tell!

Julianne Herlihy ©

**Major C.J.C. Street:**  
**The Administration Of Ireland, 1920;**  
with a substantial extract from his  
*Ireland In 1921*

and a review of his other writings on  
Britain's world role,  
and inter-war Europe.

**Introduction by Dr. Pat Walsh.**

**Intelligence Officer Street produced this exceptionally informative justification of the Black and Tan War in Ireland, using the secret archives of Dublin Castle (with many captured IRA documents and officials statistics of incidents.)**

**≈18, £15 postfree**

Review: *Angels With Blue Faces* by Lyra McKee.  
Excalibur Press, 108pp, £9.99. July 2019

## Snapshots Of The North

Lyra McKee was accidentally shot in Derry this Summer, taking a bullet meant for the police during a confrontation in Derry. She had gone to the scene to observe the action.

This work purports to be an investigation into sexual abuse at the Kincora Boys Home, first reported by the *Irish Independent* on the 24th of January, 1980.

Two books on the subject appeared in the 1980s: *The Kincora Scandal, Political Cover-Up and Intrigues in Northern Ireland* by journalist **Chris Moore** and: *Who Framed Colin Wallace* by **Paul Foot**.

Robert Bradford (formerly the Reverend Robert Bradford) was reported as being killed by the IRA on the 14th November, 1981.

The late Lyra McKee's aim was to show that Robert Bradford could have had the names of elite perpetrators associated with Kincora. She alleges that the security forces knew there was a threat to Bradford's life and did nothing, possibly in an effort to get rid of him.

Earlier she put forward the idea that it wasn't the IRA that killed him but two mystery figures. She said that, as they didn't kill his RUC bodyguard, it could have been the UK Intelligence service. She says the IRA would have killed the RUC man, presumably as a bonus point?

Robert Bradford had been a member of the Vanguard Progressive Unionist Party, led by William Craig. It lasted from 1972 – 1975 and was labelled fascist by many. Bradford then moved on to the Ulster Unionist Party.

The reason the IRA could have killed Bradford is reckoned by her to be just the IRA picking off Unionist MPs. But this wasn't the case at all. Anyone who's been in Northern Ireland during that 28 year war will have experienced periods of normality, with recognisable political figures strolling around the city centre.

She also put out the idea that the UDA and the IRA were collaborators. Another way of saying: '*A curse on both your houses*'.

Lyra McKee dodges the reason why there was a war in Northern Ireland.

As for collaboration, the only inter-

action reported in the media was to do with one of the '*Shankill Road Butchers*' who caught innocent Catholics in the street and took them to what was called a '*romper room*', where they were tortured to death. The local population heard the screams of the victims and were terrified.

These Protestants couldn't get their own paramilitaries to do anything about the matter, so someone contacted the IRA, who promptly reacted by sending a van to the area of this most notorious killer. Inside the van was a machine-gun on a tripod. Spotting the person, the van doors were flung open and he went down in a hail of bullets.

To have to take such measures, I thought at the time, the myth of this Catholic-killer as being untouchable and almost bullet-proof must have got to the gunners in their over-kill methods.

The author has trouble with the word *Troubles*. In a passage she deals with humanity in times of war, how values change. But she can't say: 'In times of *Troubles* the human race, etc.,' but is forced to write: "*In times of war...*"

This is a short book for someone who spent five years on it and in interviewing dozens of people.

Her what she calls a *Patrons List* (crowd-funding) has 200 names, taking up three and a half pages. A Foreword takes up another two and a half pages, leaving less than a hundred pages for the book proper.

I had written a number of notes on the book of the sexual abuse of the boys, some of which are pretty graphic but I think we already know all about most of this through the media. But in the end there are no names except those of the convicted housefathers at Kincora. There are reports of James Molyneaux, one-time leader of the Ulster Unionist Party, meeting up with William McGrath, the main culprit at Kincora but no mention of the Reverend Ian Paisley's part in trying to cover-up the Kincora scandal.

I'm sure you have seen TV programmes claiming to solve the mystery of this and that and ending up saying nothing. This book was born also as modern journalism,

with one eye on the career ladder.

The Foreword mentions Lyra McKee as being murdered and in another page as being shot. The Internet generally describes her as being murdered.

The dissident IRA have apologised for causing her death when firing at the PSNI. Street-wise people don't stand near the security forces in NI, especially during civil unrest. Unfortunately Lyra did on that evening on the edge of the Creggan estate in Derry. She was still young and, who knows, she might have swung round to investigating the true nature of a deliberately dysfunctional Northern Ireland that killed her and thousands of others and destroyed countless families over two generations through sectarianism.

In her Prologue it is irony upon irony when she writes of St Anne's Cathedral, Belfast:

"The moon is hanging so low tonight it could perch itself on one of the Cathedral spires. It illuminates the streets that would otherwise be in the shadows, making it difficult for the cops in passing patrol cars to see."

She is writing that the moon is no good for the young rent boys hiding behind the pillars of the Cathedral waiting for their clients in cars to come along.

The irony is that it was in this Cathedral that dignitaries from Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland and from England, including the UK's PM, Theresa May, came to pay tribute to her memory.

The book is dedicated to a *Rainbow Orangeman*.

**W.J.Haire**

## **The Congo Since Lumumba**

A story of international plundering

by

**Pierrot Ngadi**

Foreword by Dave Alvey

Athol Books, price €10, £12

Order from

**athol-st@atholbooks.org**

## Caseament, The Congo, Belgium And The Great War

"What had the republicans got from it that was not on offer before?", Professor Roy Foster asks about the War of Independence (*Modern Ireland*, p506). He does not ask what Ireland got from the World War, in which it had suffered twenty times as many casualties, or how Britain had benefitted from starting it.

He quotes a "private memorandum" by Michael Collins, whom he describes as a "realist", saying that—

"the only association which it will be satisfactory for Ireland to enter will be based, not on the present technical legal status of Dominions, but on the real position they claim, and have in fact secured".

He comments:

"He was right. But whether the bloody catalogue of assassination and war from 1919-21 was necessary in order to negotiate thus far may fairly be questioned".

In support of his contention that it was not necessary, he says that Dominion status for Ireland was—

"the solution endorsed from 1920 by the British Trades Union Congress, the Labour Party, the Asquithian Liberals, and many of Lloyd George's advisers. Bonar Law had originally, and correctly, argued that this would enable Sinn Fein in the fullness of time to declare a secessionist republic: but by 1921, with Ulster protected, he was prepared to accept the danger. Twenty-six-county dominion status was in some ways a retraction from the colonial Home Rule bruted in 1917-18, or the dominion Home Rule for all Ireland called for by Horace Plunkett's Irish Dominion League in 1919-21. But the realists, notably Collins, saw that it contained the germ of radical future developments. In a private memorandum at the time, he wrote: 'the only association'...' etc.

What the quotation from Collins's private Memo seems to say is that he would only settle for formal Dominion status plus something extra. He settled for nominal Dominion status that in reality was something much less. And he tried to wriggle out of the deal that he made, even before it was confirmed by actual governing arrangements, by making war on Northern Ireland in May 1922.

I don't know when Bonar Law said that the Irish could have a secession republic in

the long run if they agreed to have something less for a while. Foster gives no reference. But, as stated by Foster, it has the feeling of being a vague speculation about the indefinite future rather than a policy.

It sounds like Collins's "*freedom to gain freedom*". But Collins found, six months after making his deal with Lloyd George, Birkenhead and Churchill, behind the back of the Dail Government, that he had no freedom.

He found that Northern Ireland was not his to make war on, but remained part of the British state in earnest. He found that he was not even allowed to make an Election deal with the opposing party. And he was obliged to start a shooting war on the Anti-Treaty IRA, with which he had been allied in the attempt to conquer the Six counties.

Colonial self-government had been the policy of William Martin Murphy. Murphy, an outstandingly successful native capitalist and Press Baron, had connections with elements in British ruling circles independently of party politics. He was strongly nationalist, but opposed Redmond's Home Rule Bill without being a Republican, and he advocated colonial self-government in the *Irish Independent* which he owned. He could be described as a realist much more accurately than Collins, but somehow he failed to notice that Ireland was not in fact a colony.

A British colony was placed in control of Ireland by the Williamite conquest in 1691. It failed. It never developed as a colony in the proper sense. It failed to exterminate the native population and take its place, as was done by British colonies in other parts of the world. It did not become a rounded, self-sufficient society. It remained a dominating and exploiting colonial caste, dependent for a living on the native population which it oppressed.

The native population survived, asserted itself against the colonial stratum, and demanded self-government. But its self-government could not be colonial because it was not a colony. This is not a political matter, but a matter of existential social fact.

The word "*colony*" is used loosely nowadays, but a hundred years ago it retained its original meaning of a piece of a society that hived like a swarm of bees

and reproduced itself in another territory. (Other areas of the world were taken over as possessions, but were not deemed suitable for colonisation.) But, whatever word is used for it, the fact remains a fact. The national movement in Ireland was a movement of the ruling caste of the 18th century. And that caste had not succeeded in getting rid of the native population, and had not tried to absorb it.

The nativist national movement was a movement of the native population that had survived, and had developed in conflict with the English ruling stratum. And that fact made all the difference.

Ireland could not have colonial self-government because the colony had failed. And it could not be a Dominion because the Dominions were colonies: Australia, New Zealand, Canada.

The Dominions did not have the formal status of independence, but they were independent. It was clearly understood in British ruling circles, civil and military, that the Dominions were independent in substance. They were under the Crown because they wanted to be. They were detached pieces of England. They not only had their own police forces, but their own armies, and they contributed war material to the Imperial Army and Navy.

The substance of independence preceded law in those Dominions. The Irish Dominion—embraced by Collins—was a kind of untested law, unsupported by substance, through which it was hoped that substance might be acquired. It was "*freedom to achieve freedom*"—a probationary period under Whitehall hegemony?

If any such phrase was used by Lloyd George etc. in their private discussions with Collins, it was on the assumption that the Irish, if allowed freedom on a leash, would become habituated to the leash and settle down with it.

The Treatyites had their ten years in power, but they never judged that the moment had come to assert the freedom that they had acquired the freedom to gain. The Anti-Treatyites had undergone a rapid recovery from crushing defeat in War by the British-armed Free State Army. De Valera came to Office and asserted freedom. There was a moment of apprehension. But the British Home Secretary was a weak, opportunist Labourite in a weak National Government, J.H. Thomas, and he let it pass.

The effect of the Great War that Britain launched in 1914 caught up with British politics late in 1922. As the Free State

group was implementing the imposed Treaty, the Turks were defying another imposed Treaty. The British War Cabinet fell in the face of Turkish defiance, just as it was giving the finishing touch to the Irish submission. (And the colonies declined to fight the Turks on Britain's behalf: consolidating the gradual divergence in the direction of independence.)

*What had Britain got from its Great War?*

Foster is concerned about whether the war in Ireland was worthwhile for the Irish, but he does not ask whether Britain got something worthwhile from its wars on Germany and Turkey.

At one point he says that, with relation to Ireland, the World War was an "extraneous event". It was "an external event" which had an internal effect: it "created the necessary conditions for a rebellion xxxxx the British government" (*Modern Ireland*, p461).

If it was an extraneous event, then I suppose its purpose is beside the point as far as Ireland is concerned. Ireland had played no part in launching it. It was just dragged into it.

In another place he says: "*The First World War should be seen as one of the most decisive events in modern Irish history*" (p471). A decisive event in the sense in which a catastrophic earthquake might be said to be a decisive event? An event which purpose played no part in bringing about, and which had no object in which Irish will was engaged?

But—

"the war clarified the position of the Irish Parliamentary Party. It could take the opportunity to demonstrate lofty independence, or it could prove that Home Rule was fully compatible with loyalty to Crown and Empire. Redmond chose to bet heavily on the latter strategy".

Furthermore—"Redmond believed that joint action against Germany would weld Irishmen together, and... there is some evidence that southern Unionist reactions bore him out."

So Home Rule Ireland conceived a purpose for itself within an event which was itself extraneous to it and with whose general outcome it had no concern?

It participated in the War for a purpose that might be said to be extraneous to that war: blending Nationalists with Unionists in the hope that blend could be transferred back into Irish politics.

Foster sees evidence that this hope was realised with regard to Southern Unionism. Southern Unionism was a remnant of the

colonial stratum that had been given control of Ireland in 1691 and had failed. The resurgence of the native Irish had sent it into drastic decline—Catholic Emancipation, Dis-Establishment, the Land Act. It was a negligible factor in Irish politics in 1914.

The Unionism that counted was the Unionism of the colony that took root and became a society: Ulster Unionism. In the view of Philip Orr, a representative Ulster Protestant historian, the First World War was remembered in Unionist Ulster as an "*incident in the Home Rule conflict*".

Unionist Ulster took part in the War as a matter of course, because it was a British colony. This particular War had no special meaning for it. It was just another British War. The British Government was presumed to have had sufficient reason for launching it, and that reason was not probed critically with a view to ascertaining whether it was right or wrong.

Vincent Browne was given a conducted tour, by an expert, of an Imperial War Museum (London) exhibition on the Great War. It was broadcast on Radio Eireann. The expert explained the various exhibits to him. Then, out of the blue, Browne sprang an irrelevant question to him: *Why did Britain launch that War? What was it about?* The expert was too polite to tell him that the question was impertinent. He scratched his head, and racked his brain in the effort to construct a semblance of an answer to satisfy the simpleton.

It was both an indecent question and an ignorant one.

When a great State goes to war the fact of war becomes the ultimate truth for its citizens. Chatter about Right and Wrong in a transcendental sense dries up, and then it takes on a meaning subordinate to the state of war. Good becomes Victory, and Evil becomes Defeat.

The transition was effortless in Britain in 1914, because Church and State had been merged in the 16th century, with the State in command. Therefore what the State decided to do was what was Right.

The thing was not so simple in Germany, where there was no State religion, and the national state was less than half a century old, and the different religions operated freely in it. Ideas of Right and Wrong that were not mere expressions of State interest persisted in it. The Chancellor therefore made the naive statement that the State, caught between two powerful Empires, found it necessary to march an Army through Belgium, on the way to France, even though it was wrong to do so.

English State Moralism made hay with this German statement that it was doing wrong because it was necessary to survival. This was a reversion to Barbarism! Civilisation would collapse if it was let pass.

England never found it necessary to do Wrong. What it found it necessary to do was Right. Necessity was a source of Right as long as it was English. (And I imagine that barbarism saw the matter in much the same light.)

I found William King, Anglican Archbishop of Dublin around 1700, very informative in the matter of English morality. He might be regarded as the clerical counterpart of lay philosopher John Locke in the Church/State combination consolidated by the 1688 *coup d'etat*. In *The Problem Of Evil*, he concluded that Evil was whatever obstructed the Will. The Will therefore was the source of Good. It is a perfectly barbaric idea (in accordance with the general notion of barbarism), given sophisticated expression in the language of English philosophical theology, which freed England from the inhibitions of the Church/State division of Europe. It freed the English national will for its great adventure of conquest and destruction in the world.

The British ruling class did what it pleased during the 18th and 19th centuries. It acted without much moralising, and therefore it acted effectively. But in 1914 a slight complication had arisen which needed to be overcome.

Dissident Protestantism, whose only authority was pure Biblicalism, became the state power in 1640s, failed to consolidate itself as a State in the 1650s, and was subordinated in politics by the Restoration in 1660. It was granted semi-tolerance in the early 1700s and was busy in the economic business of the Triangular Trade which became the world market in which Capitalism was hatched. In the 19th century it became the capitalist class, forced its way back into state politics in 1832, and developed its political power within the Whig/Liberal Party. Puritanism and Capitalism seemed to be made for one another, like the bee and the flower. They were hard-faced, pious businessmen. And, oddly enough, the working class movement that developed slowly against them shared much of their Puritan outlook.

The backbenches of the Liberal Party (the Government) in 1914 were thick with Puritan zealots who were ill at ease with the purely practical power-politics of the ruling class.

The war on Germany had been prepared for since 1905, through the Committee of Imperial Defence, by the Tories (actually the Unionists, who were a union of the Tories and the Chamberlain Liberals) and the Whig elite of the Liberal Party.

The opportunity to launch the war came to the Liberals. It would have been simpler if it had come to the Unionists. Duplicity would not have been necessary. But the Liberal elite had to have a reason for their moralising back-benches—and for the Irish Home Rulers on whose votes they depended.

The War therefore had to be two wars that were essentially different in kind, and were incompatible with each other. For the Liberal back-benches and the Home Rule Irish it was a war to destroy a force of absolute evil that had arisen in Germany and was intent on dominating the world. Britain had no selfish material interest in it. Its only purpose was to destroy evil and make peace possible for ever more.

It came easily to the Evangelicals on the Liberal backbenches to believe that this was the case, but in the frenzy of the moment even highbrow, atheistic Liberal intellectuals to it. H.G. Wells wrote *The War That Will End War*.

The other war was a war to maintain British supremacy in the world by crushing a strong state that had arisen in Europe and might in the future become a serious rival. British supremacy in the world depended on keeping Europe weak by keeping it divided against itself. That was the meaning of balance-of-power strategy. A strong state in Europe might become hegemonic in Europe, negating the British hegemony which kept Europe divided. France might have done this in the past if Britain had not fought two Great Wars against it. Germany might do it in the future if a pre-emptive war was not fought against it.

Two conflicting accounts of the purpose of the War were published in the British press right from the start. In one account it was a Millenarian war against evil. In the other it was to ensure that Britain would remain top-dog in the world.

*The Times*, on behalf of the ruling class, said it was just another balance-of-power war. Major Street—who as a Castle propagandist in Ireland a few years later wrote *The Administration Of Ireland In 1920*—published a number of books during the War saying that its purpose was to determine who was to be top dog. (Extracts from these appear in a selection of Street's work published by Athol Books in 2001.)

Those who were running the war needed to have it clear in their minds which war it was, if it was to be brought to a successful outcome for Britain. The military men, who were professionally immune to Utopian idealism, kept their grip on reality throughout. The civil authority had a more difficult task. They had to feed the Millenarian frenzy ever more copiously in order to keep the war going in the face of the unexpected strength of resistance of a Germany that was isolated from the world by the Royal Navy from the moment Britain declared war, and that was deprived of the necessary imports of raw material and food by the British blockade and intimidation of neutrals. The task proved to be too much for them. They were themselves penetrated by the Millenarianism which they manipulated.

The Millenarian object was, in the nature of things, unachievable. And the Imperial object was subverted by the use that had been made of Millenarian ideology for the masses.

In 1914 its alleged purpose was to defend established order in Europe against an evil force of disorder that had arisen in Germany. In 1918 Britain broke the German State, but only because it succeeded in drawing the United States into its War. In 1919 it established a disorderly Europe by punishing Germany instead of making an advantageous settlement with it, and by destroying the Hapsburg Empire and conjuring a series of brittle 'nation-states' in being in its place. And, by bringing in the United States, it brought an actual World Power on the world scene—in place of Germany which had only been a possible World Power of the future.

In short, it *floundered*—caught between the two contradictory purposes of the war.

Seen in the context of 1914 purposes, the 1919 outcome was a fiasco.

Jeremy Paxman—who is now a resident of West Cork, I gather—made a centenary BBC programme on the declaration of war. He concluded with the thought that, if Britain had not made war on Germany in 1914, the British would now be speaking German—instead of the language which it had itself imposed on West Cork. Well, one piece of gibberish is as good as another, and it is only by means of some kind of gibberish that the decision of the British Empire to launch a war of destruction against Germany can be defended.

That Great War waged by the British Empire, for the destruction of a possible future rival in Europe, undermine the Empire and made Britain a dependence of its former colony, the United States. It is

therefore commemorated as a sacred event in the life of the utilitarian British state because it is rationally unintelligible.

Major Street attributed the fiasco of 1919 to the mass demobilisation in November/December 1918 of the Army that had kept the war going for four and a quarter years. The force that had been mobilised to defeat Germany and extend the Empire was needed to police the outcome, but it dissolved itself.

But that force had been raised by Millenarian propaganda, not for a coherent Imperial purpose. It had destroyed what it was told the source of Evil, and then it demobilised to let Good prevail.

Britain made war on a viable order in Europe, on the pretext that Germany had subverted it by marching an Army through Belgium, which was not a sovereign state, and replaced it with an inherently unstable series of brittle nation-states. It then nurtured that situation towards another World War.

Belgium played a critical part by enabling the British Government to inflame the British populace with war-frenzy. It was a non-sovereign state, constructed under British influence in 1831 for balance-of-power purposes. It was basic British policy for a couple of centuries that the sea outlets of the Rhine—*"the navigation of the Scheldt"*—should not be allowed to come within any major European state.

Belgium was constructed across that region on a religious foundation. (Sectarianism was bad in Ireland but could be good in other connections!) It was a Catholic secession from Protestant Holland, but was divided into two nationalities, Dutch and French. A King was found for it. A vast slave Empire was constructed by the King in Africa. It was supposedly the property of the King, not of the state which he governed.

An investigation of the King's conduct of his Empire in Africa was conducted by Roger Casement on behalf of the British Foreign Office. His Report showed that it was a barbaric enterprise. But the concern stirred up by the Report was a Nine-Days'-Wonder.

It does not seem that the Home Rule Party took much interest in it—or was possibly offended by it for causing scandal about a Catholic nation.

There were a few token reforms. The Report was buried. The Belgian Empire was extended in 1919. Forty years later it was wound up, leaving the Congo a mess.

I read somewhere—I believe it was in

Captain Mealutte's book, but I don't have it to hand—that it was Casement's opinion that his Report was used by the Foreign Office to put pressure on the Belgian Government to undertake to resist a German march-through, and was buried when Belgium agreed.

The German Government said that, while in occupation of Belgium, it found documents proving that the Belgian Government had been in negotiation with Britain about foreign policy. If Germany had not been living in a wonderland vision of Britain before 1914, and had heeded either Casement or General Bernhardt, it would have accused Britain of breach of the Belgian Treaty straight away in early August, instead of saying that it found it necessary to do wrong by marching through Belgium.

The Belgian Treaty was a Treaty about Belgium made by sovereign states, not a Treaty made by Belgium with other states. Under that Treaty, Belgium was not allowed to have a foreign policy, it was not allowed to make Treaties, it was not a sovereign state. If it engaged in negotiations with Britain, both it and Britain were in breach of the Treaty.

In the little time I have had to go into this matter, that is the sense I have been able to make of it. It needs investigation, both with regard to Casement and with Britain's purpose in launching the War.

The question of the Casement Diaries pale into insignificance by comparison. That has its origin in British homophobia, which ran parallel to extensive homosexual practice in British upper class circles. The suggestion that Casement was a rampant homosexual, supported by no evidence that has survived, was used to frighten public figures from supporting a Petition to set aside the sentence of execution.

Circumstantial evidence is all there is to go on, and that points overwhelmingly towards forging.

The most convincing circumstance is that not one of the documents circulated by the Government to frighten people off signing the Petition has survived. Those to whom they were shown were only allowed to see them briefly. The Government took them back and did not preserve them in its archive. Then, when the job was done, the Government denied that it had any such diary in its possession.

The reasonable conclusion drawn by Dr. Moloney from these circumstances was that the documents shown around in 1916 were false. The document pulled out of the hat forty years later proved nothing.

And no independent evidence that Casement engaged in the kind of activity described in the 1949 document has been discovered.

Casement's indictment of the Government, on the other hand, is borne out by circumstances: that it had been preparing for war on Germany for many years.

The Committee of Imperial Defence was set up by the Unionist leader, Balfour, and was continued by the Liberal Prime Minister, Asquith. Asquith's War Minister, Haldane, reformed the British Army in preparation for War, and he set up an Expeditionary Force that could be mobilised and dispatched almost overnight.

Haldane, a Scottish intellectual, was an expert on German philosophy. He cultivated friendly personal relations with the ruling group in Germany and was let in on its secrets. Simultaneously he made secret arrangements with the French General Staff for the placing of a British Army to pre-allocated positions in the line in France.

In August 1914 Britain was without a War Minister because of the Curragh Mutiny. The appointment of a War Minister was a sensitive matter because of the secret war preparations. Haldane had become Lord Chancellor and had to step down from the Woolsack to dispatch the Army that he had prepared.

The question of what should be done about Belgium was discussed in the pro-Government newspapers during the week before the declaration of war, *The Manchester Guardian* and *The Daily News*. It was well known that Germany had contingency plans to march an Army through Belgium, in order to outflank the French *Maginot Line*, if it was caught in war between the French and Russian Empires. The Liberal consensus was that a German march through Belgium would not require, or justify, British entry into the European War.

The German Government tried to get a clear answer from the British Government on the matter. It got evasive answers which it understood to mean that Britain did not regard the matter as vital and would remain neutral. But, when a German Army crossed the Belgian border, the British Government treated it as the first move in a conquest of Belgium in a German scheme for world conquest.

The British commercial interest, as expressed by *The Economist*, did not encourage war. War disrupts the routine of business. But it adapted to the War and, under exhortation by the Foreign Office, it began to take over German markets

from which Germany was cut off by the Royal Navy. But, for a couple of weeks, *The Economist* probed the matter of Britain's obligations under the Treaty of 1839, and the handling of the matter.

The Foreign Secretary, after the event, denounced German inquiries about British conditions for neutrality as "*infamous*". The *Economist*, which carried very few letters, published a letter from a Willcan S. Clarke on August 15th suggesting that "*later on it may be regretted that Sir Edward Grey made no response to the urgent request of the German Ambassador that he would formulate conditions for English neutrality*".

What reason could there have been for this refusal but that the British Government did not intend to be neutral.

In its editorial the previous week (August 8th), the *Economist* said:

"no class in England drove the Government into the war. It was the deliberate policy of Ministers, undertaken from a sense of obligations to France, which were unknown to Parliament or to the public..."

On October 10th it published a long letter from a W.W. Greg about the evasive interpretation of the Belgian Treaty and the Luxemburg Treaty of 1867 by the Oxford Faculty of Modern History.

The Luxemburg Treaty was of a kind with the Belgian Treaty. When Germany occupied Luxemburg, Britain did not even protest. But, when it crossed the Belgian border a couple of days later, Britain declared war. How was that? Oxford suggested that—

"England's attitude towards Luxemburg is that which she has consistently adopted towards those smaller States of Europe which lie outside the reach of naval power..."

Greg commented that Germany was just as much within the reach of British naval power in the case of Luxemburg as it was in the case of Belgium, and that "*this doctrine comes perilously near to saying that we interfere where it is convenient to do, and not where it is inconvenient*".

The Treaties therefore were "*permissive*", not obligations: a point well established in the *Guardian* and *Daily News* in the week before the declaration of war. (Both of those papers had become hardline warmongers very quickly after the declaration of war, with Redmondite journalists playing a leading part in the propaganda.)

Britain was not bound by a Treaty with Belgium to make war on any state that sent an army across its border. And

Belgium was under no obligation to resist an army that crossed its border for the purpose as transit, as it was not a sovereign state with foreign policy rights.

Britain entered the European War as a matter of choice in pursuit of Imperial interest when the German army crossed the Belgian frontier and Belgium resisted it.

If the Germany army had not crossed the Belgian frontier, it would have been very difficult for the Liberal Government to have mobilised its backbenches in support of war. And it would not have been much easier if Belgium had not offered military resistance.

If the British purpose had been to keep Belgium out of the European War, the obvious way to do that was to tell the German Government that, if a German soldier crossed the Belgian frontier, the British Empire would join the French and Russian Empires in the war against it.

Why did it not do that? On the assumption that its priority was to keep Belgium out of the war, and to maintain the existing structure of Europe as far as possible, it is impossible to find a credible answer. On the assumption that Britain, having made detailed arrangements for war on Germany in alliance with France, was looking for an opportunity to launch it, the answer is obvious: the Government needed an "invasion of Belgium" in order to overcome the resistance of its own party to another balance-of-power war.

*The Economist*, which was then a much weightier institution in British public life than it is now, drew back from answering the question it asked. To have suggested the obvious answer would have made support for the war problematical. And opposition to this Liberal war was not to be tolerated.

*The Economist* said definitely that the Government was not driven to war by public opinion. But, once the Government had got the war going properly, it was hailed as a "people's war". And people's wars are Total Wars—or, as Lord Beveridge put it, Totalitarian wars.

George Bernard Shaw stood slightly apart from the English middle class mob. He had a long article in the *New Statesman* on 14th November 1914, in which he defended General von Bernhardt who had been made the great Prussian bogey of the English propaganda.

Bernhardt had been trying to explain to Germany that it was living a fool's paradise with relation to the English: Germany was developing its capitalist economy at a very fast rate and extending its international

trade and making itself dependent on imports—British observers reckoned in about 1900 that Germany could no longer live without imports—believing that the British Empire, which ruled the oceans of the world, was an altruistically benevolent protector of free trade which would allow this development to continue indefinitely.

Bernhardt argued, on the basis of ample precedent, that if Germany did not acquire the power to protect its own world trade Britain would smash it. That was the meaning of his striking phrase, *World Power or Downfall*. (The same issue exists today between China and the United States, which stood for "freedom of the seas" against Britain at the beginning of the Great War but later took over Britain's position of control of the seas.)

Shaw commented:

"It is true that he cites Frederick the Great as an exemplary master of *Welt-politik*. But his chief praise in this department is reserved for England. It is from our foreign policy, he says, that he has learnt what our journalists denounce as 'the doctrine of the bully, of the materialist, or the man with gross ideals: a doctrine of diabolical evil'. He frankly accepts that doctrine from us... He shews in the clearest way that if Germany does not smash England, England will smash Germany by springing at her the moment she can catch her at a disadvantage. In a word he

prophesies that we, his great masters in *Realpolitik*, will do precisely what our Junkers have just made us do. It is we who have carried out the Bernhardt program: it is Germany who has neglected it..."

This was tolerated in England in 1914 as an eccentricity because Shaw supported the War very actively. But it is the case made by Connolly in *The War Upon The German Nation* and by Casement in *The Crime Against Europe*. The difference is that they took the side of the victim.

The War is the real issue that remains from the Casement issue today. The English homophobia, which led to the production of documents in 1916, that have never been seen since, to deter public figures from signing the Petition for reprieve, has somersaulted and made homosexual marriage a universal human right, the denial of which is homophobic.

Belief in the authenticity of the 1959 document, in defiance of the circumstantial evidence, is belief and there is nothing more to be said.

But was Casement's Congo Report used to persuade the Belgian Government to offer military resistance to a German march-through in exchange for a burial of the document?

**Brendan Clifford**

## More on the Seen, the Unseen and the Disappeared.

Tim Sullivan in part two of his review of 'Anatomy of a Lie' (*Irish Political Review* August, 2019) again places great emphasis on the photostats of manuscript pages that were shown to people in 1916 to convince them the police typescripts were true copies of diaries written by Casement.

There are no copies of these extant, so all he or anyone else can do is speculate about them and this controversy is bedevilled enough already with speculation. The most significant fact about these documents today is their non-existence and Hyde does not speculate about things that do not exist. And one can *only* speculate about such things.

For example, Tim speculates that only photostats were shown, rather than actual diary pages because the forgery was work in progress involving interpolation and therefore no volumes could be shown as they were not 'ready' so to speak. The

photostats hid the alterations to the existing diary handwriting. This speculation assumes they were images of what exists today at Kew. But how can this be known when none of the photostats are extant? Therefore that argument is a rationalisation of what he speculates they were.

This would mean that the diaries were under the process of interpolation in May and June 1916. That is to say, the bound volumes were in the forger's hands at that time. However, if the typescripts are true copies, the volumes must also have been with the typists at that time. The first typescripts were shown in the second half of May and the 1911 typescript is reported to have been completed by 24th June. A large quantity of typescripts were shown to Artemis Jones (a junior defence counsel) on 16th May at the preliminary hearing in Bow Street. Therefore a large part of the interpolation must have been completed before that date. Very speedy work.

By 24th June all of the interpolation in three diaries and a ledger, along with the typing of these, had been completed, thus making it possible to show the volumes since the forger had finished his task. But still they did not show them. Why?

Tim asks:

"Suppose some person or persons, inspired by suspicion, demanded to see the handwritten originals. What if someone called their bluff? What then? The Department of Naval Intelligence could not have afforded to be so reckless as to circulate typescripts without supporting handwritten originals. The risk was obvious and too great. If they were backed up by what today are known as photocopies, the question arises as to how much of the typed material would need to be supported in such a way. When we consider the amount of trouble an incredulous and suspecting individual could cause those tasked with an underhand campaign of false witness; the answer has to be all of it. A difficult individual could select various dates at random and ask to see corresponding handwritten originals. Failure to provide, at short notice, appropriate photocopies of handwritten originals would bring the vilification project unstuck."

Theoretically valid, but did this happen? Does he know of any such "*incredulous and suspecting individual*" or "*difficult individual*" who was shown these photostats in the UK?

In the cold light of day over 100 years later it seems reasonable to suppose that there were such individuals who asked to see original diaries—all things being equal—and to ask what's the provenance of these documents, let me see the actual diary, let me have a copy of these extracts, can I give them to the *Daily Mail* and finish the job on Casement and save you all the trouble and expense of showing them, etc.etc.

And a question never raised by Tim is why these alleged original diary or diaries or extracts by Casement were never published, as that would solve the technical forgery issues—which photostats did, according to him, as newspapers were also only monochrome; and it might also confirm the existence of the diaries. It would also have been a real newspaper scoop and maybe closed the case. The gutter press were not squeamish about how to deal with traitors in the middle of 1916. And why were whole volume(s) not photographed—not a difficult task. Why did none of this happen?

On the one hand Tim here speculates about viewers demanding proof about the

police typescripts, whereas on the other hand it appears they were satisfied with a glance at a photograph or two of handwriting! As Alfred Noyes admitted, in his case the viewers trusted the Government officials especially, in a context that Tim appears seems not to appreciate fully. This was at a crucial 'do or die' period in the middle of a life and death war of the British Empire and a condemned, self-confessed traitor who raised arms against the realm was the subject. So all things were not equal.

Tim quotes Shane Leslie's remarks as fact:

*"During his trial the alleged Diary (which has troubled Anglo-Irish relations for nearly half a century) was being handed about. Spring-Rice asked me to look at the photographed copies, but I declined. It was enough for me that John Quinn had recognized the handwriting. England gave him the Martyr's crown"* (Long Shadows (1966), p188—Shane Leslie).

Leslie is wrong on all counts. The '*diary*' being handed about was not at the trial but at the preliminary hearing in May. It was a folder of police typescripts as attested by Artemis Jones, not '*the alleged Diary*'.

Also, Quinn did not '*recognise*' the handwriting. He said what he saw '*looked like*' Casement's handwriting, as indeed any serious attempt at forgery would. But he did not need to be a legal eagle to remain unconvinced by this alone, and he was denied the opportunity to analyse the handwriting. Grey also conveniently ordered no more circulation of the diary materials when Quinn was on the case. Quinn would have been one of Tim's "*incredulous and suspecting individuals*" or a "*difficult individual*" and his efforts were cunningly neutralised in getting at the truth.

This was typical of the verbal trickery (for want of a better word) that Leslie engaged in all his life as a dyed in the wool apologist for what the British did in this and other issues, and I am very surprised indeed that Tim accepts him as a reliable source. If one believes Leslie about Casement, one could believe anybody.

Tim quotes Birkenhead showing an unidentified page of diary material to Sir James O'Connor after the trial. But six years later Birkenhead arranged for two volumes to be shown to Michael Collins. Why did he not show these volumes to O'Connor in 1916? The answer is pretty clear; they did not exist—yet! But like Topsy, they must have '*just grow'd*'.

But Tim insists:

"If photographic representations

corresponding to the typescripts needed to exist then something else needed to exist also; the handwritten matter to provide the photographic representations; the handwritten original bound volumes themselves."

This *non sequitur* is based on pure speculation and supposition—diary pages can exist, or be created, without being part of a volume and no volumes are mentioned in this whole exercise. Photostats of page(s) without context is what failed to convince Quinn.

Ben Allen of the Associated Press was another "*difficult individual*" who was shown handwritten pages but he was not allowed have them confirmed by Casement. So he was not given them. He was an ethical reporter! These pages have also disappeared from history.

Allen happened to be alive when the Kew volumes were made available and he confirmed in an affidavit that they bore no resemblance to the roll of handwritten pages he was shown in 1916.

So why should the photostat documents shown to anybody in 1916 be those which turned up 40 odd years later in the National Archives? Allen's testimony proves that there were in 1916 documents without any associated volume, which Tim speculates could not be the case. But the ounce of the reality that Allen provided in his affidavit is worth a ton of speculation about the existence of volumes in 1916.

By the way, it is hardly an accident that these two "*difficult individuals*" were American, the only such individuals as far as I am aware. Americans have their virtues.

Tim's point about a difference between photostats '*of*' or '*from*' the typescripts as being in some way crucial and a misreading by Hyde is specious. The authoritative *Chambers Dictionary* (1998 Edition) defines each preposition by the other.

It is beyond speculation to suggest that the level of education in the upper echelons of the British Civil service had deteriorated in the 1950s to the extent of confusion about what preposition to use when reporting something. Tim is teaching his grandmother to suck eggs in a rather desperate attempt to prove his case. And as for quoting Hall's biographer as being reliable on "*the diary*" in question—that is about as reliable as using Leslie as a source.

Tim has failed to refute Hyde's main point that there is no evidence of the bound volumes at Kew existing while Casement was alive.

**Jack Lane**

## A Scotsman, an Englishman, an Irishman, and Casement Diary Discretion

An article appeared in *The Irish Times* of 22nd August 2001 titled *Perversion of history led to Casement's downfall*. The author was Eoin Neeson, a journalist, historian and former director of the Government Information Bureau. Among a number of discussion points aired, the article suggested that the deployment of the controversial Diaries had meant that "today he is more remembered for the entirely hypothetical question of his alleged degeneracy and sexual perversion than for his years of monumental and mould-breaking humanitarian work on two continents..."

Further on, the article mentions that a US publication, *The Barnes Review*, in 1998 had "published extracts from an interrogation by the US military after the second World War of Gestapo leader Heinrich Mueller. He said a Swiss forger named Zwingelman, who he had later employed, confessed to having, on (Admiral) Hall's instructions, forged the Casement diaries during the First World War".

### ENCOURAGING INFORMATION

This was encouraging information for any proponent of forgery; at last a forger had been identified. However, there was a catch. The transcript of the alleged 1948 interrogation of Heinrich Mueller by an American Intelligence officer had a dubious provenance. It had originated with a party whose name had been associated with the fabrication of historical documents; one Gregory Douglas, also known as Peter Stahl, among other aliases. This individual, as well, was known to have connections to the Intelligence community.

What was perhaps most interesting about the supposed interrogation transcript was not what it contained but the timing of its emergence. Just the previous year, 1997, the controversy as to the authenticity of the Diaries had been brought out of a state of semi hibernation due to the publication of a book, *The Amazon Journal of Roger Casement*. This was based on Casement's own accounts of his 1910 South American journey. The editor, Angus Mitchell, incited a certain amount of consternation within the academic world due to the unapologetic assertion that the corresponding 1910 'Black Diary' had been forged.

### UNCANNY TIMING

The timing of the appearance of the alleged interrogation transcript was un-

canny. A number of forgery proponents learned of it and referred to it in their writings just as the debate was picking up steam. At a major international conference on Casement in 2000, organised by the Irish Government, Dr. Roger Sawyer, Casement biographer and authenticity proponent, was able to lay out before the distinguished gathering the pathetic flimsiness of the case for the discovery of the identity of an alleged forger. The forgery faithful were made to appear credulous and buffoonish.

Was all this a matter of chance? It could indeed have been.

Then again it may have been a deliberately contrived baited trap to assist in discrediting the forgery position. The point of the matter is that forgery advocates need to be alert and wary. Cognitive passivity is not an option.

### ACTIVE READING

When material is read it needs to be read actively. Arguments need to be checked for their coherence and realism. References need to be scrutinised to see if they say what the writer claims they say. Nothing can be taken for granted. All needs to be questioned.

The Casement Diaries embrace an area where the worlds of history, politics and the secret state overlap. It is treacherous territory. An acute discretion is called for which we might label Casement Diary Discretion.

To misdirect, to disinform, to nurture trust for later exploitation; all such belong among the dark arts of the Intelligence field. Falsity can be insinuated into a public discourse by a variety of means. Agency can be via conscious activists or unknowing dupes. So-called *experts*, or scientific methodologies applied outside their appropriate context, may be deployed to contrive an appearance of accuracy and objective detachment.

Disinformation usually arrives in the company of appealing ideas and well supported facts. That way it is less readily recognised for what it is.

### A MYSTERIOUS PINK PASTE

Covering about 10 pages of the 1910 diary there is a pink glue-like coating. It also appears on most of the pages for January 1911 and on a few more 1911 diary pages. This substance had drawn the curiosity of diary researcher, Kevin Mannerings. After the end of a symposium on

Casement in Buswell's Hotel, Dublin, in 2003, this writer, then Secretary of the Roger Casement Foundation, discussed this matter with Mannerings. There was the question of why it was on some pages and not on others. We both held a suspicion that the substance had some sort of shielding or blocking function.

Responding to my questions, he was able to say that he had noticed what looked to be evidence of erasure on SOME of the pages coated with the substance. By this he meant the likes of observable changes in the way ink had been absorbed by the paper as a result of what he deemed had been the prior application of an erasing fluid or, simply, where a part of a letter had strangely disappeared.

This he considered to be the erasure of previously existing writing so as to facilitate the forged interpolation of material now taken to be of Casement's own penmanship.

I enquired as to what was the corresponding position with the pages on which no paste had been applied. He was not able to answer this question.

I advised that it would be most worthwhile, if at all possible, to survey ALL the pages to which NO paste had been applied. This comprised the great majority of pages of the combined 1910 and 1911 diaries. If it was revealed that evidence for erasure was distributed in a random way between the paste covered pages and the other pages, then the notion that the paste had some type of blocking or shielding purpose would be grievously dented. On the other hand, if evidence for erasure was confined to the minority of paste covered pages then we had some new and provocative evidence.

Mannerings visited the National Archives, Kew, Surrey where he examined the Diaries by appointment, on a number of occasions over the next two years. One aspect of these visits was a piecemeal, time-consuming, survey with magnifying glass of the non-paste covered pages of the 1910 and 1911 diaries. When he related his findings to me, it was to state that he was not able to discover any evidence of erasure on the pages on which no paste had been applied.

### WORKING HYPOTHESIS

That the paste had a purpose concerned with frustrating the effectiveness of forensic technology was now powerfully boosted as a working hypothesis. He wrote to the National Archives at Kew asking what the substance was. He received a reply that it was *Polyvinyl Acetate*. It had been applied in 1972. Further investigation

revealed that this substance was not known as one used for the preservation and restoration of paper containing handwritten material as had been alleged.

Contact with a private forensic laboratory brought forth a response that the detection of erasure and/or interpolation using Ultra-Violet or Infra-Red light would be impeded by this substance having been applied to a written page.

This research cannot be definitive, obviously. It was not overseen and documented by professionals. However, it exemplifies the application of the scientific method. An initial hypothesis was proposed and then tested via a number of successive investigatory steps. Each step provided yet further support for the initial hypothesis.

Mannerings reported in a general way on the findings described above at the 2006 symposium organised by the Roger Casement Foundation. A press release had been prepared and issued to the main Dublin media outlets.

The media failed to engage.

#### MORE QUESTIONS

*Polyvinyl Acetate* is itself a colourless paste. Yet, what is to be seen on some diary pages has a distinctly pink hue. How is that explained? Perhaps what was applied in 1972 contained more than one substance. An unanticipated reaction over time between the constituent chemicals might have produced colouration changes as observable in the chemical aging of old photographs and newspapers.

The presence of the mysterious paste receives absolutely no acknowledgement in *Anatomy of a Lie* [by Paul Hyde, ed.]. This strange irregularity remains unmentioned and unexplained. If one takes the position that the Diaries were written up after Casement's death, as the book does, it is hard to see how any explanation for the presence of the substance can be advanced.

The notion of forged erasure and interpolation into existing diaries of Casement is what discussion on the substance centres on. Its presence on certain diary pages is conceived of as frustrating the detection of this type of forgery by technical means such as the use of Ultra Violet/Infra Red light.

*Anatomy of a Lie* breaks continuity with the earlier books advocating forgery, those of Noyes and Mackey, in that it avoids promoting the concept of forged interpolation into existing Casement diaries.

#### A VULNERABILITY

The notion of the Diaries having being written after Casement's death exposes

the pro-forgery position in an interesting way. Suppose pollen residue tests were conducted and these confirmed the Diaries had indeed been in the tropics all those years ago. What then? Diary believers could claim the idea they had been written in Britain after Casement's death was now proven false. So, the most recent forgery theory had been elegantly dismissed by science and authenticity had been confirmed, yet again!

#### MINING THE ARCHIVES

No matter how much forgery theory purists may find to criticise in *Anatomy of a Lie*, the fact remains that this book has taken an approach to examining the authenticity question which has not been taken before. One may not agree with every position taken on every question raised but, nonetheless, the effect on the reader is a powerful one.

The approach involves the examination via the existing archives of the evidence which is presumed to confirm the so called Casement Black Diaries as genuine and authentic. The various pieces of evidence are scrutinised, examined and analysed. What emerges is a paper rogues' gallery.

There was the supposed forensic examination conducted by a Dr. Harrison in 1959 which seems, in retrospect, to have amounted to little more than an inquisitive glance. The 'report' which emerged was a mere 93 words long.

All the other 'forensic examinations' are gone into and revealed to have been of little or no scientific value.

The archival evidence for love affairs between Casement and two named young men, a Norwegian, Adler Christensen and a young man from Belfast, Joseph Millar Gordon, proved to be most unimpressive. For example, some evidence for the Christensen affair came from a Norwegian hotel porter named Olsen who provided two mutually contradictory and implausible recorded accounts.

For this writer, the stand-out chapter is the *Epilogue* at the end, which deals with a week's text from the most notorious of the Diaries; that for 1911. For anybody who takes the Diaries to be authentic this chapter is bound to challenge their smug assumptions.

The six mutually contradictory accounts of the discovery of the Diaries originating with Special Branch Chief, Sir Basil Thomson, are described in all their glory. Among the thought-provoking and extraordinary facts revealed is how there are official files connected with the case still classified after a century.

It is explained how Casement had been

spied on for over a year, in Ireland, in America and in Germany, yet no hint of an addiction to 'unnatural vice' as described in the 1911 diary was detected. There are revealing accounts of spoken contributions to the 1916 Centenary celebrations focused on Casement, provided by two legal heavyweights from Ireland; Michael McDowell, former leader of the Progressive Democrats, and Prof Seán McConville.

But it is the relentless revelation of the slag-heap of archival dross backing up the alleged authenticity of the Casement Black Diaries which is the crowning achievement of *Anatomy of a Lie*.

Tim O'Sullivan

Concluded

## Unchanging Times: *Press Gangs and Press Gags*

*The Times* each morning reprints a piece from exactly a century ago when Britain and France were punishing Germany for losing a war unleashed by themselves after years of careful planning.

While most of the guns had fallen silent at the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month of 1918, German men, women and children were being starved to death deliberately by the blockade enforced by Britain's Royal Navy.

(Turkey moved its capital from Constantinople to Ankara shortly afterwards, to be out of range of British guns, and in discussion with C.P. Scott of *The Manchester Guardian*, David Lloyd George spoke of razing Athens if the Greeks didn't do as Britain wished. The Greeks, who were anti-Turkish, had been bullied outrageously by Britain when Britain was at War with the Ottoman Empire.)

*The Times* coverage of the Great War, its origins, conduct and conclusion, was and still remains dishonest, hypocritical and self-righteous and designed to inspire hatred of the victims of British aggression.

Britain, already ruling the world's largest Empire in 1914, ended 1918 with territory one third again bigger.

On 27th June 2019 *The Times* carried three Editorials. The first, "*Fair Care*", takes NHS Doctors to task for prioritising care of foreign patients over making them pay for their treatment. It uses the term "*Health Tourists*".

The NHS has staff at all levels born outside Britain, many of whom were educated up Graduate level in their countries of origin at no charge to the British taxpayer. (or to the immigrant paying British taxes). I've yet to see an Editorial in *The Times* making this point.

The third Editorial in *The Times* is headed *Selling Out*, with the sub-heading "*Europe's Human Rights Watchdog is Turning a Blind Eye to Russia's Crimes*".

It starts thus-

"The Council of Europe, 70 years old this year, was once hailed by Winston Churchill as a way to bring the continent's human rights abuses 'to the judgement of the civilised world'."

As Oscar Wilde said of Dickens's "*Death of Little Nell*"—"One would need a heart of stone not to laugh". Churchill, chief begetter of the Black and Tans and arms supplier to the "B" Specials, architect of the Bengal Famine, and of other human rights abuses, claiming kinship with the civilised world!

The incontinent scoundrel apparently thought it right that his own island's abuses should escape judgement. *The Times*, when under Harold Evans, since Knighted, carried a glowing Obituary of the now officially discredited Lord Widgery, and has even yet to acquire any concern for human rights.

Recently it got apoplectic over cruelty to pigs in slaughter houses within days of publishing a very sympathetic obituary of Lord Carrington, who (it acknowledged) had given prior approval to the torture of prisoners in the North of Ireland on the introduction of internment without trial.

The second *Times* Editorial of 27th June was headed "*Press Gang*" and claims that "*Politically motivated campaigners are trying to smear fine reporting*".

It reports that one of its journalists, Andrew Norfolk, had been attacked in a 72-page pamphlet, by a campaign group, "*Hacked Off*", for writing articles that tended to encourage "*fear of Muslims*". In fact Norfolk was awarded the Paul Foot award for his exposure of the sexual abuse of white teenagers by men of Pakistani origin and the complicity of social workers, police and local councillors in the North of England, lest they be accused of racism.

I'm impressed by the Paul Foot award, for Foot was an honest and fearless journalist, frankly politically-motivated and an admirer of Leon Trotsky. Foot was also a nephew of Michael Foot, a distinguished journalist and later leader of Britain's Labour Party, now safely dead so

that *The Times* can peddle the lie that he was a traitor in the pay of the Soviet Union.

Norfolk also won the Orwell Prize. As I said in a recent Blog, Orwell, once a Socialist, was described by Conor Cruise O'Brien as a conservative. I suspect he was like Senator Joe McCarthy, or even Cruise O'Brien in his later years. Norfolk also won the Journalist of the Year Award. Which reminds me that Harold Evans was presented with the Editor of the Year Award in February 1982.

I watched that ceremony with great interest, noting Dr Conor Cruise O'Brien in the gathering. For on that very morning *The Press Council* had released its condemnation of *The Times* for an untrue report on its front page the day following the funeral of Bobby Sands.

The *Press Council's* grudging condemnation was laboriously extracted from them by myself.

The Press Council changed its name and its rules shortly afterwards.

The *Times* report complained of had asserted that Republicans had killed over 2,000 Protestants between 1969 and May 1981. In fact total fatalities numbered over

2,000. They included Protestants, Catholics and others. They included non-involved civilians, British Crown Forces, Republican and Loyalist paramilitaries. British Crown Forces and Loyalist Paramilitaries had occasionally killed each other but more often had collaborated in the killing of non militant Catholics and armed or unarmed Republican paramilitaries.

When the Press Council changed its name to the Press Complaints Commission I became ineligible to make a complaint like the one upheld by its predecessor. It changed the rules. As I was never a member of the IRA, I could not complain of a lie written about them. If I was a member I could be interned or shot. Some joker had read *Catch-22*. I felt like Yossarian.

But the Press Complaints Commission was superseded and today there's a body described as the *Independent Press Standards Organisation* (Ips). Whether it is *Ips* *Facto* independent is moot.

*The Times* is happy to be a member of it. I won't test whether it would exclude me as a witness.

I'll take my cue from the late Sam Goldwyn—"INCLUDE ME OUT".

**Donal Kennedy**

## From All For Ireland To All For Wine

### —One Healy's Odyssey

In the '*Irish Times*' of 18th January 2014, and under the heading of "*Vintage wine*", that paper's wine correspondent, John Wilson, enthused:

"Maurice Healy is known in the legal profession for '*The Old Munster Circuit*', a light-hearted memoir from his time as a barrister in Cork. However he can also lay claim to being the first Irish wine writer and deserves greater recognition. His books make for a fascinating and humorous read; there can be few wine writers who have tasted Château Lafite-Rothschild over a span of 128 years. Healy was a proud Corkman, from a family steeped in politics; his father was a nationalist MP in Westminster, and his uncle was Timothy Healy (1855-1931), a leading nationalist politician and first governor general of the Irish Free State. Healy himself once stood, unsuccessfully, for election. He was educated at CBC Cork, Clongowes and then UCD before being called to the Irish Bar in 1910. He practised on the Munster circuit until 1914 and again after the first World War. This period provided the inspiration for '*The Old Munster Circuit*'. During the

war he served in the Royal Dublin Fusiliers and saw action on various fronts, earning the Military Cross."

"With the breakdown of law and order during the War of Independence Healy found himself unable to practice, and moved to England where he spent the remainder of his life. Having been teetotal until the age of 30, he then fell utterly in love with wine. Delighting in the pleasures of the table, Healy enjoyed a reputation as raconteur and bon viveur. His two books on wine were '*Claret & the White Wines of Bordeaux*' published in 1934 and '*Stay Me With Flagons*', published in 1940. Sadly both are out of print, but old copies can be found from time to time. The style is at times florid, but always laced with wit, charm and great warmth... Those who criticise modern wine writers for their verbosity should look to Healy. In his day there were never references to flowers, fruits or spices. Instead the descriptions were altogether more literary. Typical of his lyrical style is this evocative passage: 'and this wine had the true glow of the ruby; you were conscious of a lapidary worth. The bouquet did not

fail to justify the clarity; it was almost spiced, so sweetly aromatic was it. And then the true glory revealed itself, not to the eye, not to the nose, but to the palate. It caressed the gullet; it spread its greeting all over the mouth, until the impatient throat accused the tongue of unfair delay. It was glorious, glorious, glorious; and a month later I had not yet stopped talking about it... Healy died in 1943 at the age of 55 soon after the publication of *'Stay Me with Flagons'*. He is fondly remembered in Cork where the late-lamented Lovett's restaurant had a Healy room and held an (almost) centenary dinner there in 1990 which featured a speech from the redoubtable T.P. Whelehan, one of my predecessors in this column. Others, such as wine historian Ted Murphy, are very familiar with his writing. The *'Old Munster Circuit'* was republished in 2001 with a biographical introduction from barrister Charles Lysaght. I am indebted to Lysaght for most of the historical information included here."

In his entry for Maurice Francis Healy (1887-1943) in the Royal Irish Academy / Cambridge University Press *'Dictionary of Irish Biography'*, Charles Lysaght had given a fuller picture of his political pedigree:

"He was the son of Maurice Healy (1859-1923), a Cork solicitor and later an MP, and his wife and cousin, Annie, the daughter of A.M. Sullivan (1830-84)... While at UCD he was gold medalist and auditor of the Literary and Historical Society. Healy then read for the bar at TCD and the King's Inns and was called in 1910. Later that year he stood unsuccessfully for West Waterford in the interest of the All-for-Ireland Party against the official candidate of the Irish parliamentary party. Between 1910 and 1915 he practised at the Irish bar, mainly on the Munster circuit. He was called to the English bar at Gray's Inn in 1914. In 1915 Healy obtained a commission in the Royal Dublin Fusiliers, with whom he saw action both on the Western Front and in Gallipoli. He later served at the headquarters of the 29th Division in France and then in Germany during the occupation that followed the cessation of hostilities on 11 November 1918. He was awarded the MC shortly before his retirement early in 1919 with the rank of captain. Healy returned briefly to the Munster circuit before moving to London, where he set up practice in the chambers of his maternal uncle (and the hopelessly ineffectual counsel for Casement in his 1916 Trial—MOR) Serjeant Alexander Sullivan (1871-1959)... In 1931 he was appointed a KC, but was less successful than had been anticipated, as he seems to have allowed himself to be diverted by other activities, especially his love of wine: he had come to wine with the zeal of a convert, having been a teetotaler until his time at the headquarters of the 29th Division. He was a member of several dining clubs, in one of which, known as 'Ye Set of Old Volumes', he acquired the nickname 'The Prattler', and he was involved with his close friend André Simon in the foundation of the Wine and Food Society. In 1934 he published a volume on claret and

the white wines of Bordeaux, in the introduction to which he stated his conviction that 'the good talk that is inseparable from a wine dinner is even more important than the wines that are being served.' He himself was a charming conversationalist. In *'Who's who'* he listed his recreations as talking and listening to music. He was famous for his hospitality to the young. Healy secured a niche as an occasional broadcaster on the BBC. In 1937 he broadcast in tones that were still recognisably of Cork in a series of memoirs of the previous coronation year, 1911, which, as he said in his talk, had been the happiest of his life..."

In other words, he was a Royalist. The Wikipedia entry for Maurice F. Healy says of him:

"He saw action in the First World War on the Western Front and at Gallipoli. He received the Military Cross in 1919 after serving in France and also in Germany during the immediate post-war occupation. Maurice at one point stood for Parliament as candidate for West Waterford. After the Irish War of Independence, while several of his close relatives became prominent political figures in the Free State, he chose to practice at the English Bar. While he would have been happy enough to see Ireland gain Home Rule by peaceful means, he had a horror of revolutionary violence (although he also denounced the crimes committed by the Black and Tans) and he seems to have found life in the new State uncongenial."

But why had he found *"life in the new State uncongenial"*? After all, his Uncle Tim was the Irish Free State's Governor General. Neither his Sullivan nor Healy families can be held responsible for Maurice F's own Anglophilia. His father, Maurice Snr, was deemed not worthy of being actually being referred to by his first name in the *'Irish Times'* wine correspondent's encomium in honour of the son.

Yet the father had been a politician of substance. Maurice Snr's Wikipedia entry says of him:

"He was returned to parliament four times, first as a member of the Irish Parliamentary Party for Cork city from 1885 to 1900, in which year standing as a Healyite nationalist he was defeated by William O'Brien in a bitter campaign. He was returned again for Cork city in May 1909 to January 1910, and in March 1910 for North East Cork, this time as a supporter and member of William O'Brien's All-for-Ireland League (AFIL). From the December 1910 general election until the December 1918 general election he again represented Cork city."

In his introduction to the 1997 Aubane Historical Society book *'The Cork Free Press—The Restructuring Of Ireland*

*1890-1910'*, Brendan Clifford wrote:

"The electoral overthrow of John Redmond's Home Rule Party is usually depicted by historians as a consequence of the Easter Rising and the shooting of prisoners-of-war by the British authorities after the suppression of the Rising. But Redmond's Party had lost all but one of its Cork seats long before 1916. It lost them in the General Elections of 1910. Redmond's candidates were defeated by Independents in the Election of January 1910. The Independents constituted themselves into a party, the *All-For-Ireland-League*, and defeated the Redmondites again in the Election of December 1910, which was the last Election before the First World War, the Easter Rising, and the general overthrow of Redmondism in 1918."

See also [http://free-magazines.atholbooks.org/ipr/2009/IPR\\_July\\_2009.pdf](http://free-magazines.atholbooks.org/ipr/2009/IPR_July_2009.pdf) for my article "Did Redmond Reconquer West Cork in 1916?" where I debunked that misapprehension.

It is, however, also worth looking in some further detail at the ups and downs of Maurice Healy as an MP for Cork city, a two seat constituency. Healy had been MP since 1885, but in 1900 William O'Brien stood against him, and defeated him by 5,812 votes to 1,985. However, with the foundation of the All-for-Ireland League by William O'Brien, D. D. Sheehan and Canon P. A. Sheehan in Kanturk, County Cork, in March 1909, O'Brien and the Healys joined forces against Redmondism. The other MP for Cork city, Augustine Roche, remained an incorrigible Redmondite. Determined to force a contest in the city, O'Brien resigned his own seat and nominated Maurice Healy as the Independent Nationalist candidate for the May 1909 by-election, where he regained his seat by defeating the Redmondite candidate, George Crosbie of the 'Cork Examiner', by 4,706 votes to 3,546.

In the January 1910 General Election, the AFIL trounced the Redmondites in Cork County, with Maurice's brother Tim Healy also winning for the AFIL in Louth. But the forward march was halted in Cork City. O'Brien had re-entered that fray. The votes were 4,535 for O'Brien, 4,438 for Roche and 4,229 for Maurice Healy, with the result that Roche retained his seat and Maurice once again lost his. In March 1910 O'Brien compensated by resigning his second seat in Cork North East to allow Maurice to become MP for that constituency until he stood again for the city in the snap December 1910 General Election. The Redmondites regained the Louth seat from Tim Healy, but O'Brien compensated him as well by getting the AFIL's Moreton

Frewen to resign his Cork North East seat in March 1911 so that Tim could now become MP for that constituency.

But the key feature of the December 1910 General Election had not only been the consolidation of the AFIL hold over Cork County, but the victory of Maurice Healy in Cork City. This time, the Redmondites had misjudged the situation, not only expecting Roche to retain his seat, but also hoping to unseat O'Brien himself by standing Willie Redmond, brother of Party leader John Redmond, against him. But the votes were 5,384 for O'Brien, 5,269 for Healy, 4,746 for Redmond and 4,743 for Roche, with the AFIL winning both seats.

The headlines in the *'Irish Times'* on 8th December 1910 read "CORK CITY DEFEAT OF THE OFFICIAL NATIONALISTS. MR. O'BRIEN AND MR. HEALY HEAD THE POLL." The report continued:

"Overnight the return of Mr. William O'Brien was widely expected, but opinion was sharply divided as to whether he should have as colleague Mr. M. Healy who was defeated at the January election. There was no doubt on the matter today. Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Healy, representatives of the All-for-Ireland League, triumphed in the home of the organisation, soundly beating Mr. William Redmond and Mr. A. Roche, representatives of the Parliamentary Party."

In the light of such a dramatic triumph for Maurice Healy, it is remarkable how speedily both the *'Irish Times'* wine correspondent and Charles Lysaght jumped over their passing mention of his son Maurice F. Healy as that election's AFIL candidate in West Waterford. The Wikipedia entry on the sitting Redmondite MP, J.J. O'Shee, says of him:

"In 1894 in alliance with D.D. Sheehan he co-founded the Irish Land and Labour Association (ILLA), chaired by Sheehan with O'Shee as secretary. They campaigned for radical changes in land and labour laws, in particular the granting of smallholdings to rural labourers. The Irish Party leaders suspected this independent organisation from the beginning. A year later in 1895 O'Shee was elected as an anti-Parnellite to represent the constituency of West Waterford at Westminster, which seat he held until 1918. From 1898 Sheehan put all his energies into building up the ILLA, which spread across Munster and by 1904 peaked 144 branches. Although Sheehan was a Parnellite when elected MP for Mid-Cork in 1901, the Sheehan-O'Shee alliance reflected how the Parnell split could be bridged by seeking co-operation in an independent organisation. Sheehan speaking of O'Shee wrote that 'we co-operated heartily in and out of Parliament in making the Labour organisation a real and vital force, and our relations for many useful years were of the most cordial and kindly kind'. The Irish Party leadership on

the other hand, refused to consider direct Parliamentary representation to the Land and Labour Association, an indication of the middle-class determination with maintaining its hold over national politics..."

"With the introduction of the Wyndham Land Purchase Act of 1903 won by William O'Brien MP, O'Shee achieved some notable successes in negotiating land purchase... However the leaders of the Irish Parliamentary Party (IPP), John Dillon and Joe Devlin strongly opposed the O'Shee-Sheehan ILLA alliance, particularly after Sheehan grew closer to the dissident O'Brien when he was alienated from the party in 1904 after his policy of conciliation was rejected by its leaders. O'Shee aligned himself with the leadership of John Redmond. Dillon decided to intervene and set about splitting the ILLA in 1905, forming a new 'original' ILLA group, strictly subservient to the Party, under the loyal 'Redmondite' O'Shee. Purpose: to confine Sheehan's movement, otherwise '*the whole of Munster will be poisoned and no seat safe on vacancy*'. O'Shee's organisation was forthwith the only one recognised by the Party and permitted to attend Irish Party or United Irish League conventions."

But if John Redmond held a firm grip on Waterford city, the situation was different in the West Waterford constituency, where O'Shee's Redmondite subversion of the *Land and Labour Association* left a lingering resentment. Influenced by the AFIL surge in neighbouring Cork, an O'Brienite Independent Nationalist candidate emerged to challenge in the January 1910 General Election. In a constituency which the *'Irish Times'* described as "*hotly contested*", the O'Brienite candidate, Arthur Ryan, secured as many as 1,309 votes, giving the incumbent Redmondite MP, J. J. O'Shee, with 1,753 votes, a good run for his money. The *'Irish Times'* of 28th January 1910, reported from the count at Dungarvan:

"Mr Ryan said he had started this election a fortnight ago, and he had no reason to be ashamed of the result... Mr Ryan afterwards appeared on the balcony of the Devonshire Arms Hotel, and was received with immense cheering, and Mr O'Shee appeared at the window of Lawlor's Hotel. There was considerable excitement, and a cordon of police was placed between the rival parties. Mr O'Shee essayed to speak, but was met with groans, blowing of horns, and other kinds of noise, while Mr Ryan was loudly cheered. This continued for some time. The streets are ringing with cheers for Ryan. Dungarvan was Mr Ryan's stronghold, and polled here the largest of all the districts, about 3 to 2 for his opponent. It is considered Mr Ryan, who was opposed by the priests, the United

Irish League, and six members of Parliament, made a splendid fight. He is determined to make another shot should occasion offer."

But, for whatever reason, he didn't, in what should have been a winnable constituency for the AFIL. The *'Irish Times'* was to report on 28th November 1910:

"At the AFIL selection convention in Dungarvan, the following resolution was carried: 'That the convention select Mr. T. D. Sullivan, the grand old man of Irish politics, as the Nationalist candidate for West Waterford, and they pledge him their unstinted support.'"

T.D. Sullivan (1827-1914), a brother of A.M. Sullivan, was the author of "God Save Ireland" and had been Lord Mayor of Dublin 1886-88, and an MP 1880-1900 for the constituencies of Westmeath, Dublin College Green and West Donegal, successively. Perhaps he was too much "*the grand old man*". In any case, he was quickly replaced as candidate by his grandnephew Maurice F. Healy. The *'Irish Times'* of December 3rd reported a lacklustre appearance:

"Today a motor car was used by Mr Healy, and he has printed on his car 'Vote for Healy'. As yet there is an absence of that enthusiasm which was so prevalent at the last election."

Why Maurice Jnr's campaign should have remained lacklustre is hard to fathom. Eight days were to elapse between his father's impressive victory at the Cork City polls on December 6th and the West Waterford polling on December 14th. But the result for Maurice F was a mere 727 votes, compared to O'Shee's increased vote of 2,402.

With the AFIL leadership of O'Brien, Sheehan and the Healys disregarding the anti-Imperialist war arguments of its *'Cork Free Press'* editor Frank Gallagher, and instead supporting Britain's War on Germany, this was a campaign for which Maurice F showed far greater enthusiasm, in a manner that particularly endeared him to Dublin Unionists. The *'Irish Times'* of 20th September 1915, reported:

"A recruiting meeting was held on Sunday afternoon in the People's Park, Blackrock (Co Dublin). There was a large crowd present. The meeting was held under the auspices of the City and County Recruiting Committee. Sir Maurice Dockrell, D.L. (who would be elected Unionist MP for Dublin Rathmines in the 1918 General Election—MO'R) said the Germans would have them believe that they were friendly to Ireland. The Germans belonged to the feline tribe. They were like

the tiger, and sprang upon you before you knew where you were. The Allies were going to win—of that there was no doubt. But they were fighting a powerful nation and must have more recruits. Blackrock had done well, and they wanted still more men."

"Mr. H.S. Doig said in days gone by Irishmen were divided in politics and in many other ways. Today they were standing together, resolved and determined to preserve liberty and freedom in this country. He was standing that day on the same platform as his friend, Lieutenant Healy, whom they all knew belonged to a great political family in this country. They knew there was a man named T.D. Sullivan, who wrote their National Anthem, 'God save Ireland'. Today their countrymen were singing that song as they walked into the trenches. They knew they never met a man named Sullivan who was not a fine fighting man, and Lieutenant Maurice Healy was a member of the glorious fighting Sullivan family. He asked them to cheer up Mr. Healy on his way to the front and the work he had to do. The most cheerful men he had met were the soldiers in the trenches, and he said, without the least hesitation, that the Irishmen were the best. A general told him to send out Irish soldiers, for they were always the most cheerful and willing, and anything he asked them to do, if it were at all possible, they would carry it out..."

"Lieutenant Maurice Healy said that this was a very interesting day for him, for he had expected to be in the trenches on Sunday, 19th September. He was not there because they would not let him go. He was sent to Ireland by the Colonel of the 4th Battalion of the Dublin Fusiliers to get men to fill up the gaps made in the battalion. He had made a bet that he would raise 1,000 recruits. He had not succeeded, so they had kept him at home until he fulfilled his bet. (Hear, hear, and a voice—"You will get them, sir.") He hoped he would, but was sorry he would have to remain in Ireland."

On the conclusion of that Imperialist War, Maurice F. was back in his native Cork from occupied Germany in February 1919. He appears to have remained singularly unimpressed by the fact that two months previously, in the December 1918 General Election, the Sinn Féin triumph over the Redmondites had seen the inaugural meeting of the First Dáil Éireann being held in January.

Contributing to that victory was the AFIL's decision to support Sinn Féin and to give it a clear run against the Redmondites by standing down its own MPs. In Cork City his own father, Maurice Healy Snr, and William O'Brien, both stood down, leaving the field clear for the two seats to be won by Sinn Féin's Liam de Róiste and J.J. Walsh. The votes were 20,801 for Walsh and 20,506 for de Róiste, as against 7,480 for the Redmondite Maurice Talbot Crosbie, 7,162 for the Redmondite Richard O'Sullivan,

Last month *Irish Political Review* carried what we thought was Brian Murphy's letter to the *Sunday Independent* of 21st July. Brian has contacted us to point how that letter was bowdlerised by that newspaper. The omitted parts of the original letter are highlighted in brackets below:

## A Bowdlerised Letter

I note with regret and concern that Eoghan Harris has returned to his allegation that the Irish republican movement, under the administration of Dail Eireann from January 1919, engaged in sectarian acts against members of the Protestant community. **(Once again he cites the late Peter Hart's study of the IRA (1998) as a prime source to justify this contention and, at the same time, he makes fun of Tom Barry's personality. Rather than engage in a debate on the character of Tom Barry—the book about him by Meda Ryan (2003) is still the most authoritative in that regard—it would appear sensible to introduce some new information on the allegation of sectarianism.**

**Firstly,** it is highly significant that Dail Eireann placed members of the Protestant faith in charge of land reform. Robert Barton, a British officer in charge of Irish prisoners during the 1916 Rising, was not only elected a TD for Wicklow in 1918 but also acted as minister for agriculture from August 1919. In that capacity he created a National Land Bank in December 1919 with the aim of helping Irish people acquire land and to improve their farms. Erskine Childers and Lionel Smith Gordon, both of the Protestant faith, were appointed directors of the bank. Far from driving Protestants from the land, Irish republicans selected Protestants to be in charge of land reform. **( This fact alone undermines completely the claims of Hart and Harris.**

Secondly, while researching recently the life of Winnie Barrington (1897-1921), who was the accidental victim of an IRA ambush on 14 May 1921, I came across many examples of Catholic and Protestant co-operation in Limerick. The most relevant statement to this debate was made, on 14 April 1922, by Winnie's father, Sir Charles Barrington. Speaking at a large gathering of the Protestant community, not yet a year after his daughter had been killed by the IRA, he declared that 'in years gone by and at the present time the question of religion never arose in Limerick or the South; they all, Catholic and Protestant alike, lived in the best of harmony and good fellowship. They attend to their own business and nothing else, and although the Protestants were in the minority the greatest toleration was extended to them by their Catholic neighbours.' Other members of the Protestant community expressed the same sentiments.

**In conclusion it has to be accepted that** this toleration did not survive the Civil War: Protestants, who in the main supported the Treaty, were targeted by those who opposed it. They were discriminated against, however, not because of their religion but because of their politics. In the same way those Protestants who opposed the Treaty were confronted by the state. For example, when Erskine Childers was executed, on 24 November 1922, he was shot not as a Protestant but as an opponent of the Treaty.

**(This narrative of events is so far removed from the polemic of Eoghan Harris that one is forced to ask if he is writing with a desire for historical accuracy or with the priority of a political agenda. In that regard it should be recalled that, no so long ago, he was a declared member of the Reform Group with the aim of re-joining the British Commonwealth. Perhaps Mr Harris, or the editor of your newspaper, might inform your readers as to his present standing.)**

Dr Brian P Murphy *osb*  
Glenstal Abbey  
11.7.2019

2,519 for the Unionist Daniel Williams and 2,254 for the Unionist Thomas Farrington.

And in the County Waterford constituency, where Maurice F. had polled so abysmally in December 1910, the Redmondite MP J.J. O'Shee was finally unseated, with his 4,217 votes in that

election's extended franchise being swamped by the 12,890 votes for Sinn Féin's Cathal Brugha, who would preside over that inaugural meeting of the First Dáil.

Maurice F's preoccupations were focused elsewhere. This past February 27th, in *The*

To page 30, column 1

#### INFRASTRUCTURE IRELAND

Now is the time to build Ireland into a State fit for the future. Interest rates on State borrowing are almost at NIL interest rates. The National Treasury Management Agency is set to borrow 25 Billion Euros in the normal course of business and why not borrow 125 Billion and invest 100 Billion in badly needed infrastructure?

Ireland needs to copy the infrastructure model of Switzerland which, despite the apparent handicap of all of those mountains, has turned the handicap into an advantage by using engineering expertise. In Switzerland railway tunnels and bridges have opened up the country to make it one big tourist attraction. Switzerland builds hydro-electric dams everywhere water is falling. I mean everywhere!

Ireland has plenty of falling water to be harnessed to produce really green electricity. What are we waiting for?

Let me begin by describing Switzerland and Ireland to see where we are now and how we got to here.

On 1st August 1291, the Swiss in the Lake Lucerne region—Uri, Schwyz and Unterwalden—Unterwalden consists of Nidwalden and Obwalden—met at a meadow in Rutli on Lake Lucerne and by oath bound themselves into a Republic to protect themselves from the depredations of the Von Habsburgs.

The Von Habsburgs were based in a castle halfway between Zurich and Basel at a place called Aaran. Other cantons joined the *Eidgenossen* as it was originally called. "*Eidgenossen*" means bound together as a co-operative union by oath.

The latest canton to be formed is *Jura*, which joined in 1799.

All was not peaceful after 1291. The Hapsburgs has to be fought in several battles before they left in around 1350, but they still exercised some control up to their defeat in the Swabian war of 1499.

Then came the religious wars, sparked by the German Reformation which was preached by Zwingli in Zurich Cathedral, the *Grossmunster*. The merchants in the towns became mostly Protestant and the

country rural people remained mostly Catholic. The result was that the bigger towns controlled political power and this was augmented by those towns taking in skilled Protestants fleeing from France.

All the cantons maintained a strong military tradition. It was their way to keep their independence against foreign aggression and also against aggression from neighbouring cantons. The Swiss Guard at the Vatican in Rome is a modern-day example of that tradition.

The Swiss Confederation avoided involvement in the Thirty Years War 1618-48 but the cantons supplied soldiers to the French, the Spanish and the Dutch and to various German princes—at a price of course. In 1653, after an attempt to raise taxes by the towns, the rural people revolted. The revolt was severely crushed, after which the Protestant towns, Lucerne and Bern, attempted to change the Confederation in their own favour. This was resisted by the Catholic cantons and a war followed. The Protestants and Catholics continued sporadic war between each other until the French Revolution.

Napoleon invaded in 1798 and he caused all Swiss to unite and reject his "*centralisation*" of Switzerland: the French army had to withdraw in 1802, after which there was another bout of civil war between the Protestant capitalist class and the Catholic rural working class. This uneasy, and at times violent, state-of-affairs went on until, in 1848 with revolutions in the air all over Europe, a civil peace was negotiated with a new federalist constitution: '*The Federal Constitution of 1848*', which is still the Swiss Constitution. Under this power is devolved to strong cantonal governments while at the same time there is a strong national parliament.

Switzerland remained neutral in World War I and World War II, although it feared invasion in World War II from Italy in the south and Germany in the north. The use of four languages—German, French, Italian and Romansh—cause loyalty problems in times of wars.

Numbered bank accounts enabled the Swiss banks to prosper during the world wars, but caused a great amount of trouble and heart-searching from the 1960s to the 1990s, when truths began to be revealed and financial collaboration with Nazi Germany was admitted.

The High German spoken in Germany is frowned upon in Switzerland where

Schwyzerdütsch—Swiss German—is preferred and promoted on radio and TV, and in schools and businesses. The other languages spoken are also dialects of their parent languages.

Ireland has an area of 32,000 square miles. Switzerland is 15,000 square miles and a lot of that is in Alpine mountains. The population of Switzerland is about twice the population of Ireland. There is a huge transient population in Switzerland, consisting of tourists and a relatively enormous population of foreign nationals working at all levels of business and industry: particularly in hotels, restaurants and shops.

It seems that, while appearing to be strict on immigration, the Swiss issue three-year working visas to foreigners who assist the Swiss economy on low wages: after three years they are sent home to their own countries. There seems to be a substantial population of Vietnamese in Switzerland at present, both in the hotel and restaurant sector and as part of the tourist population.

Michael Stack ©

To be continued

## Healey

continued

*Times*" UK's "*On this day—Britain at War*" centenary series, the most noteworthy item deemed worth republishing from its issue of 27th February, 1919, was the following letter, headed "*Home in cattle trucks*", and put into print only two days after dispatch, as part of that paper's campaign for British vengeance at Versailles:

"*To the Editor of 'The Times'*: Sir, I left Cologne on February 7 in a train consisting of cattle trucks for the men and unheated third-class carriages for the officers. There was a 'kitchen car', with two ranges and two boilers in it. Even in this, with its four fires, any water spilled froze instantly on the floor. Blankets of a wretched quality were provided. As I had been ill, I had provided myself with a hot-water bottle, which I refilled at the engine every couple of hours. Nevertheless, the water froze long before it could be renewed. In the trucks for the men was a little straw. The journey to Dunkirk took 51 hours, and we were met by the query, 'The Adjutant's compliments, and was it true that four men had died of exposure on the journey?' We left Cologne Station full of steam-heated trains devoted to the German civil population. Why not let them use the cattle trucks and save the carriages for the men who were dragged from their homes by the crimes of these same people and who should not now be

To page 31, column 1

## Capitalism continued

fewer than half the number employed by General Motors alone in the 1970s.

All of this Wartzman elegantly describes for us by means of bringing to life the personalities who were the driving forces behind what happened on both the employer and Union sides of the dispute.

Amid all the goodwill, the fundamental error that American business made from the beginning was to oppose the idea of government-funded universal health and pensions services in favour of business providing the same benefits for its workers.

The irony is that other Western capitalist economies followed suit.

(Reviewed by Colin Teese, Former Deputy Secretary of the Department of Trade in Australia, *News Weekly*, March 9, 2019)

**THE END OF LOYALTY: *The Rise and Fall of Good Jobs in America* by Rick Wartzman. Public Affairs, New York. Hardcover: 432 pages. Price: AUD\$42.99.**

\*\*\*\*\*

## Healey

continued

returned in a condition which, with an epidemic raging, invites a fatal disease? Yours faithfully, Maurice F. Healy, Ashton Lawn, Cork, Feb 25."

Home is really where the heart is, and Maurice F's heart was in England. The *Irish Times*' wine correspondent facetiously wrote that "*with the breakdown in law and order during the War of Independence Healy found himself unable to practice, and moved to England where he spent the remainder of his life*". But that was an option freely chosen by him. His uncle, Tim Healy, had chosen a different path, and his Wikipedia entry records:

"With the outbreak of World War in August 1914, the Healy brothers supported the Allied and British war effort... Timothy's eldest son, Joe, fought with distinction at Gallipoli... Healy after the Easter Rising was convinced that the IPP and Redmond were doomed and slowly withdrew from the forefront of politics, making it clear in 1917 that he was in general sympathy with Arthur Griffith's Sinn Féin movement, but not with physical force methods. In September that year he acted as counsel for the family of the dead Sinn Féin hunger striker Thomas Ashe. He was one of the few King's Counsel to provide legal services to members of Sinn Féin in various legal proceedings in

## More Capitalism !

### "Not enough migrants arriving to keep pay down— Central Bank

The number of people willing to move here to work is not going to hit levels seen during the last boom and will not keep wages down, economists at the Central Bank are forecasting.

The Department of Finance expects that another 50,000 jobs will be added this year, barring a hard Brexit, and predicts average wages will rise 3pc in 2019, 3.2pc in 2020 and 3.3pc the following year.

While that message spells bad news for employers trying to address shortages in key areas, it is good news for those in work, as it implies that wages will continue to rise.

With a record 2.32 million people now in work and recent data showing that just 110,000 are classified as unemployed, pay has started to rise.

Wage gains averaged 2.8pc in 2018, up from just 0.8pc in 2017, according to Central Bank economists Stephen Byrne and Tara McIndoe-Calder.

In the past, migrants from the EU would have filled skills gaps in the economy as they did in the boom years when, in 2007, net migration here topped 100,000 people. By contrast, as the labour market here tightened through 2018, net migration was just 34,000, the economists wrote in an analysis published yesterday.

Rising job opportunities and wages in eastern Europe mean migrants are less tempted to come to Ireland, unless the pay gap is very big. Mr Byrne and Ms McIndoe-Calder wrote:

"As such, attracting migrants may only occur at higher wage differentials, going forward, than seen in the 2004-07 period that coincided with the EU accession countries joining the pool of available

both Ireland and England post the 1916 Rising. This included acting for those interned in 1916 illegally in Frongoch in North Wales... In 1920 the Bar Council of Ireland passed an initial resolution that any barrister appearing before the Dáil Courts would be guilty of professional misconduct. This was challenged by Tim Healy and no final decision was made on the matter. Before the December 1918 General Election, he was the first of the AFIL

EU migrants at relatively low wages". "This implies that the wage-dampening effect of net inward migration may be subdued when compared to the pre-crisis period".

There is also a risk that a rise in the number of workers coming here could put further pressure on infrastructure, especially in housing, which is in short supply in booming parts of the country.

Business group Ibec has highlighted the risk that labour shortages pose to local firms, suggesting they have emerged as a factor in the construction industry. Labour costs typically account for half of businesses' overall costs, and so they are highly sensitive to changing wage levels.

A separate Central Bank of Ireland research analysis, also published yesterday, highlighted the risks from a lack of housing.

"Ireland is likely to require significant inflows of workers from abroad over the coming years, provided the economy remains on a favourable growth trajectory," the report said.

"A continued focus on addressing housing supply shortages can help ensure that Ireland remains an attractive location for the migrants who will be needed to fill vacancies in the labour market" (*Irish Independent*, 30.7.2019).

## Labour Comment:

The first paragraph tells us that there are too few migrants to keep wages down; the final paragraph tells us we must build more homes to accommodate any influx which would ensure that wages keep going down.

What a load of guff we keep hearing from the middle-class and the Left about integration, multiculturalism and the like. The Central Bank have no illusions of grandeur relating to migration.

Blair had a similar solution some decades ago which eventually helped bring about the vote which brought us Brexit!

members to resign his seat in favour of the Sinn Féin party's candidate, and spoke in support of P.J. Little, the Sinn Féin candidate for Rathmines in Dublin."

But it had been Maurice F. Healy's own free choice to spend his "*Days of Wine and Roses*" in "*England's green and pleasant land*".

**Manus O'Riordan**



BOOK REVIEW: THE END OF LOYALTY: The Rise and Fall of Good Jobs in America by Rick Wartzman

# The New Capitalism: Downgrading The Working Class

The author could not have chosen a better title for what he wanted to illustrate: whereas American big business was once able and willing to provide well-paid and reliable jobs and working conditions to all Americans willing to work, that is no longer the case.

In the process of making his case, Rick Wartzman provides the reader with a thoroughgoing and painstakingly documented account of the evolution of US labour relations for most of the 20th century and up to the present.

The book is constructed in three parts:

- I. The Golden Age;
- II. Turbulent Times; and
- III. The Era of Shareholder Supremacy.

It is centred on the activities in relation to the evolution of working conditions and employment in four major American companies: Kodak, Coca-Cola, General Motors and General Electric.

The golden era actually begins in the immediate aftermath of World War II.

As the war in the Pacific was drawing to a close in 1945, a group of 19 businessmen gathered in New York to plan the peace. Going under the name of the *Industrial Advisory Board of the Committee for Economic Development*, it devised a plan to ensure that 58 million discharged servicemen, along with the others who had sustained war production, would be able to find secure and regular employment in a postwar US economy.

The CED, as it came to be known, turned out to be thoroughgoing, influential and progressive. Some complained that it

was promoting an extreme brand of "*enlightened capitalism*"; in particular because it accepted an important place in postwar industrial relations for organised labour.

This latter position was radical even for Kodak's George Eastman, whose idea was to pay his workers so well they would ignore unions.

The postwar climate of US industrial relations was built on the idea of an adversarial system in which Unions would be recognised as legitimate advocates of labour in the bargaining exchanges with employers. In the process, industrial peace became the norm, and wages and workers' conditions steadily improved.

All of this was helped by the times. A nation in possession of more money and secure employment wanted more and more of the things US business was happy to provide. The view, misguided, was that all of this could continue forever. Curious-

ly, it was brought down by the system itself, helped by the onset of the global economy.

US business actually harmed itself by insisting that business, not government, should provide both health and retirement insurance for workers. By the beginning of the 1960s, this was pushing up wages to levels that began to aggravate inflation. The 1970s oil crisis made it all worse, at a time when the American economy was so important that its inflation infected the rest of the world.

As well, American companies, which hitherto had the domestic market to themselves, now began to feel the pressure of import competition. Wage rates were generating inflation and making American businesses internationally uncompetitive.

From this time, the great compact between US labour and employers began to unravel. With the onset of globalisation, it was doomed. US companies not merely wanted to be able to meet international competition at home, they wanted to compete for international business.

Moreover, they became obsessed with profit over social responsibility. A new face of capitalism was emerging in which long-term job security would no longer be possible. Business was even saying that employee loyalty was no longer necessary or desirable.

The consequences for labour were devastating. Wartzman tells us that, by the 21st century, the four biggest U.S. companies—Apple, Amazon, Facebook and Google—employed 300,000 workers;

*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 31