

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

December 2017

Vol.32, No.12 ISSN 0790-7672

and Northern Star incorporating Workers' Weekly Vol.31 No.12 ISSN 954-5891

Brexit And The War Of The Worlds!

The 26 County Government says it will not tolerate the restoration of a Border between the part of the island which it governs and the Six Counties in the North which are part of the British state. It means that it will not tolerate of a Customs barrier.

In a bygone era it denied the legitimacy of the Irish region of the British state. Its Constitution asserted *de jure* sovereignty over the whole island. It repealed that assertion of sovereignty in 1998, after the IRA ended the War that it declared on Britain, on condition that the system of British government in the Six Counties was altered substantially in the interests of the large nationalist minority in the North.

The Dublin Governments had not in any sense been a party to the War between the IRA and Britain. This war was not in any sense a resumption of the Anglo/Irish War of 1919-21. It was a war declared by a new IRA, born out of the undemocratic, sectarian system of British government in the Six County region of the British state. Every Dublin Government during those 28 years condemned the War that the IRA declared and waged on its own authority.

The legitimacy of that authority as stated can be disputed, but the reality of support for the War by the undemocratically-governed nationalist populace is a fact beyond reasonable dispute. And the terms on which the War was settled were a substantial alteration in the British system of undemocratic government in the Six County region.

Dublin Governments throughout the War were disapproving onlookers, except for Charles Haughey and Albert Reynolds, who acted as intermediaries towards a settlement.

The Northern War of 1970-1998 owed nothing to Dublin Governments. They had no part in it. The terms on which it was ended demonstrated that it was—as this journal had maintained throughout—a British affair caused by the undemocratic mode of government that Britain chose to impose on the Six Counties as a means of enacting Partition.

Dublin Governments, while condemning the IRA for waging war on Britain on the issue of Northern Ireland, kept the clause in the Constitution which denied the legitimacy

continued on page 2

UK Launch of "The Atlas Of The Irish Revolution"

The Department of Foreign Affairs organised a lavish UK launch of the "*The Atlas of the Irish Revolution*" at the Irish Embassy in London on 9th November 2017. The canapés were nice and the wine and Guinness flowed freely. A panel discussion was advertised with the Editors of the *Atlas* (Dr John Crowley, Mr. Mike Murphy, Dr. Donal Ó Drisceoil and Dr. John Borgonovo) that would be moderated by Mr. Fergal Keane. But none of this happened. Mr. Keane did not show, with no explanation given, and there was no discussion as promised to the disappointment of many.

After registering, I got permission to give out copies of the review below, together with a copy of Dr. Philip McConway's review in the *Midland Tribune*. I distributed about 30 copies of each to the people waiting to be admitted to the launch meeting room upstairs, not yet open, including copies to Donal Ó Drisceoil. About 10 minutes later I was ordered to stop giving them out which I did. Then a very angry John Borgonovo came down

continued on page 5

A review of Tony Connelly's '*Brexit and Ireland*'

Brexit: the view from RTE

"This will be the first time we have to stand up for ourselves diplomatically, since we became a Republic. We've been hiding behind the British skirts institutionally for donkey's years. The British have done a lot of heavy lifting for us for so long. I don't think we're psychologically ready for it" (*Brexit and Ireland* by Tony Connelly, 2017, p. 343).

This is from a book about Brexit by an RTE journalist. It is a quotation from an Irish official who has worked for the European Commission since 1995. He is referring to Irish influence inside the Commission as well as to the general influence exerted by Ireland in Europe.

The statement is factually incorrect in

that it blanks out numerous European policy initiatives from Fianna Fail Governments over the first 30 years of membership, thereby making incomprehensible the Irish decision to join the European Monetary System in 1979 after the UK had left, as well Ireland's adoption of the Euro. But the quotation is nonetheless revealing. It highlights a psychological deficiency that is now being experienced by many Irish politicians and officials whose careers began from the late 1990s onwards, a deficiency that is shared by the

continued on page 8

CONTENTS

Page

War Of The Worlds. Editorial	1
UK Launch Of <i>Atlas Of The Irish Revolution.</i> Jack Lane	1
<i>Brexit: The View From RTE.</i> Dave Alvey (Review of Tony Connelly book)	1
<i>Readers' Letters: Casement Diaries: Archival Realities?</i> Paul Hyde	3
<i>Atlas Of The Irish Revolution.</i> Leaflet	6
Just How Anti-Hitler Was The War-Time Prime Minister Of Northern Ireland? Manus O'Riordan	10
The O'Connor Column (Fine Gael's impressive Brexit stand; Stephen Collins' poppy-cock; Is there even "One Just Man"?; Irish America; O'Toole's latest revisionist thesis)	11
Revisionist Jamboree At Kilkenny Castle. Tim O'Sullivan (Part 4)	14
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (History, Remembrance and Culture)	17
November Brexit Developments. Dave Alvey	18
Vincent Morley, Lords and Poets. John Minahane (Review, Part 4)	19
Between Two Civilisations. Desmond Fennell	21
Reflections On The Theatre. Wilson John Haire	22
Chaos In Kenya, Peaceful Transition In Zimbabwe. Tom Doherty	22
The Russian Revolution. Brendan Clifford	23
Review Of Sinn Fein's Brexit Policy. Irish Political Review Group	26
IPR Index for 2017.	29
<i>Biteback: Varadkar And The Poppy.</i> Tom Cooper	
Israel's Claim To Be The Only Democracy In The Middle East. Steven Jaffe	
Israel Has Displayed A 50-Year Contempt For Democracy.	
David Morrison	31
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (English Ireland; The Poppy Business)	32

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

Armagh Abu!

(back page)

Pig Buyers Again!

Pat Muldowney, Wilson John Haire, Seán McGouran

(page 33)

of British government in the Six Counties. And then they repealed that assertion of *de jure* Irish sovereignty in the North after the IRA agreed terms with Britain for ending the War—just as if they had been a party to the War.

Repeal of the sovereignty clause in 1971, when we demonstrated at the Department of External Affairs building to demand it, might have made a difference to the course of events in the North. Repeal in 1998 was at best an empty gesture.

There were grounds in the pre-1998 Constitution for action against a British border within Ireland. Article Three suspended action to give effect to the sovereignty assertion of Article 2. Enforcement of sovereignty was left to the discretion of Governments.

In 1974, when the Government was charged with breaking the Constitution by signing the Sunningdale Agreement, its legal defence was that it did no more than recognise the fact that there was a British government in the Six Counties. Doctors C.C. O'Brien and Garret FitzGerald, the

Coalition spokesmen on the North, said that their merely factual acknowledgement that there was British government in the Six Counties did not prejudice the right of any future Government to act to enforce Irish sovereignty.

The Constitutional assertion of sovereignty over the North was repealed, to no useful purpose in 1998. British government was recognised as legitimate. So what Constitutional grounds would there be for action by a Dublin Government to prevent Britain from establishing Customs posts along its Border??

The Border did not cease to be a Customs barrier because of any Dublin pressure on London, or any Anglo-Irish Agreement. It happened as a by-product of Ireland joining the EU following Britain in a British Isles sort of way. The sense of national purpose in the state was at a low ebb when it happened. The Establishment middle class of the nation had trivialised itself. It was shamed by the War in the North and it sought refuge from itself in Europe. And, apart from the fiercely

resented Haughey period, it was cannon-fodder for Britain in its long, largely successful, campaign to divert the EU from its original purpose.

. . . AND NOW!

In its negotiations on Brexit, Britain has found itself in a novel position: in the past it has negotiated 'unequal treaties' with other countries—treaties in which its own force and might are brought to bear on the other party to secure arrangements to its own advantage and the disadvantage of the junior party. On this occasion the balance of power lies with the opposing party, and Britain must rely on its wits and statecraft to extract the best deal it can.

Ireland is, for the first time, on the stronger side in the negotiations. However, that advantage can be dissipated if it handles Unionist susceptibilities in its usual uncomprehending manner.

After Brexit there must be a comprehensive political, legal and economic barrier between Britain and Europe. The question is whether this division will occur between mainland Britain and the island of Ireland or run across the UK Border with the EU—the old Irish Border with Northern Ireland.

Tory MEP Charles Tannock has called for a referendum to be held in Northern Ireland, to allow for continued membership of the Customs Union and the Single Market after the UK leaves the European Union. At first sight this seems an attractive option: to seek democratic endorsement for the Special Status for Northern Ireland, which the EU negotiators—including Ireland—are seeking to extract from Westminster. The EU is demanding this Special Status, as one of the 'Red Lines' upon which agreement must be agreed before negotiations proceed to the next stage, the trade relationship between the UK and Europe.

Given that Prime Minister Theresa May is constrained by reliance on DUP votes to maintain her party in power, this is a way that Special Status for Northern Ireland could occur. Unionists are opposed to Special Status as creating a barrier between themselves and the UK, while it is universally advocated on the Nationalist side. But they could hardly withdraw from the 'Confidence and Supply' agreement with the Conservatives on the issue of giving the Northern Ireland democracy a say on a matter of such crucial importance—particularly as Northern Ireland voted to remain in the EU in the UK referendum of June 2016.

However, is such a referendum on Special Status desirable?

In a Special Issue in January 2017, this magazine took the view that, rather than relying on constitutional novelties, people in Northern Ireland should be allowed to experience the reality of separation from the EU—the 'hard border' in Ireland—before being asked to vote on Irish unity.

However, that is a cumbersome approach in the sense that Ireland—as the EU country with a land frontier with the UK—would be required to erect an expensive Border apparatus on the island, an infrastructure that would not be required if a majority in Northern Ireland decided to remain in Europe.

That said, however, Ireland will undoubtedly have to regulate an EU external Border with Britain, regardless of whether it falls across the island or in the middle of the Irish sea.

Some years ago Athol Books published *The Economics Of Partition*, which showed that Northern Ireland formed part of the British capitalist market and concluded that there was a corresponding political expression of that interest.

Things have changed a lot since then: the heavy industry which characterised the North, an industry for which the British market was an essential, has been decimated. The Northern Ireland economy is now tailored to the larger European market: agriculture springs to mind here, but there are also other areas. Undoubtedly any new edition of that book would see a very different picture.

The essential point remains that the people of Northern Ireland are entitled to vote on whether to remain in the EU—and thus leave the British polity. Such a vote may overlap the national division in the North but it also transcends it. Many European nationals have made their homes in Northern Ireland and there may be sections of the Protestant nationality which see their interests better served in Europe.

A Border Poll—as provided for under the Good Friday Agreement—should be held not long after the UK has formally left the EU.

While there may be diehard Unionist satisfaction at new barriers being erected against the Republic of Ireland, that emotion is matched by Nationalist anger—low-key at present, but bound to rise.

If an arrangement for this division to be measured by objective voting is not made now, there is likely to be civil unrest in connection with Brexit. Chris Hazzard, the Westminster Sinn Fein MP, has predicted that any attempt to impose a

continued on page 4

Casement Diaries: Archival Realities?

In the interest that your readers are correctly informed, I would like to bring the following to their attention.

In the May issue of *Irish Political Review* (Archival Realities) Mr. O'Sullivan refers to Casement's friend John Quinn of New York being shown a photographic facsimile of handwriting by Naval Attache Captain Gaunt [The relevant part of Tim O'Sullivan's letter is reproduced below, ed.]. Unfortunately, Mr. O'Sullivan has compounded the skilful confusion created by Sawyer, Reid and others. He states that Gaunt wrote to London on 22nd August quoting Quinn's authentication of the handwriting as Casement's. There is no evidence that Gaunt did this but, if indeed he did, he chose the wrong day; Quinn saw the photos on 23rd August in the presence of Maurice Leon, counsel to the French Embassy. Also present was Captain Gaunt who, according to O'Sullivan, had already foreseen and scripted Quinn's reaction the day before. It was therefore unnecessary for Quinn to see the photographs a second time on the 23rd and Gaunt was wasting everyone's time. Others cite this alleged event of 22nd but they attribute the showing to another Captain, one Walcott who is not mentioned by Quinn.

Several letters by Quinn dated 24th confirm the showing by Gaunt on the afternoon of 23rd. Indeed Quinn had written on 21st to Godkin that he intended to go to see the photographs "in a day or two". There is no record by Quinn that he was convinced by what he saw and his subsequent letters indicate considerable suspicion.

"I don't want to be quoted to anybody as vouching for the authenticity of the diary... I am going to put a handwriting expert on the photographic copies."

"... I am going to ask the Captain [Gaunt] to permit a handwriting expert... to look over the photographic copies" (Quinn letter to Spring-Rice, 24th August)

Mr. O'Sullivan uses selective framing to misinform by omission. What Quinn wrote on 9th September to Duffy was:

"...I was finally shown what purported to be photographic copies of his diary and the handwriting looked like his... the Naval Attache told me that he had received a peremptory cable from Gray [sic] under no circumstances to show the diary" (Quinn Papers, New York Public Library, pages 573,4).

Certainly the handwriting "looked like his" otherwise there was no point in showing it. In light of Quinn's continuing suspicion, the remarkable statement of explicit verification quoted by O'Sullivan, which Gaunt allegedly attributed to Quinn one day before he saw the photographs, must be fictional unless precognitive telepathy went awry.

One of the problems of investigating the Casement controversy is that of the reliability of sources of information. Both official and authorial sources are unreliable and logically so. The perplexity arises not only from Mr. O'Sullivan's acceptance of those unreliable sources but also from his repeated use of the same discredited rhetorical devices used by the unreliable authors.

Mr. O'Sullivan ends his letter with a trite "enough said" which is intended to endorse his conjectures, omissions, and misinformation. But his 'enough said' is a foreclosure device which betrays that his exposition will not bear scrutiny. This cliché short circuits reasoned argument and reveals that his deliberations about authenticity versus falsity of the diaries tend to favour the former while posing as the latter. *Complimenti.*

Paul R. Hyde

Extract from Tim O'Sullivan letter, May *Irish Political Review*:

"...a telegram to Washington naval attaché, Captain Gaunt, dated 29 June 1916 stated: "Photographic facsimile & transcript of Casement's diary of which you have, no doubt, already heard is being sent to America by today's mail..." (Foreign Office Archive: TNA FO 395/43)

After the execution, John Quinn, an Irish-American lawyer and friend of Casement, viewed the photographic facsimile at the Embassy. On August 22nd Gaunt wrote to London describing his reaction. He quoted Quinn: "I declare this to be the handwriting of the late Roger Casement" (Scotland Yard MEPO 2/10664). Quinn went on to write to Gavan Duffy (Casement's trial solicitor) describing how "the handwriting looked like" Casement's (National Library of Ireland MS 17603).

Editorial

continued

'Hard Border' across the island of Ireland will be met by civil disobedience. In response, Unionists point out that such a movement in 1969-70 led to armed struggle.

While a full-scale war about the EU/UK Border looks unlikely at this stage, there is no doubt that things could get messy if no avenue of political remedy is provided to those who are being subjected to the constitutional injustice—as they see it—of eight DUP MPs creating a Hard Border in Ireland.

*

The Irish Government came close to falling towards the end of November. There are those who see the hand of Britain behind this crisis. Taoiseach Varadkar intemperately threatened an Irish veto on progress to Phase Two of the Separation Talks between Michel Barnier's team and Britain when in fact it would be an EU veto.

The occasion of the crisis was the way political control was exerted—or failed to be exerted—over the way the Garda authorities conducted themselves. The Justice Department has featured before in Irish constitutional crises—notably the Arms Crisis of 1970. At that time the Department and Gardai had been penetrated by British security services and, while there were subsequent attempts to bring the security forces under political control, perhaps they have not been entirely successful.

Whether or not there was any external involvement in fanning the security crisis, there is no doubt it was welcomed by those who wanted to see the Irish side weakened in the Brexit negotiations. Ian Paisley MP expressed delight that Irish interests would not be mediated by a functional Government at the crucial December EU Summit which will decide whether Britain has successfully jumped the hurdle to the second stage of Brexit talks.

It has been pointed out that the gardai are civil servants of the State, rather than of the Government, and that therefore they must enjoy a greater degree of independence from political control. That said, it must be ensured that they do serve the democracy.

The problem of how the democracy exerts control over the 'repressive State apparatus' is not confined to Ireland. The nature of the security services is to be

repressive, even violent—not a pretty sight. But how else is order to be maintained?

The trick is to maintain the repressive element needed to curb anti-social elements while making the agents of repression amenable to political oversight by the elected representatives. This is still a work in progress in Ireland. Two Garda Commissioners and two Ministers of Justice have been forced to resign because they have failed to conduct policing in a satisfactory manner. It remains to be seen whether the new incumbents will be able to arrange matters in a better way.

As to the handling of this crisis, the Irish polity did not damage Irish interests in internecine warfare, as its opponents desired.

The general view appears to be that Taoiseach Varadkar has been diminished by his handling of the complaints against the way his Tanaiste, Frances Fitzgerald, conducted the Justice Department in the previous administration, while Fianna Fail and Sinn Fein have been strengthened.

Labour's Alan Kelly was the agent of bringing the matter to public attention by obtaining disclosures of internal Department of Justice documents which indicated acquiescence in a garda strategy to discredit Garda Sergeant Maurice McCabe because of his exposure of mismanagement of police affairs in the Cavan/Monaghan area—but it is hard to see Labour deriving much electoral advantage from this. (It has not been generally noticed that Monaghan was also the area in which British agents subverted some local police, as Col. Morgan pointed out in his *Dublin/Monaghan Bombings*.)

The Government has lost a Minister of Justice who appeared weak and mendacious. But the country has breathed a sigh of relief that it has not been faced with lame duck caretaker administrators in the Brexit negotiations or with a Christmas Election—a triumph for Irish democracy!

*

Sinn Fein has effected a leadership change. Gerry Adams will stand down from the Presidency and from the Dail at the next election.

The Irish chattering classes have long sought such a transition in the belief that a Southern-led SF will place less emphasis on the North.

But of course all that has changed with Brexit. From the North being an embarrassment, best forgotten, it is now back in the political arena. The constitutional imperatives have changed. And, in the new

situation, Sinn Fein is the Irish party which functions in both jurisdictions: there is no forgetting about the North now.

Up to now there has been an all-Ireland economy within the context of an all-EU economy. But there has been no all-Ireland political presence—outside of Sinn Fein.

If Irish Governments continue to call for an All-Ireland economy without a corresponding political dimension, they place themselves in the same position as Westminster—which rules the North undemocratically, having no political representation there.

The basic rule of social life is that politics has primacy over economics. Apart from Sinn Fein, there is no Irish politics in Northern Ireland.

*

"Anything that separates Northern Ireland from the rest of the United Kingdom, economically or politically, is something that we could not and will not bear": Nigel Dodds, leader of the Democratic Ulster Unionists at Westminster, said that. It is DUP policy. The DUP is the major political party in the Northern Ireland region of the United Kingdom only because the British political parties have refused to contest elections in it.

Since the Six Counties were made into Northern Ireland in 1921 there have been Welsh and Scottish MPs in plenty in United Kingdom Governments but never a Northern Ireland MP. There used to be MPs from the Six Counties in United Kingdom Governments before Northern Ireland was invented in 1921. The British political parties excluded the Six Counties from their sphere of operation when they concocted them into Northern Ireland.

Northern Ireland was separated from the political life of the United Kingdom when it was born. It has always been governed in essentials by the Whitehall Government but it has never had a representative in the Whitehall Government of the state as a whole. The Unionists agreed to operate a little subordinate government outside British party politics—the only kind of real politics that exists in Britain. Whitehall gave them a block grant to do it. What normal politics consists of for the most part is deciding how much money to raise by taxation and deciding how to spend it. That was never done in the Northern Ireland system. The taxing was always done by Westminster, as was most of the spending. The little things that the little Northern Ireland system did were financed by the Block Grant from Whitehall.

Northern Ireland is an alien element in British political life. It was designed for the purpose of making mischief in Ireland as a whole.

John Bruton—a former Taoiseach of the 26 County Free State that was made into an independent state by De Valera—appeared on Radio Ulster in mid-November. He warned that Brexit will undermine the Good Friday Agreement. He said that the purpose of the GFA was to provide a framework for a kind of British/Irish "identity". We don't doubt that that is what Mr. Bruton somehow managed to see in it. It is what his heart desires for Ireland as a whole. And, as an outside observer of Northern Ireland, he can see things in it which it is impossible to see from the inside.

We analysed the GFA when it was published and what we found was the opposite of a scheme to produce a confusion of "identities". What we saw was a framework to facilitate the separate development of the two peoples which have occupied Ulster ever since the Protestant Plantations/Immigrations of the 17th century. The pretence that these two peoples constituted a political "community", on which even a devolved government with little authority could be based, was discarded. The reality of two peoples was acknowledged, and the practice under which one governed the other was set aside.

Lord Trimble, the Unionist leader of the time, under duress applied to him by Tony Blair in his prime, did not openly reject this demotion of the status of the Unionist community, but, advised by the Official IRA (Lord Bew and Eoghan Harris), he dragged his heels over its implementation—fatally undermining both the SDLP and his own party in the process. It was eventually implemented by the DUP, when it was Paisley's party. And it has functioned as a framework for the separate development of the two peoples.

In fact, of course, the development has been one-sided. The GFA has served the nationalist community well. It was stunted under the old system, and was driven to

make war on it, and has flourished under the GFA. What the GFA required of the Unionist community was adjustment to loss of the status that it had enjoyed under the 1921 system. It had been foolish to agree to that system in the first place, but it did undoubtedly *enjoy* it while it lasted.

Paisley saw early on that the 1921 system was at the end of its tether. In the early 1970s he advocated a return of the Six Counties to the normal political system of the state—this was called "integration". He soon dropped Integration. Presumably he was authoritatively informed by sources in the deep state that Whitehall had a purpose for the Northern Ireland system that it would not be diverted from just because it happened to be causing war just then.

Soon after that we were informed from a Loyalist source that Paisley had told paramilitary leaders that a united Ireland was inevitable in the long run. It could be delayed but, when the point of no return came, it must not be resisted as in 1912.

A generation later he outmanoeuvred the despised "fur coat brigade" of the Unionist Party and put the GFA into effect with a good grace, presumably with a view to exerting British influence on the nationalist community in the process.

Some of Trimble's Ulster Unionists moved to the DUP for rejectionist reasons, others were attracted by Paisley's success in making the Agreement functional. They diluted its character. This, combined with an element of obdurate fundamentalism within the DUP, led to the ousting of Paisley. The present DUP is largely led by refugees from the UUP. In a Trimblist spirit it has brought an end to devolved government by a combination of administrative mismanagement and fundamentalist opposition to an Irish Language Act.

PS: As we go to print a book about Northern Ireland has been published by the diplomatic master-mind of a generation, Noel Dorr: *The Search For Peace In Northern Ireland: Sunningdale*. He does not manage to say what Northern Ireland is. He does not deny that it is an undemocratically governed region of the British state, but neither does he assert it. And, in an explanation of Partition, he writes:

"In Ireland, over time, two different senses of what I would call 'community identity', offering two opposed agendas for the future, crystallised out of the centuries long interaction between the two islands... What do I mean by 'community identity'? Something more

than religious difference..., though religion can play a part... The broader concept I have in mind is not easy to define. I am talking about the sense of relationship and community that develops among a particular population: a sense of continuity over time: a sense that they have a common history. Or, perhaps, it would be more correct to say that they have a shared narrative about the past, passed on from generation to generation"... (p11, *The Search For Peace In Northern Ireland, Sunningdale*, Royal Irish Academy, 2017).

So there were two somethings which the diplomat cannot quite find a name for. Two nations, perhaps!

Evasive circumlocution to ward off recognition of obvious and stubborn reality remains the mode of Dublin Establishment thought about the North.

Atlas Launch

continued

from the launch room and asked me "Why are you doing this?" I said I was giving out reviews of the book—what was wrong with that?

Philip McConway's review was clearly known to him and others, and they were really annoyed at it being brought to their attention. He held up Philip's review and asked why we were not doing something ourselves. I reminded that he also had a copy of our review in his hand, to which he seemed oblivious in his rage. He stormed off. This was a repetition of John's reaction to reviews of an earlier book of his in the *Irish Political Review* back in 2012 when I passed him in the street in Cork. He then promised/threatened to send us a response. But none came. Let's hope that this time he translates his anger into a response. But he is probably not keen to move out of the academic comfort zone into the real world.

The launch itself had well over a hundred present. When I sat down, I was approached by a burly gentleman man who introduced himself and checked who I was and ordered me again not to give out leaflets which I had already given up. I said I had got permission for those I had given out downstairs. He said 'Not from me and I'm in charge'.

The Deputy Ambassador opened the event. The superlatives started rolling and never stopped. The new President of University College Cork, Patrick O'Shea, spoke next in a similar vein. The

What Is A Nation? by Ernest Renan & Joseph Stalin. **£8, £6**
The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings, 1974, a military analysis, by John Morgan, Lt. Col (Retd.). **£20, £17.50**
The Economics Of Partition, A Historical Survey Of Ireland In Terms Of Political Economy by B. Clifford. **£10, £8**

superlatives were again many and varied. He was delighted that the volume was not only reviewed but editorialised about in the *Examiner* papers and had several laudatory items in the *Irish Times*. What higher praise could there be! He was particularly fulsome in his praise of all the illustrations, graphics etc. The highlight for him apparently was the fact that they contained a photo of a smiling de Valera (sniggering laughter). He did not seem to realise that this could be interpreted as having damned it with the faintest of faint praise.

Ken Loach, who launched the book, was also fulsome in his praise, it was magnificent, a true weighty tome. There had been a shared history with Britain but it was not a pleasant but a brutal one. It had been a conflict between the British ruling class and the Irish people. Not with the British people. But what Government of the British ruling class had ever paid any price for their approach to Ireland?

Ken's approach to this history is that of a morality play of good Irish people and good British people versus a bad British ruling class. It is lay preaching, like the pronouncements by so many on the Left on numerous other issues. However he did note that the title needed explaining, as there had not been a revolution in Ireland—he certainly knows more about revolutions than the Editors—but he hoped the book would contribute to a revolution in Ireland. Dream on, Ken!

It was reported that apparently all British publications approached, including the *BBC* and *The Guardian* refused to review the work.

Donal Ó Drisceoil followed. He told us that a ship with a reprint of 14,000 copies weighing 75 tons was at that moment sailing to Ireland from the Italian printers and all were already sold. Then he went from superlatives to fantasy, saying that this reminded him of the *Aud* sailing with another revolutionary cargo over a century ago. He noted that the story goes on and there will be debates as shown by the leaflets distributed earlier!

But there was no opportunity provided to continue the debate on this occasion. No discussion or contributions from the audience followed, as had been expected by many there.

I was going to ask a few questions. Did the 75 ton reprint take on board the errors highlighted by Philip McConway and rectify them? Could John Borgonovo provide actual evidence of the "*Republican intentions*" that would have caused fear among the Protestants *qua* Protestants of West Cork?

He must be familiar with all newspaper reports of the period, all books, memoirs, archives, the BMH witness statements, the pension statements etc. and it should be easy for him to produce it—if it exists.

If he knows the motives of the Bandon Valley killers, as he claims, he must know who they were. Who were they? If he cannot answer these questions satisfactorily, then he is feeding the sectarian thesis that is now pursued by members of the ranters and ravers club such as Eoghan Harris.

Despite all the sources available John probably lacks a vital source—personal knowledge of people who fought in the War of Independence—with a resulting lack of empathy with them and what they were. I grew up among them, they were my neighbours. They took on the Tans, the Auxies, the Regular Army and the most despised of all, the good Catholics in the RIC. If John's allegation was put to them I think that they would find them incomprehensible and, insofar as they could comprehend them, they would, quite rightly, consider them beneath contempt.

I have a suggestion to help him. The handsome figure that adorns the cover of the *Atlas* was one of those neighbours, Roger Kiely from Cullen, an Intelligence Officer with the Millstreet Battalion of the IRA—but he is not identified in the book. As he was chosen to '*front*' the book, the editors might have had the decency to say who he was. They might even have included the artist Sean Keating's opinion of him:

"Roger Kiely was about the best and finest man I ever knew. A few years ago I went to look for him in County Cork. I found him a poor school-teacher in a poor little school near Kanturk. I asked him about the others and found that death, poverty and America had claimed them—the Unknown Soldiers." (BMH *Witness Statement* 505).

But, instead of that generosity of spirit we have despicable, mean-spirited allegations by well-paid editors and professors who would not be fit to tie the shoelaces of such men.

Kiely's son, Der, is alive and well in Millstreet and is a renowned servant of the community—like his father. I suggest that Borgonovo takes his head out of the archives for a day and visit him and he will get some idea of what the War was really about. While there, he could drop in on another neighbour, Tom Meaney, the son of the local Battalion Commandant. He might come away a wiser man.

Jack Lane

Leaflet distributed at launch of *Atlas Of The Irish Revolution*, Irish Embassy, London, 16 November

Atlas Of The Irish Revolution!

WHAT REVOLUTION?

There was an Irish War of Independence. Ireland wanted to govern itself independently of England. It did not want to turn the world upside-down in pursuit of some wild vision. It just wanted to govern itself. That is what it voted for in the 1918 General Election. There would not even have been a War if England, which had just won the Great War for Democracy and the Self-Determination of Nations, had not made war on the elected Sinn Féin Government

For three generations the events of 1919-21 were known as the *War of Independence*. Then *Oxford University invented the Irish Revolution, and some Irish academics took the hint and prospered. It was entirely discreditable to England that it made war on a sober, democratically-mandated, independent Government in Ireland—but a wild Revolutionary turmoil: that would be something else!*

The late Peter Hart, a Canadian graduate of Trinity College, Dublin instructed by Australian Professor David Fitzpatrick, concocted a tale about an Irish revolutionary upheaval that became genocidal. It was immediately hailed as a classic by Emeritus Professor Roy Foster of Oxford University, and was given mass circulation around the world by Oxford University Press.

That story has now been discredited by serious academics. John Borgonovo, an Associate Editor of this *Atlas*, and a contributor to it, was once one of those serious academics. It is sad to see how he has declined since being adopted into the revisionist coterie that runs the History Department at University College, Cork, and disparages Cork's contribution to national development and to the War of Independence by being an apologist for Peter Hart's chicanery just as earnest academics in Ireland and Britain are unravelling Hart's concoctions and causing the tide to turn. (See the work of John M. Regan, University of Dundee.) Poor John has clambered aboard a sinking ship.

For example, he says that "*the Protestant population in parts of west Cork feared republican intentions. Sectarian and political tensions in that locale later featured in the controversial 'Bandon*

valley killings' of thirteen Cork Protestants in April 1922." (564). There is no evidence produced to establish that Protestants qua Protestants feared Republicans and the reference to the Bandon valley killings is a collection of weasel words equating 'sectarian and political tensions' as the motivation which is all that 'featured' can mean. If he believes this he must know who did it and why and be able to show us how exactly these two elements 'featured' in the episode. He should also include an explanation for the attempted killing of Catholics in the same episode.

However, in another piece on 'Suspected Informants in Munster' after listing the number and backgrounds of those executed he tells us that 'the selectivity of this list should be emphasised. For example, it did not reflect a blanket IRA suspicion of the unionist gentry, former policemen, or even of civilian contractors working for the RIC and military.' (570). If these groups, whom we can assume were sympathetic at least, - and some active supporters of the Crown forces in many ways - were not targets why should the Protestant community have been considered targets and have reason to fear 'Republican intentions'? As Borgonovo well knows it was Republicans led by Tom Barry and other leaders who physically protected Protestants during this exceptional episode but that is conveniently ignored by him when he has to genuflect to the Hart thesis.

The Irish Government of 1919-21 issued a regular publication, the *Irish Bulletin*, detailing events in the War which it circulated to Westminster politicians and to the world press. Those Bulletins were scattered in libraries around the world. The Aubane Historical Society has collected them, has published three volumes of them, with more to come, The Atlas includes a little chapter on the Bulletin. Other chapters have ample reference endnotes, but this one has none. The fact that there is a comprehensive collection of the Irish Bulletin currently available is concealed. The political bias is blatant.

This 'Atlas' is a vanity project. Cork University is awash with money and is looking for things to do with it. So it produces this flashy display literature that will not be influential because of its poverty of content, and will not be widely read because it is physically too heavy for anyone but a strong man to lift.

With regard to content, the Midland Tribune, in a long review, has shown what a slipshod piece of work it is in its dealing with Offaly. Its quality is certainly no better in its coverage of Cork. And its

grandiose title of Atlas is entirely unwarranted. Geographers have written some of the best history, but this Atlas is neither reliable geography nor history.

The introduction to this *Atlas* is headed with a quotation from Fr. Michael O'Flanagan in June 1916 "*Geography has worked hard to make one nation of Ireland; history has worked against it.*" It then goes on to claim that "Geography is not just some 'objective' counterpart to history, however, or even a mere backdrop to historical events and processes. It is often integral to them."

It goes on in this vein as if O'Flanagan was giving a geography lesson to the volunteers in 1916 and explains that the title of *Atlas of the Irish Revolution* for the book was chosen to deliberately highlight geography as being the crucial element in this history. Hence the need for the numerous and elaborate maps, tables, illustrations, etc.

Fr. O'Flanagan was a Vice President of Sinn Féin under President de Valera. His point was that, in the case of Ireland, the geographical condition of being an island did not shape the population into a corresponding nation. Fr. Flanagan was a two-nationist, who recognised the Ulster colony of the early 17th century had undergone a distinct national development of its own which did not fit in easily with the national development of the native population. Nothing of this will be found in the would-be *Atlas*.

The Northern Ireland dimension of the 'Irish Revolution' gave rise to a 28 year 'Long War' in recent times. It is sketchily dealt with in a chapter called *The Unionist Counter Revolution And The Invention Of Northern Ireland*. The Ulster Protestants were Counter-Revolutionaries because they just wanted to stay as they were within the British state. But the fact is that they did not invent the Northern Ireland system, which generated Protestant/Catholic antagonism from the start. That was done by Westminster. It was what led to the recent War. But it is important to the Editors that Westminster should not be held responsible for the things it was responsible for.

Regarding Cork: Peter Hart's thesis was that there was something about Cork which predisposed it towards "political violence", and towards religious genocide. There are echoes of this discredited thesis in Borgonovo's contribution.

He says that "*Cork did not support John Redmond's constitutional nationalism*". That might be true enough if Redmond's nationalism was constitutional. Redmond's nationalism was challenged

in Cork in the 1910 Elections by William O'Brien's All-For-Ireland League (AFIL). The AFIL took eight of the nine Cork seats away from Redmond. Its case was that Redmond had made the Home Rule movement into a Catholic Ascendancy movement by weaving the Ancient Order of Hibernians into the structure of the Home Rule Party; that his strategy of forcing through a Home Rule Bill at Westminster in tight alliance with the Liberal Party, which meant supporting the Liberals against the Tories on internal British issues, was driving Ireland towards Partition.

Redmond held Unionist Ulster in contempt. He relied on the British army to break its resistance to all-Ireland Home Rule. After the Curragh Mutiny of March 1914 he got an Army of his own by taking over command of the Irish Volunteers. Then, as the situation was ripening for Civil War, Britain joined the European War and made it a World War for the destruction of Germany and Turkey. Redmond committed the Home Rule Party to British Army recruitment for this Imperialist War in which there were 50,000 Irish casualties.

He enacted this reversal of the traditional nationalist view of Britain's wars without seeking an electoral mandate for it. And, when the 1910 electoral mandate of Parliament ran out, he agreed with the Liberals and Tories that elections should be suspended till the end of the War, with Parliament continuing as if elected.

It was Redmond's autocratic reversal of the Irish national view of British Imperial War that precipitated the Easter Rising. Redmond's Party was swept aside when Elections were eventually held in December 1918. The AFIL merged with the new Sinn Féin Party. The handful of Redmondites elected refused to attend the national Parliament that was mandated by the electorate.

John Borgonovo needs to learn a lot more about the history of Cork and acknowledge the unique contribution of William O'Brien and the AFIL to that history and have the courage to say so.

**Jack Lane, Aubane Historical Society,
9.11.2017 lane.jack@gmail.com**

Brief summary of some errors relating to County Offaly outlined in Dr. Philip McConway's review in the *Midland Tribune* of 26 October 2017 which have not been refuted by the authors concerned, despite an invitation to do so:

Dr Marie Coleman, 'War of Independence: Regional Perspectives' essay (pp. 579-587).

- Coleman incorrectly infers the Offaly IRA's first fatality from combat, Captain Patrick Seery, fought with the Westmeath IRA and died in that county (p.580).
- Coleman claims IRA GHQ was 'exasperated' with both Offaly brigades (p.580). The evidence reveals Richard Mulcahy, the IRA Chief of Staff, was frustrated with Sean Mahon, the South Offaly No. 2 Brigade commander. Mulcahy sought to demote Mahon following an unsuccessful attempt by the IRA to ambush a train carrying British Army troops in 1921. Coleman misrepresents this incident to disparage the entire Offaly IRA.
- Elsewhere, a biographical profile of Mulcahy mistakenly includes a photograph of Patrick Hogan (p.785).
- Disproportionate and distorted coverage is devoted to the Coolacree killings (pp.581-82).
- Noting the Coolacree incident proved 'controversial,' Coleman does not elaborate why or discuss RTÉ's well publicised deception. Why is RTÉ's discredited pseudo-documentary 'The Killings at Coolacree' cited as a source in a prestigious publication?
- Why does Coleman rehash the long demolished land grab canard (p.582)?
- Coleman erroneously alleges the IRA said the Pearsons stored Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) munitions in their home. No explanation or context is provided for the UVF reference (p.582).

Professor Terence Dooley, 'The Burning of Irish Country Houses, 1920-21' essay (pp. 447-53).

- Dooley falsely asserted Derrylahan House (misspelled 'Derryglahan' and 'Derrylahan') is in Offaly, rather than North Tipperary (p.449).
- Dooley's cited figure of sixteen Big Houses burned in Offaly from 1920-23 is inflated (p.449). Dr. McConway's verifiable figure is eleven.
- Dooley's speculative claim that 'there is no denying' an agrarian motive for the IRA's burning of E.J. Beaumont Nesbitt's mansion at Tubberdaly in Rhode is unproven (p.452). The corroborated motive was an IRA counter-reprisal for the executions of IRA prisoners in Portlaoise. Dooley is aware his speculative motive is contested. However, he decided to ignore conflicting evidence thereby misleading readers.

Maps

- Several maps in the *Atlas* display a flimsy grasp of the midlands geography. Kilbeggan, a key centre of the IRA's North Offaly Brigade operations, is misnamed 'Kilbrennan' in a map supposedly documenting IRA attacks on Crown forces in Leinster (p.583).
- A Civil War map, purporting to show the National Army's Athlone Command area in 1923, confuses Offaly (King's County) with Queen's County. The county name change dates to 1920. Walsh Island is mislocated. (p. 714).
- A map highlighting an IRA raid on the Grand Canal inaccurately notes Pollagh (Offaly) is in Nenagh (North Tipperary).
- A map on 'Locations of Na Fianna troops, 1909-22' contains a baffling reference to 'Cloone' (p.174).
- A map detailing the eighty-one Civil War 'official executions' by the Free State government, refers to two executions in Birr Castle and one execution in Birr town (p.737). In fact all three executions were in Birr Castle. The evidence indicates the victims were civilians, not IRA Volunteers.

IRISH BULLETIN
a reprint of the official daily
newspaper of Dail Eireann
Volumes 1-3
12 July 1919 - 1 January
1921
(1,597 pages)
Published by the Aubane
Historical Society
Order to: [https://](https://www.atholbooks-sales.org)
www.atholbooks-sales.org

Brexit

continued

RTE journalist in whose book the quotation appears.

Having been educated to turn away from the traditional preoccupations of Irish statecraft and to place their faith in the primacy of globalist economics, they have become apolitical. Having set their compass by the British worldview, they have been disorientated by the fault lines in that worldview that Brexit has exposed. To borrow a phrase from the Commission official: they are not *psychologically ready* for the political challenges that are being thrown up by Brexit.

Tony Connelly's book contains many such revealing statements from

anonymous and named sources and a wealth of information relevant to the Irish Brexit debate. Its faults reflect the prejudices of the Dublin elite and of RTE specifically, but it would be inaccurate and churlish to dismiss the book as propaganda. As an experienced news reporter Connelly, who has specialised in European affairs since 2001, performs a useful journalistic function and his book is a welcome source of reference.

Brexit and Ireland has a lot of telling omissions and, despite appearing to be a straightforward reporting of the facts, its narrative accords with the known prejudices of RTE. For that reason I will describe the shortcomings of the book before summarising its useful contents.

'IRELAND'S NEED TO STAY CLOSE TO BRITAIN'

In the fourth chapter, when Connelly is describing a meeting of the European Council that took place in Bratislava in September 2016, he states that Enda Kenny was "*already having to balance Ireland's need to stay close to Britain with loyalty to the other 26 member states*" (p. 65). Ireland's need to stay close to Britain is thus taken as a given, but why? It doesn't follow that a close trading relationship necessitates close political alignment. It doesn't follow that, because Brexit will create innumerable difficulties for Ireland, Taoiseach Enda Kenny was right to support David Cameron's campaign to reform the EU along Eurosceptic lines. It is not necessary to the Good Friday Agreement that Ireland should be a close ally of the UK on other matters.

This question of where Ireland should position itself in the confrontation between the UK and the EU is at the centre of the Irish Brexit debate, but for Connelly it doesn't even merit discussion. Yet as the Brexit story has unfolded it has become increasingly obvious that the negotiations are unequal, that most of the cards lie with the EU. From the start the politic course for this State was always to cultivate meaningful relations with the Brussels institutions and the other member states while maintaining a businesslike relationship with the UK.

We might prefer that the English Tories were less anti-Europe but that is a matter out of our control. Where vital Irish interests are affected these have needed to be brought to the attention of the relevant players on the EU side and this, as Connelly shows, has been happening. However, in the context of that critical relationship with the EU, the notion of a close Anglo-

Irish relationship that needs to be maintained has been a hindrance and an unnecessary complication. In essence it is ideological baggage from the campaign of anti-national revisionism that has been on the wane for some time.

HOUSE OF LORDS INTERVENTION

Connelly's account of how the British House of Lords investigated the effects of Brexit on Northern Ireland is fascinating but, being biased in favour of the close relationship with Britain, he cannot tell the full story. This is how he describes the Irish rejection, in December 2016, of the House of Lords report and the accompanying proposal that Ireland and the UK should conduct a bilateral agreement in advance of the Brexit negotiations:

"The rejection of the report's findings was as swift as it was brutal. Although he acknowledged the Committee's work, Michael Noonan, the Minister for Finance, said Ireland and Britain could not do deals 'on the side'. Enda Kenny, at an EU summit in Brussels four days later, said bluntly that a bilateral deal was 'not available in the context of Ireland being a member of the European Union negotiating team'. Dara Murphy, accompanying the Taoiseach to the summit, described the ideas as 'nonsensical' ..."(page 80).

But Connelly fails to ask the important question here: *why was Michael Noonan the Minister that set the running* on this issue? The politicians who were covering Brexit were the Taoiseach and his Minister for Foreign Affairs, Charlie Flanagan. It was unusual that Noonan should intervene on an important matter outside of his remit.

It might be argued that all three Ministers were members of the same Cabinet and that no great significance attached to Noonan's intervention, but that doesn't hold water. On an RTE radio talk show in January 2017 I heard a journalist from the *Irish Independent*, Declan Power, express outrage that Noonan had shot down the bilateral agreement after all the work that had been expended by the House of Lords Select Committee. Declan Power is generally sympathetic to the military interventions of the US and Britain and never misses an opportunity to speak warmly of '*our nearest neighbour*'.

The more likely explanation for Noonan's pre-emptive action is that he was keenly aware of the importance of maintaining EU solidarity at that time through his own experience of dealing with Brussels and that he considered

Kenny and Flanagan to be conflicted as between their loyalties to Britain and the EU. This episode shows that a question mark still hangs over some elements in Fine Gael in the matters of international alignment and excessive closeness to Britain.

DIVIDE AND CONQUER TACTICS

Connelly describes how the EU leadership was insistent that there should be '*no negotiation before notification*', meaning that no member state should have dealings with the UK until Article 50 was triggered and negotiations commenced. He recounts how there was a justifiable fear on the EU side that Britain would use '*divide and conquer*' tactics to undermine the cohesion of the EU-27. In the following paragraph he catches well the diplomatic power play that went on before the negotiations:

"It was not just officials who were under pressure not to get into anything that smacked of pre-negotiation. One senior Commission figure believes the paranoia about British tactics was not misplaced. 'The Brits were trying to get concessions from different people', she says. 'They were trying to get the Eastern European states to agree some kind of bilateral deal or understanding that would safeguard the interests of all British citizens in their member states, and vice versa. But they were rebuffed. The Brits were *furios* that there was a solid wall on no negotiation'" (Tony Connelly's emphasis p. 63).

While Connelly's pro-British leanings are clear, and this is shown where he describes the House of Lords investigation into Northern Ireland as a '*hopeful*' development, he also reports developments that support the opposite stance as shown in the above quotation, which is to his credit. However, comparing his account to the account of Brexit developments given in my *Irish Political Review* series of articles, I consider that Connelly has made a number of important omissions. Throughout the book he makes no reference either to Ray Basset's high profile interventions in favour of close relationship with Britain, or to the campaign launched by the *Sunday Business Post* in March 2017 to re-align Ireland with Britain rather than the EU. More important, he makes no mention of Mairead McGuinness's failure, in December 2016, to win the nomination of the European Peoples Party (EPP) for the Presidency of the European Parliament.

I have written about this a number of times because I consider it an important event which Anglophile Ireland would

like to pass unnoticed. McGuinness was considered the front runner for the nomination because she was popular and respected in the EPP but also because she was well regarded by the Greens in the Parliament, a grouping whose support was needed to win the Presidency. Manfred Weber, the EPP leader, let it be known that he thought the nomination should go to a woman. McGuinness's main opponent for the nomination was Antonio Fajani, a member of Berlusconi's party in Italy, not a party you would expect to be popular in the European Parliament. Reporting for the *Irish Times* Suzanne Lynch canvassed opinion among EPP MEPs and was told that McGuinness was highly regarded but that '*her nationality was against her*'. Being Irish she was considered too close to Britain. In the event Fajani won the nomination and the Presidency and, unlike his predecessor, Martin Schulz, has so far been rather anonymous in the position. That the EPP were right not to choose McGuinness was shown when in August this year (see the *Irish Times*, 21 August) she delivered a tub-thumping speech to the Fine Gael faithful defiantly declaring, "*We are not prepared to give up our trade with Britain*".

During the period of intense diplomacy from November 2016 through to the triggering of Article 50 and Theresa May's calling of snap election in Britain earlier this year, two letters from the *Irish Political Review Group* were published by the *Irish Times*. The first letter (5 December 2016) made the point that Ireland urgently needed to distance itself from Britain in the light of Brexit. The second (19 April 2017) criticised the leading Irish official with responsibility for Brexit matters, John Callinan, for publicly stating that he was unrepentant about Irish officials maintaining close links with their British counterparts, and warned of the danger that Ireland would be perceived in Europe as a proxy for the UK. Connelly's inside story of that time shows that both letters cut straight to the issues that were engaging the main participants behind the scenes.

INFORMATIVE CHAPTERS

Brexit and Ireland has three informative chapters on the Irish agrifood sector and an excellent chapter on the fishing industry. A chapter headed '*The great disruption*' describes problems that will need to be faced in the gas, electricity, horse racing and engineering sectors. A chapter headed '*An unpleasant sheet of water*' deals with the Common Travel Area without explaining its origin as a refusal on the UK side to fully recognise Irish sovereignty. '*Old*

habits of wariness' is an examination of the way Brexit may disrupt the Peace Process, and *'The unity play'* is an account of behind the scenes dealings of Irish officials not only regarding the Guidelines for the Brexit negotiations, but also for the text of Theresa May's letter triggering Article 50—a document with which the Irish Government should not have been involved.

The second last chapter covers opportunities that the British exit may offer for Ireland. It concludes by describing an Irish company, Crowley Carbon, which performed a drastic u-turn once the referendum result was announced. The company, which specialises in assisting large companies to reduce their energy consumption, ceased investing in the UK and changed from doing 70 per cent of its business in Britain to 15 per cent. In the process Crowley Carbon tripled in size and broke into markets in Poland, Croatia, Italy, Germany, France and Ukraine. Interesting snippets like that crop up throughout the book.

The topic of the final chapter, which was obviously completed at an early stage in the negotiations, is the Brexit talks process itself. Connelly concludes his work with a quotation in which an Irish Commission official muses over the possible effects of Brexit on Ireland over the next ten years.

"We need to be lucky twice. We need to be lucky in that the Brits *don't* go for a hard Brexit. And we need to be lucky in that the final settlement allows us to *breathe* inside whatever the EU is going to look like" (p. 344).

The above statement which may well be from the same official whose words are quoted at the start of this article epitomises the dread that Irish Anglophiles are feeling as they face the future. The pessimism is understandable; their worldview has collapsed.

THE PROBLEM OF RTE

Why has a clued in journalist like Tony Connelly chosen to side with the Anglophile view of Brexit when the wind has been blowing strongly in the opposite direction since early 2017? The answer is most likely related to the long standing corporate bias of RTE. Many of the station's leading broadcasters—Gay Byrne, John Bowman, Marian Finucane, Joe Duffy, Myles Dungan—are known supporters of the Anglicisation agenda. That so many of the top presenters hold similar pro-British views is almost certainly attributable to a policy orientation at the station. Tony Connelly's view of

Brexit reflects the RTE view and that has impaired his overall analysis.

The interesting aspect now is that Brexit is forcing the political class and the State machine to move rapidly towards a closer relationship with the EU and a more strained relationship with Britain, and various RTE personnel are finding it difficult to keep up with that. An insight into the problem was provided when Fianna Fail leader Micheál Martin recently reviewed David McCullagh's biography of de Valera. McCullagh is a presenter on the main current affairs programme on RTE television, *Prime Time*. In polite language Martin thrashed the criticism that McCullagh made of de Valera and, when Leo Varadkar spoke at the official launch of the book, he praised Martin's review. That is how the individual views of a broadcasting personality are treated in public life when a change in the political climate requires a shift in official thinking.

Over the next few years it will be interesting to observe how RTE as a corporate media entity adapts to the new political landscape that is being shaped by Brexit.

In 1996 the Irish language channel, TnaG was founded. Some time before that an attempt to bring RTE under tighter political control was defeated and legislation was passed recognising the independence of broadcast media. The up-shot of these events was that the traditional role of defending national culture was shunted off to TnaG and the RTE mainstream became wedded to the Anglicisation/revisionist/anti-republican agenda. It is possible that a diehard stance will now be taken in defence of that agenda. How will Irish democracy respond to such a development?

One way might be an increase in individual complaints against individual broadcasters made to RTE and to the Broadcasting Authority of Ireland (BAI). That approach would be both commendable and effective. There is also the avenue of focussing attention on the bodies responsible for broadcasting: the RTE Authority and the BAI [Broadcasting Authority of Ireland]. In any case it would be foolish of the powers-that-be in broadcasting to believe that the actual society they serve can be manipulated to suck up a political agenda that has passed its sell-by date.

To conclude this section: it is unfortunate that Tony Connelly's otherwise informative book has been marred through being an expression of the corporate RTE view. The subject deserves a more thoughtful treatment from a writer with a solid base in the Irish Establishment.

Dave Alvey

Just How Anti-Hitler Was Was The Wartime Prime Minister Of Northern Ireland?

J.M. Andrews (1871-1956) was Ulster Unionism's wartime Prime Minister of Northern Ireland, from November 1940 until May 1943. See <https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=e5Tlo5mv1I> for the British Pathé News feature, "Ulster's New Prime Minister" (1940), wherein Andrews proclaimed:

"Ulster is the key to the defence of Ireland. To make it neutral would mean handing over that key to Hitler. A neutral Ulster is impossible. We mean to stand by Britain and the Empire."

Stirring words, with an attack on the neutrality of the Southern State implicit as its sub-text. But how different from Hitler's thinking had been Andrews' own outlook during the 1930s? In an Address to this year's Desmond Greaves Summer School, on the theme of the relevance of the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Movement, Martin Mansergh shed light on how Andrews firmly believed in a "final solution" that would see the complete ethnic cleansing of the Catholic minority from Northern Ireland, Mansergh related:

"It is worth reflecting a little on the circumstances that created the need for a civil rights movement in Northern Ireland in the first place... The area included the maximum number of Ulster Protestants and Unionists, even in counties and large towns where they were in a minority, but nearly everywhere to a greater or lesser extent the population of the two communities was, if not interspersed, contiguous. As the Catholic community had a greater propensity to grow than the Protestant one, the political discretion of the government was used to sit on that, and, if possible, to incentivise Catholics to leave Northern Ireland. When my father (Nicholas Mansergh) was collecting material in 1936 for his book *The Government of Northern Ireland—A study in devolution*, he had the opportunity to interview in the Ulster Club J.M. Andrews, Minister of Labour and future Prime Minister of Northern Ireland, though only briefly, and the Attorney General Anthony Babington. According to his unpublished notes, 'both regarded diminishing no. of R.Cs with undisguised satisfaction. **Andrews confident that they would be "progressively eliminated"**—Babington hopeful, but a trifle anxious'." (My emphasis—MO'R).

So, the objective was that not even one 'sinner' of a 'Taig' would remain in Northern Ireland. It was only in the context of Britain's war with Germany that Andrews was in any way anti-Hitler. For it can hardly be maintained that there was any fundamental philosophical difference between the two regarding the *untersmenschen* nationality they each regarded as 'contaminating' the body politic they dreamed of and aimed for. A lifelong Orangeman, Andrews would also hold the positions of Grand Master of County Down from 1941, and Grand Master of Ireland (1948–1954). In 1949 he was appointed Imperial Grand Master of the Grand Orange Council of the World.

Manus O'Riordan

The O'Connor Column

FINE GAEL'S IMPRESSIVE BREXIT STAND

Watching the Coveney/Johnson press conference in Dublin on 17th November was a very heartening experience. The body language and self-assurance of Foreign Minister Simon Coveney showed he had more than the measure of Boris "Bonkers" Johnson, the political successor of Lord Palmerston.

Bertie Ahern, the long term Taoiseach who Micheál Martin's Fianna Fáil has refused re-admission to the party, had rightly said the previous evening that this is the Irish moment, its point of maximum leverage. While the other EU26 might be tempted to buckle on Ireland's interests to get a deal with the UK, the Stage 1 aspects of the agreement is subject to national veto, and thus the moment when the Border must be settled. Stage 2 (the "trade deal") is adopted by Qualified Majority Voting, and Irish leverage will be gone: "*We have power on our side to get as far as we can now. After it we have little power, but a lot of talk*" (IT 17.11.2017).

Coveney, while assuring Johnson that there were no two peoples on earth who enjoyed a warmer and more intimate relationship, blah blah, was emphatic that *There Will Be No Stage 2 talks until Stage 1 is Settled*.

He indicated that there will be a hard border between the EU and Britain because Britain is leaving the EU (if it actually does), but *That Border Will Not Be within Ireland*. This is all non-negotiable and, if Britain leaves, "special arrangements" for Northern Ireland will be required. The UK/EU border in Ireland, if British actions mean there is to be one, will be *in the Irish Sea*:—Mr. Johnson, Britain will not be allowed land responsibility for your border in Ireland on the Irish Government or on the EU.

All absolutely crystal clear, and very reassuring.

Taoiseach Varadkar met Premier May later the same day and announced in advance he would be saying exactly the same thing, with the implicit threat that Ireland will actually veto any Stage 1 settlement that allows for a hard border within Ireland (he was able to avoid the dreaded "v" word by publicly assuming that the EU26 can be counted on not to act against Ireland). Bottom line.

This journal was partial to Coveney in the Fine Gael party leadership race last year because he is solidly rooted in the Collins/Mulcahy tradition of that party, rather than the Redmondite/Imperial elements around which Kevin O'Higgins constructed much of Cumann na nGaedhal in the 1920s. All of this is substantially why Sticky ideologue and Micheál Martin advisor Eoghan Harris has been gunning against Coveney, and nearly succeeded in having him side-lined. In the leadership race. The modern folk had their way, and so we got the still unknown quantity that is Varadkar. So be it, but also so far so good: Varadkar and Coveney have been facing the Brexit challenge as a solid united front.

Northern Ireland can bring out the best and worst in Fine Gael. Brexit has brought out the best, following some initial wobbles (see Dave Alvey's reports in previous *Irish Political Reviews*). This unity is quite a turnaround from how that party was disabled and disoriented on what constituted the national interest by that old Collins/O'Higgins fault line throughout the decades of the Northern War. The new uncomplicated sense of national interest in Fine Gael has been heartening to witness, and shows that its first ever two-term run has finally moulded it into a natural party of government.

As the Dáil debate in advance of the Coveney/Johnson and Varadkar/May meetings showed, the position on Brexit they adopted—which it must be said was first enunciated by SF immediately after England had voted on Europe as it did—is now shared by FG, FF, SF and most of the Independents. Even 'the Left'—the Trotskyists and the 4% outfit still known as "*the Irish Labour Party*"—have fallen into line, though unconvincingly. The moral position of Sinn Féin has been massively strengthened by the the state adopting the position it advocated in the Brexit crisis.

Meanwhile in Europe the Prussian-Puritan German Social Democrats (a 20% party and declining) is trying to block Ireland paying down debt so as to punish it over 'Apple Tax' (or lack of it!). Merkel and the Christian Democrats, according to Derek Scally in *The Irish Times* (17.11), are having none of the SPD's populist anti-European trouble-making and are supporting Ireland's debt strategy, which is to dispose of loans borrowed at high interest and replace them with low-interest loans

now on offer elsewhere. European Christian Democracy (think Delors, Kohl etc.) has rarely let Ireland down.

Let's see the Irish Government now stick to its guns on Brexit. Luckily it doesn't have Labour in government with it to dilute the firm stand taken . . .

STEPHEN COLLINS' POPPYCOCK

The Taoiseach caused shock by appearing in the Dail wearing a "*shamrock poppy*", devised by the British Legion for the Irish. A defence of Varadkar's stunt was offered by Stephen Collins in *The Irish Times* (16 Nov.). His thesis is that this poppy wearing demonstrates "*the pluralist nature of modern Irishness*" as the "*Republic continues to embrace a European identity*".

It is difficult to conceive of a less European symbol than the poppy. It is an empire relic, worn in the white racial regions of the former Empire to bolster a common militarist culture. According to the British Legion itself, it honours all those who have fought in all British wars since 1914, and particularly in its two "*Great*" anti-Europe wars. There is no pretence of also honouring the enemy killed in those wars.

In this approach it departs fundamentally from what other European nations do on 11th November each year. On that date this year French President Macron and German President Steinmeier, neither wearing a poppy (it is an unknown symbol in Europe), embraced at one of the scenes of Great War carnage in a gesture of reconciliation between former enemies. Events in Belgium similarly involved the representatives of all nations who had once fought each other. In Britain, on the contrary, only the "*fallen*" of the British side are lamented: there is no lamenting the "*enemy*" dead and there is no thought that the British troops fell for anything other than the 'right' side in every conflict in which they were involved, from the Marne to Helmland. It is a carnival of defiant hostility to all enemies of all time and everywhere.

Collins' proposition that poppy-flaunting in Ireland is a sign of the Republic maturing into "*a European identity*" is perverse beyond words.

IS THERE EVEN "ONE JUST MAN"?

Sadaka (The Ireland-Palestine Alliance") held a "*High Level Forum*" in

Dublin on 28th November, just after we went to press. This proclaimed the core truth that, unless sustained international pressure is applied against Israel, it will continue its activities with impunity and there is no hope of a "two-state" or any other kind of "solution" emerging.

Irish political leaders cling to the notion of the necessity of a renewal of the interminable "*Middle East Peace Process*". This illusion is underpinned by reference to the Irish Peace Process. But in the latter the two sides (the British Government and the IRA) had relatively equal power (if the international leverage of the latter is included): and neither side could totally prevail militarily over the other on the ground. Hence the negotiated outcome. None of this balance of power exists with regard to Israel/Palestine, where one side is all-powerful and the other powerless, and Israel can exercise its power with impunity. No force—not the US, the EU or any other—is applying pressure to it to concede anything. The "Peace Process" in such a context cannot be a negotiation about anything, but merely a fig-leaf for Israel to continue its relentless colonisation of Palestine.

Among the speakers at the event were Mustafa Barghouti (independent member of the Palestinian Legislative Council and of the PLO Central Council), Mr. Daniel Levy (President of the US Middle East Project and former adviser to Israeli Prime Ministers) and Ms Rima Khalaf Hunaidi (former Deputy Prime Minister of Jordan). The speakers met with President Michael D. Higgins at the latter's invitation, and also with Foreign Minister Coveney, and addressed the Joint Oireachtas Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Is there One Just Man in the entire Irish political firmament who will stand up and state clearly what needs to be said: that the Mid-East Peace Process is a masquerade, and that without the application of tough sustained pressure on Israel, no progress will be made towards any solution other than a completion of the Zionist colonisation project.

MISSION TO PYONGYANG

Independent TD John Halligan, a Minister of State in the current Coalition, recently tried to organise a delegation to visit the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to talk with its Government. This was a bold initiative at a time when the President of the World was proposing its physical extermination, with some mild disapproval from his underling states. Halligan, who had once been a Sinn Féin the Workers Party Councillor and had visited North Korea, stood out on RTÉ as

a voice of reason on the realities of North Korean life and on the rationale for Kim's behaviour: DPRK was warning the US that it had no intention of getting the Libya treatment. Fellow "Independent Alliance" Ministers Finian McGrath and Shane Ross intended to join Halligan in his "peace initiative" if the Koreans agreed to meet them, and all indications were that they would.

The torrent of ridicule and denunciation that greeted Halligan's initiative from other politicians and media smart-asses was breath-taking. How pathetic, they chimed in unison, that a mere Irish Junior Minister should presume to undertake such a mission. Even the mandarins at Iveagh House, stretching their constitutional powers, 'let it be known' that they opposed the 'proper' role was tending to storm damage. Underlying all the hostility was a colonial cringe—foreign affairs and the ordering of the world were 'of course' purely a matter for our (Anglo-American) betters to tend to and the Irish must know their place in the order of things. It was particularly sad to see fellow Waterford TD, David Cullinane (SF), join in the hounding of Halligan.

But surely what we need is more of this type of thing, not less. Haven't Sinn Féin's own initiatives on Palestine, the Basques, the Catalans etc. not all had a substantial impact on opinion on these issues in Ireland?

Halligan's initiative was finally aborted when a story conveniently emerged that, during an interview for a Waterford County Council job, he had casually asked a woman interviewee if she was married. Having been painted into the Harvey Weinstein corner, Halligan had to relent, and abandon his Korea plan. Thus are affairs ordered at the so-called media/political 'interface' these days.

IRISH AMERICA

It is interesting to watch the role of Irish-America in the US Trumpian movement. There has been some comment on the wealth of Irish names appearing among activists of that movement. This is interpreted as demonstrating not a reorientation of Irish America, but its demise, absorbed into the great melting pot. This is nonsense—and it is not the first time that wishful thinking led senior figures in Ireland to prematurely declare the death of Irish America.

Two immigrant groups of the 19th-20th centuries stand out in America: the Irish and the Jews. Both have had a dramatic impact and have become influential organised elements in US politics.

Other large groups—whether Italians, Germans, Chinese or Russians—have left little trace. In the labour movement the Jews became dominant in its intellectual aspect while the Irish spearheaded the market muscle and organisation building element. Jews to this day dominate in the media, both liberal and conservative, Wall Street finance, and the Hollywood 'dream machine', the driving force of US State propaganda. The Irish are only peripherally present in Wall Street and in Hollywood (except as acting operatives) but are a significant group in big business (as was discovered during the Peace Process).

Trumpism, and what lies behind it, will doubtlessly morph into something else but it is also without doubt a defining anti-Establishment democratic movement of the current era. Whether its curbing by the Establishment will succeed remains to be seen. The Irish involvement in it is huge and indisputable. This must prompt the conclusion that it has a bright future. Jewish liberal intellectuals on the other hand form the cutting edge of the "left-wing" Bernie Sanders movement. Again this would suggest it too has a future. Trumpism and Sandersism are really two sides of the same coin, currently competing for the same voters—the working/middle class—with programmes which behind the rhetoric are substantially similar.

For the first time since the 1960s the black community has hardly featured in the current popular movement—it long ago tied its fortunes to the wagon of Democratic Party patronage, and is overwhelmingly Clinton-loyal and neutered as a result. Whether Trump/Sanders are antipodes or twins, or will morph into the same thing as a common large working/middle class rebellion remains to be seen. It is nevertheless interesting to note how the common Republican/Democrat Establishment (and its Irish media derivatives) is as appalled as much by the one as by the other.

But one thing is for sure, Irish America is alive and well and will stamp its imprint on whatever does emerge.

THE SECTARIAN EDGE OF O'TOOLE'S LATEST REVISIONIST THESIS

Fintan O'Toole, "European Press Prize Commentator Award" winner and Irish "Broadsheet Columnist of the Year", propagates a view that in Ireland everything went to wrack and ruin once the natives took over affairs. The final stage in the degradation came when the aborigines got their hands on the economy with, for O'Toole, predictable consequences. He gave full vent to all of this

in his bestseller *Ship of Fools: How Stupidity and Corruption Sank the Celtic Tiger* (2009). This depicted Ireland as a terminally corrupt, failed state. Indeed, that "failed state" label featured much in his commentaries in the 'newspaper of record' during the crisis years of 2008-12, undermining Ireland's efforts to get foreign loans at less than crucifying rates of interest. Thanks Fintan!

Following a brief period as tribune of the people, O'Toole went international with his outrage, from which point the gongs began to roll in. He has secured a lucrative platform for his views with the élite Clintonesque US liberal press. There he has obliged his new masters with a contribution to the State-sponsored anti-Russian witch-hunt, denouncing the susceptibility of western intellectuals to Russian intrigue and their "tendency to fantasise about Russia as the vigorous counterweight to a supposedly decadent West" (*New York Times*, 11.09.2017).

In a recent article in *The Irish Times* (24.10.17), entitled 'The corruption of Irish banking goes back 30 years', O'Toole used the far from clear-cut issue of tracker mortgages to take his Irish 'failed state' theory to a new level, opening a new front in the revisionist project. He dates "the culture of corruption" in Irish banking very specifically—to 1987. This cultural degrading, he argues, started when banks exploited the 1986 DIRT legislation (introducing "Deposit Interest Retention Tax") to create bogus non-resident status for depositors, "allowing the local farmer and shopkeeper and doctor to sign a form claiming to be resident outside the country and therefore exempt from Dirt":

"the Jesuit boys who filled the board-rooms and the executive suites of the banks decided that these frauds were just business. They eyed each other and thought: 'If we don't do this, the other crowd will.' A rot set in and it has never been stopped."

I don't know if "Jesuit boys" predominate over other groups in Irish banking leadership. But what O'Toole is really talking about is the native Catholic business class, whether Jesuit or otherwise formed. His article cleverly links the decadence of Irish banking with the project of the Irish state itself, whose founding event was the 1916 Rising, suggesting that, as 2017 is the "30th anniversary of the corruption of the Irish banking system", we should really have a parade to commemorate it too, as "it is, after all, living history, a part of what we are".

Having made this connection, O'Toole's claims that a good banking culture,

glorious in its morality and righteousness, was overthrown when the "rot set in" in 1987. That previous noble culture was personified in Mark Hely-Hutchinson, CEO of the Bank of Ireland:

"He was perhaps the last gentleman in Irish banking. He treated everyone who worked for him with dignity and respect. He could give a sincere Christian answer to the question of what he thought corporate government to be: 'I think that very simply, that corporate governance includes behaving to your customers and to your staff and to the public the way you would like other people to deal with you.'

The routing of that culture was epitomised in "the fate of one of the great lost documents of modern Ireland: Mark Hely-Hutchinson's abortive code of conduct for bankers". This "ethical charter for the industry" was rejected by the State as unworkable on the grounds that such a code could only work if accepted by all banks, which was unlikely in a cut-throat marketplace in which predatory foreign banks were already operating. O'Toole notes how the State, after failing to facilitate this voluntary "code of ethics", woke in 2008 to "an existential crisis generated by a banking system that had no moral compass, that knew no boundaries".

O'Toole's narrative paints the switch in Irish banking from the high-minded Hely-Hutchinsons to the low-principled "Jesuit boys" as a culminating act in the aboriginal usurpation that had begun in 1916. It's all hopeless now, he concludes, because our system "has no ethics":

"we'll do this again and again—frauds followed by vague wailing about 'culture', followed by more frauds... Now, the only code that will make a difference is the criminal code."

With this tirade, O'Toole is opening an interesting new revisionist front, nativising global capitalism's crisis into a purely local affair of aboriginal corruption. The deregulation and financialisation of global capitalism, as every child knows, began in the 1980s under Thatcher and Reagan, and was driven to an extreme of unregulated greed and money-making by the forces of Wall Street, the City of London, the US Federal Reserve and the Clintons in the 1990s. And woe betide any lesser country that failed to keep pace! But writing for *The New York Times*, O'Toole can't say any of this, things a former version of himself would have had no doubt about. No, the corruption of Irish banking has to be presented as a uniquely isolated, Irish aboriginal, affair.

Picking the year 1987 as the moment Ireland began its descent to the moral abyss has a purpose, as that was the year that most determined native of them all, C.J. Haughey, came to power and inaugurated an economic revolution in alliance with a new entrepreneurial class and the Trade Union leadership. O'Toole's pre-ference is that Ireland could have retained a noble banking system and yet still have participated in the globalising, deregulating world economy of the Clinton era—in the backwash of which he himself thrives these days. His myth of a unique Irish capitalist "corruption" requires an explanatory formula, and that is identifying the moment when high-minded "Hely-Hutchinsons" were replaced by the ethics-free "Jesuit boys", i.e. the Protestants by the Catholics. That, for O'Toole, was when all "ethics", all "boundaries", evaporated.

And what of his claims about pre-1987 Irish banking, in those halcyon days of the pre-"Jesuit boy" Hely-Hutchinsons?

The minuscule Protestant business class did very well in the Irish Free State, functioning as a closed, privileged circle with a lot of economic clout. Large industrial undertakings, to the extent that they existed at all (e.g. in brewing and distilling, bread, dairies, biscuits, manufacturing), and other institutions such as the pre-nationalised railways, the accountancy and insurance houses, Trinity College, *The Irish Times* and so forth, were not just mostly Protestant owned, but also had largely Protestant managements and supervisory staffs. Even the lower operative grades were generally recruited on a "Protestants-first", "ex-Servicemen second" and "Others third" basis. It was a "culture"—to use a favourite O'Toole term—that eventually had to give way for sheer want of numbers. All of this is well known, not least to O'Toole (though he operates a strict silence on it), and has begun reluctantly to be conceded in recent times. The essential references can be found in Niall Meehan's recent pamphlet, *Embers of Revisionism*.

O'Toole singles out the Bank of Ireland as the standard bearer of old world decency. That outfit—by far the largest bank in the country—certainly had an interesting culture, though not one O'Toole tells us about. Down to the late 1960s, it managed to remain largely Protestant. Its long-time Governor up to the Second World War had been Andrew Jameson, of the distilling family. A leading figure in the southern loyalist leadership, he had strong-headedly backed Bonar Law in rejecting any measure of Home Rule for Ireland. The tune

changed after 1914 when northern unionists opted for partition and a loyalist "Ulster", throwing southern unionists to the nationalist 'wolves'. A rethink was required.

The bank under Jameson had co-funded the southern unionist anti-Home Rule movement and even, covertly, the northern UVF rebellion. Now he mobilised it, first around Britain's last ditch "Irish Convention" of 1917, and later in grey-area activities on behalf of Lloyd George. At the height of the Tan War, Jameson organised a committee of Dublin unionist business leaders to contact the Dáil on behalf of Lloyd George to feel out possibilities for a 'deal' minimising the extent of separation from the Empire. Dev indulged Jameson but knew well to treat this outfit with suspicion. When the Collins-Griffith people finally signed the "Treaty", Jameson mobilised southern Unionism behind it and ensured, through the Bank, the solvency of the Treaty state and the bank-rolling of the Treaty War. Throughout the 1920s a shadowy committee of "former Unionist" financial people, headed by Jameson, continued to function, bank-rolling the "Cumann na nGaedhael" party against the Republican threat. This is all well documented history (by among others John Regan, *The Irish Counter Revolution*).

There are other problems with O'Toole's tall tale of the noble "values" of the Bank of Ireland. In 1983 Pádraic White, ceo of the IDA, set out the main impediments to industrial development. Prominent among these was the unproductive "rent-seeking" nature of Irish 'old' capital, especially the banks, which preferred investing in safe London Bonds and Papers than in capitalist development in Ireland (see 'A concept of industrial development in the 1980s', *JSSISI*, 1983, available online). There were those in the Bank of Ireland who understood this problem, not least Hely-Hutchinson himself. A Protestant and Freemason—essential prerequisites—he rose to leadership of the bank when it was still a Protestant closed shop. But it was he who then oversaw the dismantling of its sectarian recruitment system, letting in the "Jesuit boys".

What's more, and not entirely unrelated, he was a friend of Charles Haughey. Haughey pursued consistent goals over his career. One was a belief in Social Partnership to manage economic change through a societal consensus, as opposed to the confrontational path chosen by Garret FitzGerald. As Minister for Finance he had come very close to achieving such a "tripartite system" (as he called it) in

May 1970 when he was sacked from government after Lynch, acting under British pressure, purged his cabinet to change policy direction on the North. Back as Taoiseach in 1979-82 he revived his Social Partnership and, in the 1981 "National Understanding" which he agreed with the Unions, he provided for a central body to drive enterprise development—and it was to Mark Hely-Hutchinson that he turned to chair it.

The Fine Gael-Labour Government that replaced Haughey in 1982 dissolved all of this. When Haughey came back yet again, in 1987—O'Toole's *annus horribilis*—Social Partnership was finally put on an enduring footing. As part of this, local boards ("Area Partnerships") were set up

in poorer areas to build local capacity to combat long term unemployment. Haughey sought out strong personalities with the clout to prevail over vested interests to drive these boards. He got former IDA Chief Executive Pádraic White to lead the Dublin Northside Partnership and Mark Hely-Hutchinson to lead the Inner City one. The retired banker went on to fulfil that voluntary function as a much respected and authoritative figure for nearly a decade.

If O'Toole, through his sectarian mischief-making, wants to open a new front in his deprecation of the state, its history and all its works, maybe he ought to pick his heroes and villains with greater care.

Part 4

Revisionist Jamboree at Kilkenny Castle

It was now time for discussion moderator Fintan O'Toole to turn his attention to the audience. Wearing a smile, the evidence of some self-satisfaction, he remarked how it was "very strange" "in relation to the sexuality", the way it went through three phases. During the first Casement absolutely could not have been gay, being an Irish nationalist hero and martyr. In the second phase, he might have been homosexual, but was still a great man, in spite of it. (Some laughs from audience.) Now, in the third phase, he was a great man, because of his homosexuality.

INVITATION TO POSE QUESTIONS

He then began to present an invitation to the audience to pose questions for the panel. Before O'Toole had finished his sentence, a man, tall, lean and well into middle age, rose from near the front of the audience with his hand up. "O'Toole, I pray you sir, a dissenting voice..."

The man, this writer was later to learn, drove from County Kerry to observe and experience what the *Body of Evidence* event had to offer. He had felt compelled to intervene and express his dissent. From now on, in this piece, he will be referred to simply and aptly as 'the dissenter'.

O'Toole told him he was expected to ask a question. As the dissenter came level with the stage he accepted the microphone from O'Toole's hand. Now, just beside the stage he was sideways on to the audience and to the stage.

Eyeing the three panellists some number

of feet away from him, he remarked, a judgemental note in his voice: "I see there is no dissenting member on the panel".

"Dissenting of what?" inquired O'Toole, precision in his voice.

"Dissenting", said the man, pausing briefly to collect his thoughts, "the consensus that you are putting out here". Addressing the individual responsible for the series of events of which this one was part, he continued; "Mr O'Connor, sir, if you were hanged sir, your eyes would be dilated Every organ in your body would be dilated." Ó Conchúir, motionless, listened.

The physical symptoms, according to the dissenter's description, were not precisely accurate, but the insight that lay behind it was sound. The so-called autopsy report referred to time and time again in *The Casement Project*, actually a brief note of a few sentences, in the handwriting of the prison doctor, merely describes physical attributes one would expect to witness on a corpse following judicial execution by hanging. (See: *Getting Casement Backwards*, part 02, *Irish Political Review*, May 2017. See also: Ch. 18, *Knight's Forensic Pathology*, 3rd Ed. 2004.)

The man went on to challenge the emphasis on Casement's sexuality. He said his sexual habits "should be as irrelevant as his eating habits, his sleeping habits and his sense of self-regard". "Could you ask a question..." O'Toole, insistently demanded as he cut the man off before he got further than announcing the word "Casement"; the name announced

emphatically and with escalating force; the beginning of a new sentence the dissenter strived to form. An incoherent verbal tussle ensued between the two men.

ONE MINUTE TO MAKE POINT

O'Toole repeated that the man was supposed to ask a question. "*Could I have the floor, please, a dissenting voice, for three minutes?*" the man pleaded.

"*Give him a chance*" a male voice, its owner sounding as if he came from Dublin, interjected from the audience. Muttering emerged from around the hall.

O'Toole: "*... it is not fair to everybody else*".

The dissenter: "*You are afraid it will not be fair to you.*"

There were more mutterings from the audience.

The Dublin male voice again: "*Give him five minutes*".

O'Toole: "*You are here to ask an expert panel*".

The Dublin male voice from the audience, now louder and impatient: "*Sorry. Just—the point he's making is that if somebody is hanged their anus is going to be dilated. It is not a proof of homosexuality and he (Ó Conchúir) is foolish to take that stuff seriously!*"

Before the audience member had finished delivering himself of these words the verbal altercation broke out anew.

O'Toole: "*You cannot hijack the event*"

The dissenter: "*I can make my point in three minutes*"

O'Toole: "*.. very unfair to everybody else*"

The dissenter: "*You are afraid*"

O'Toole: "*I am afraid. I am afraid of egotism destroying it for everybody else...*"

The dissenter: "*What I am saying to you, Mr O'Toole..*"

O'Toole: "*I will give you one minute and you can ask the question when you are through...*"

"*Sit down, for God's sake*"—a woman called from the audience, a tone of exasperation.

In answer, there was vigorous sympathetic clapping. After the clapping some voices asked that the dissenter sit down, other voices, and they were fewer, asked that he be given a chance.

AUTHENTICITY PROVEN—FOSTER

There was an uneasy quiet. "*Mr O'Toole*" said the dissenter and then he paused. "*The Black Diaries are an allegation against Roger Casement. They have never been proven. They never can be authenticated because they would be a laughing stock*".

O'Toole, curtly and sharply: "*Okay,*

you've made your point"

The dissenter: "*That's not my point, I am not finished...*"

O'Toole: "*You are finished...*"

Roy Foster: "*I think the question of authenticity has been proven*"

Dublin male voice from audience: "*It hasn't, it hasn't.*"—Insistently.

The dissenter: "*Don't mislead...Don't mislead the people*"

Foster: "*Will you allow me to speak? Read the appendix of Séamas Ó Siocháin's*"

The dissenter: "*... we are ordinary people*"

Foster: "*Will you stop interrupting, me. Read the appendix in the best biography of Casement by O Siocháin. There is a close reading of the diaries and the cross referencing and the internal proof of consistencies ...*"

Foster went on to similarly endorse Jeffrey Dudgeon's biography.

The dissenter: "*How do you explain all the differences between the diary in Dublin ...*"

O'Toole, interrupting: "*This is not a dialogue between you and the panel. There are a lot of people here*"

Foster: "*If you do not understand what asking a question means, I am not going to bother*"

At these words from Foster the audience broke into supportive applause and the dissenter walked back to his seat.

SOME OBSERVATIONS

It is interesting that Foster justified authenticity in terms of the biographies by Ó Siocháin and Dudgeon and nothing more. However, in his book on the revolutionary generation, *Vivid Faces*, published in 2014, just two years before, Foster based his 'proof' for authenticity on a wider set of sources and gave purported forensic testing pride of place: "*The belief that the diaries thus used were forgeries... has not survived forensic examination, handwriting tests, analysis of possible interpolation and cross-checking of references with other sources about Casement's life*" (*Vivid Faces*, Pg 138, Foster, 2014)

Was it an article which appeared in the *History Ireland* edition for July/August 2016 which sparked this change of tack, so as to avoid awkward questions and embarrassment? The article called *Casement, Tried and Tested* by Paul Hyde, debunked (yet again) the Giles examination which writers such as Foster have turned to as a justification for their authenticity claims.

Foster's claim that the biographies by

Dudgeon and Ó Siocháin validate the authenticity contention is groundless. These works do not list what the arguments for forgery are much less construct counter arguments. They lack technical awareness in regard to how forgery could possibly have been effected. They merely irrelevantly point out various consistencies within the diaries and between the diaries and other sources regarding, persons, events, places and things, the fact of which nobody challenges, least of all forgery proponents.

DID CASEMENT HATE ENGLAND?

"*Would anybody like to actually ask a question?*" O'Toole asked the audience.

A man asked about how Casement's attitude to Britain changed from being that of a loyal servant of the Crown to one of hatred.

Foster explained that Casement came to hate "*British imperial power as it operated in the world*". He was upset by its hypocrisy and the way it had attempted to undermine his campaigns against human rights abuses. However, he had many English friends and felt comfortable in Britain. There was no Anglophobia; hatred of the English and of Britain as such. One can glean that from his letters, an edition of which is needed, "*as fascinating as the diaries are*".

But, did Foster realise just how "*fascinating*" the diaries could be? He had described to the questioner a picture of Casement's view of Britain which, in terms of the source material available, is well founded. But there is other source material pertinent to the question which he overlooked. It comes from what he had described earlier as "*a terrific psychological sourcebook*". It paints an altogether different picture.

There, in a diary entry for 20th July 1910 is summed up Casement's view of England and the English. "*Return to Sasana (England)—beastly Hole*".

The sentiment is mean, spiteful and uncultivated. It is at odds with the Casement we thought we knew from other evidence. It reveals the mind of a one dimensional pantomime villain.

Could it be this was introduced into an existing diary by the hand of a forger to create a negative picture of the sort of person Casement was?

FORGERY SIMPLY ASSUMED

A woman wished to learn more on "*how his ascent to sainthood came about ...*"

Ó Conchúir told how growing up he knew nothing of Casement and only really began to appreciate his significance from a conversation he had in 2010 in Spain with a woman who had read the Spanish language novelised biography by Mario

Vargas Llosa; *The Dream of the Celt*. Up to that time, Ó Conchúir admitted, regarding Casement "*I knew nothing*".

"Mr O'Connor, really, you still know nothing about him", offered the dissenter, from his seat in the audience.

O'Toole: "Sorry, would you please stop, please stop ... people did not come here to listen to you interrupting"

Foster gave the opinion that there was a rediscovery of Casement in the late 1960s and early 70s. Attention was drawn to him with the big biographies by Inglis and Reid. He put it down ultimately to the bones being repatriated in 1965.

Two final questions were accepted. The first came from a man with an English accent who wanted to know more about the attitude of De Valera and the Catholic Church to the sexuality question. The second question came from a woman who wondered about Casement's connection to the Irish Republican Brotherhood.

Foster referred to the close association between Casement and IRB figures such as Bulmer Hobson. He mentioned how there is a new awareness of the activities of people in the north such as Alice Milligan and Pat McCartan and how their activities fed into what transpired in 1916. He admitted he knew nothing of what De Valera personally thought of the diaries question. Neither did he know of the views of the Catholic Church on the matter. Regarding nationalist circles generally, the view that the diaries were forged was "*simply assumed*" as part of the work of "*perfidious Albion*". That meant there was no requirement on the part of nationalists to construct an analytical response to the challenge the diaries posed.

But, were all nationalists so hopelessly unreflective, as Foster alleges? Could it be there really was an analytical response, during the early 20th century? Denying its existence obviates the thorny problem of having to confront it on a rational level.

FINISHING UP

By way of concluding matters, O'Toole asked about further instalments of *The Casement Project* that were still to happen. Ó Conchúir referred to future productions of his *Butterflies and Bones* dance piece and a short film *I'm Roger Casement*, based on it, to be shown on RTE television the following November.

In the event it was not screened until mid-January, 2017.

O'Toole, concluding, referred to Casement as a historical persona with "*a sense of human connection, a sense of compassion, a sense of an Irish identity which is also morally connected to the rest of the world*".

ONLINE AFTERMATH

Three weeks later, writing online, (www.casementproject.ie), Ó Conchúir referred to *Body of Evidence* and what occurred. He wrote online that the dissenting audience member "*clearly disagreed that Casement was gay and that the 'Black' diaries are authentic*".

This reveals a grave lack of comprehension of the issues involved. It would have been possible for Casement to have been gay and at the same time for the diaries to be forgeries. Forgery of the Casement diaries, in the minds of its proponents, is, generally, not solidly bound up with any set and definite conception of Casement's sexuality. Why should it be?

It is simply false to claim that the dissenting audience member offered any view as to the sexual preferences or orientation of Casement.

Ó Conchúir went on to claim (26 Aug 2017) :

"He took exception to my description of the post-mortem examination of Casement that describes the dilation of his anus, pointing out that all our orifices would be dilated after a hanging. I don't disagree with him, and wasn't offering the post-mortem as proof of 'the practices to which it was alleged the prisoner in question had been addicted'. Instead, I was interested in the invasive treatment of Casement's body and in the subsequent discussion of that physical probing at the highest levels of British government."

But in his blog for 17th December 2015 he wrote:

"In Kew, there is the letter from the Dr Percy Mander, the duty prison medical officer at Pentonville Prison who examined Casement's body after his hanging to probe whether he could have had the sex he wrote about." (www.fearghus.net)

Thus the reason for the alleged examination is portrayed as one to establish if there was any evidence upon Casement's executed body which corroborated the sexual descriptions contained in the diaries. Clearly, Ó Conchúir, at that stage, believed the so called autopsy report provided some level of evidence for the diaries as authentic documents.

His more recent explanation for the constant referencing of the doctor's written note throughout *The Casement Project*, which he now accepts was medically purposeless, is unconvincing. As for his reference to "*The subsequent discussion of that physical probing at the highest levels of British government*". there is a problem; there is no evidence such a discussion ever took place. He appears to have confused the so called autopsy report

with an examination of copies of the diaries conducted by Harley Street psychiatrists which was passed on to the Government and discussed at Cabinet some time before the death sentence was carried out.

FURTHER REFLECTIONS

More than any other of the men executed by the British in 1916 opinion on Casement is sharply divided. This creates a challenge for those tasked with commemorating his legacy. The obvious way to meet such a challenge is to organise activities which embrace the diversity of voices. *The Casement Project* was the main means by which official commemoration of Casement was mediated during 2016. It is a sad fact that it failed grievously to reflect this diversity.

Given the particular outlook on Casement of the chief organiser, an outlook influenced by the likes of Prof Foster, the *doyen* of the so-called historical 'revisionists', nothing else could have been expected. His dance production and film reflected a 'creative' interpretation of one widely held view of whom and what Casement was. The production of *Butterflies and Bones* at what was understood as a family event on Banna strand, however, was highly insensitive and inappropriate.

No voice was given to a number of distinguished individuals who, working in Ireland and Britain, consider the Casement diaries to be forgeries. They could have made enlightening contributions to organised public discussions. But, such people, in terms of the discourse of *The Casement Project*, were sidelined. When we look at the panels of speakers at *Body of Evidence* and other *Casement Project* events we notice they are all proponents of the controversial diaries as valid documents. Thus the range of discussion was narrowed and its quality impoverished.

The complaint of the dissenting audience member from Kerry that there was a restrictive consensus in operation, as he observed of the *Body of Evidence* panel members before him, was well founded. Valid also was his complaint that there was an unnatural and unhealthy emphasis on Casement's sexuality in evidence. And, indeed, the *Casement Project* did not focus on Casement's published book, nor did it focus on his many articles written under pseudonyms.

The result was that he was reduced to a body rather than an individual with emotional, moral and spiritual dimensions.

The Casement Project left much to be desired.

The project received funding through the Department of Arts and Heritage, and the Arts Council.

Tim O'Sullivan

Series Concluded

HISTORY, REMEMBRANCE, AND CULTURE

Watching the "Poppy" remembrances in the UK, I was flicking through the UK News Channels and there on Sky News in the third week of October, I was amazed to see all the newscasters and *their guests* already wearing the Poppy. It really is happening earlier and earlier and there is something quite *creepy* about the whole thing.

It is one thing to see the 11th November and the whole Cenotaph ceremony with the Royals: Queen Elizabeth II and the royal ladies all in their deepest black mourning clothes closeted up in the balcony of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, and the Royal Princes, with their glitzy military uniforms bejewelled with medals, marching in slow step to lay their wreaths amidst the politicians and so many soldiers. All the TV Stations did a grab shot of the "ordinary people" observing the minute's silence throughout the Kingdoms—and whether it was coordinated or not (and I heavily suspect the former)—sure enough everyone seemed on message.

But there was something about the whole spectacle that seemed—to me—distinctly suspect. I hesitate to use the word "*fascist*" (so overused these days and almost never in its right context!) but honestly looking on from my own country—it simply gave me the shivers and, far from convincing me that all this was an expression of free will, the opposite seemed to be the case.

And getting the hapless German soccer team to wear the poppies actually had the *opposite effect* of historical reciprocation, if *that* was the intended outcome—but we all know too well it was most certainly not. What was very interesting to hear was the young German fans who were asked about the Poppy and they said it was something that was never worn in Europe but when told it "*represented remembrance of the war dead*", they were wholeheartedly *against* war and therefore thought it a good idea.

But they were certainly not "*the useful*"

idiots" the British took them for—because to a person they had no intention of importing that sort of thing home to Germany. And if the British thought they had pulled off a *coup* against the Germans there were many who saw through the whole shenanigans and felt all the more offended.

Brexit has—or so it seems to many—made the British lose their senses completely and with crises every second day it seems that May, Johnson, Hammond, Gove *et al* couldn't fight their way out of a paper bag and seem to think that these kind of *stunts* will give them some kind of credibility with their own people but I think that even *they* must surely see that this kind of stuff is unhelpful at the very least and totally unproductive at the very best!

But "*useful idiots*" are to be found never-the-less and they are in their nearest neighbours. The new progressive, liberal, pluralist Irish elite are all that Britain could ask for and more. They are the politicians, journalists, writers, academics *et al* who decry an old Ireland "*of a backward past of deValera and the Church*" and who now preach so loudly and insistently of a "*tolerant inclusive we*" that leaves the rest of us who do not see their "vision" very firmly out in the cold. The ousted Fine Gael Minister of Justice and Defence Alan Shatter in his combative departure used a phrase that has taken on new life here in the Republic. He viewed his dismissal as having a "*chilling effect*" on democracy itself. (That is so typically Alan Shatter—never knowingly to *underestimate* himself—God forbid!)

That phrase has taken on a new lease of life and now if anyone dissents from the *given narrative* of our new elite, we are all howled down as having a "*chilling effect*" on society, democracy, justice, or whatever you are having yourself.

Mostly the phrase is used to kill debate and it does its job very effectively. Try being pro-life and you are so "*chilled*" that your voice is effectively closed down and you are howled out of all "*rational debate*".

The whole point of course is that rationality itself is driven out, and all attempts to counter this very worrying trend are treated with such howls of rage, ugly name calling, appalling language, and mob-like behaviour so that one is in the end usually "*silenced*". Unless of course one is very brave and there are still some of these people left and truly thus—does our democracy benefit!

One need only look on at the UK where the great feminist writer Germaine Greer

was "*silenced*" and not allowed speak at an Oxford University debate about transgender issues. And it was women who were to the fore in her 'silencing'. In the US—there are unparalleled numbers of people being 'silenced' and the incredible thing is that most of them are Trumpian/Christian/Conservative (not all of these are necessary the same) voices who are reviled by a liberal Clintonite elite who now have a new term for ordinary white Americans; they are "*white nationalists*". And the fact is—that these are for the most part poor, badly educated people who have been treated abominably by their political masters and who have been denied by *their* globalists overlords even the basics of a decent job/wage not to mention health, education, housing.

For the coastal elites—these people are a joke—literally. Listen to any Hollywood/Music super-star and they express their outrage that they are living in a country with such "*red-necks*", "*in-breds*", "*racists*" etc., but some of these (and isn't it funny that they are usually the most vocal about African poverty?) are the very same people who have been named as tax-cheats in either the Panama Papers or the more recent Paradise/Parasite Papers. Representatives for Madonna, Bono, and others who were caught, immediately released Press Statements to the effect that it was "*their* accountants/tax experts" who were responsible while they were in the dark!! As the young today say "*yeah whatever!*"

Going back to the "*useful idiots*" that we have in Ireland for Britain's "*glorious war-dead*", now we can add our Taoiseach, Leo Varadkar, Fine Gael, who felt it was appropriate to go into our Dáil wearing a 'Poppy' embedded in a Shamrock (really!) to show how much "we have matured". But did anyone see any British politician wearing the Easter Lilly to show their maturity? Of course saying that—did ye see that many Irish politicians—other than Sinn Féin—wearing that symbol of Irish freedom—even in these years of commemoration? And there is Leo, whose bi-racial background saw his parents—Indian doctor dad, Irish nurse Mam—meeting in the UK where their first daughter was born, going back to India and finally coming back to Ireland where their only son was born.

Leo was educated in 'The King's Hospital School', a very pricey Church of Ireland establishment founded in 1669. Then he went onto Trinity College Dublin (where else?), where he studied Law before

switching to Medicine. What I found interesting is that, in a recent speech in the Dáil, he employed the revisionist term used by Roy Foster *et al* to name-call Sinn Féin as meaning "*Ourselves Alone*", which made me wonder had he any knowledge of either the Irish language or our history? Even with the most rudimentary knowledge of our language—anyone can translate Sinn Féin as meaning "*We ourselves*": so why would our Taoiseach be so linguistically ignorant? Or was it just another opportunistic political ploy to try and demean the only significant all-Ireland Party?

If any of my readers have a moment—take a look at the Wikipedia page on 'The King's Hospital School' and be informed of its history. (And, incidentally the, for them, low lying status on the current league table of school performance, in which Cork's Presentation College is the top all out performer!)

But where Leo is helping to forge a newer, glossier, maturer "*us*", I was amazed to read in our own *Evening Echo* here in Cork 11th November, 2017 that the World War 1 Memorial in South Mall—almost beside the Electric Restaurant—has now been quietly renamed '*The Heroes Column*'. We were informed that wreaths will be laid by the Defence Forces, The Royal Munster Fusileers, the Western Front, the Royal British Legion and others.

What is very noticeable is how the lovely memorial to the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, a fine slab of simple granite, which was right by the roadside, then disappeared into the earth—where it was literally entombed by Cork City Council. But, due to the outcry of the public, it was somewhat re-instated. Now it is only to be seen at the back of the site—making it as insignificant as possible. This was erected by the people of Cork in 1984 and it was a true monument to the indiscriminate slaughter of hundreds of thousands of people. Such a monument held the eye for a long moment of true reflection on the horrors of war.

Now with 'The Heroes Column' wreathed with "Poppies" there is a very different ambience to the whole area and what one feels is not the loss and grief of war but instead its *insidious glorification*.

And what now of our National Monument, which is situated not that far from the World War 1 *memorial*? It truly is a magnificent limestone monument and was unveiled by the Cork Young Ireland

Society in 1906. Underneath an aesthetical, pleasing, copula, there is a magnificent statue of Cathleen Ní Houlahán (Ireland) with a Celtic Cross underneath her arm and, lying against her, the Harp; and then, on the next tier of the monument, are the four heroic figures of Tone, Davis, Dwyer (left arm after falling off or some act of vandalism), and O'Neill Crowley with the dates below them: 1798, 1803, 1848 and 1863.

After several requests by the citizens of Cork, Cork City Council cleaned up the detritus and litter that surrounded the monument for the centenary celebrations, but they refused to consider further refurbishment, including the very necessary proper cleaning of the limestone itself. Yet the City Councillors had no problem with giving our taxpayer's money to the tune of €20,000 to the British Legion's World War 1 memorial.

We asked for *parity* and were parodied ourselves as being fixated on "*old history*". It seems that the Fenian dead are indeed dead and gone contrary to Pádraig Pearse's assertion!

And our State has even outsourced the '*Irish University Review*', a copy of which this morning was delivered to our door, courtesy of the Royal Mail. Edinburgh University now produces it, but I can certainly say without fear of contradiction that it is still our tax-payers who pay for it. Our State makes sure of that, but doesn't take control of the content which is so much to Britain's favour that all the revisionist heavy hitters make huge efforts to get their material into it. And we all know that what is to Britain's favour is to Ireland's disfavour so the question has to be asked *Qui Bono?* And equally important—why does our State allow this kind of thing to continue?

What interested me about reading up on Leo Varadkar was that he was "*selected*" for the '*Washington Ireland Program*' (American spelling) which "*prepares ambitious young people for future leadership roles*". Even looking at the Wikipedia page of this secretive program, there is no mention whatsoever of who pays for the six-month internship of those chosen but it does say that they have "*received support*" from the Irish, UK and US Governments—but I can see George Soros's hand behind the puppeteers. And while the fake media goes on about Russian interference, nobody questions British or American real interference.

Julianne Herlihy ©

November Brexit developments

A proposal arising from close consultations between Michel Barnier's Task Force and the Irish Government that the effective border between Ireland and the UK should be delineated by the Irish Sea represents the main recent development in the Brexit negotiations. This is discussed in some detail below.

Other key developments in November include decisions regarding the destination cities for the European Medicines Authority (EMA) and the European Banking Authority (EBA), the continuing progress through the British House of Commons of the EU Withdrawal Bill, and the collapse of the talks on the formation of the next German Government. The EMA will move to Amsterdam, the EBA to Paris. While some Tory rebels have objected to the inclusion in the Withdrawal Bill of a precise date when Brexit will come into force, the Westminster Government has responded by proposing a Withdrawal Agreement and Implementation Bill which would facilitate changes to the schedule and arrangements about a transition period. The political crisis in Germany will impinge on the Brexit talks by reducing German involvement over the next few months, a time which may turn out to be critical.

ESCALATION OF IRISH BORDER AS ISSUE IN THE NEGOTIATIONS

On 15th October, at the conclusion of the European summit of that date, in response to British assertions about the need to avoid the return of a hard Border in Ireland, Michel Barnier promised to provide '*further refinement*' of six Guiding Principles on Ireland. These were described in a Guiding Principles document, published by the EU on 6th September, which was a response to a UK paper of August 14th which talked vaguely about an undefined customs '*arrangement*'.

In the Guiding Principles document it was stated that, "*Border issues are broader than economic questions*". Then on November 8th a new Working Paper on Ireland from the Barnier Task Force was circulated which spelled out in greater detail how areas of North-South co-operation, "*as provided by the Good Friday Agreement (GFA)*" would be adversely affected by Brexit. The paper clearly identified Brexit as a threat to the GFA.

Seven priority areas recognised by the North/South Ministerial Council at its last meeting in November 2016 covered areas

like environment, health, agriculture, transport, education/higher education, tourism, energy, telecommunications, broadcasting, inland fisheries, justice and security, and sport, were examined by Task Force officials. In line with a technical mapping exercise that had been agreed early on in the talks process, the areas of North-South co-operation were further broken down into 142 areas. In a long report published on the RTE website Tony Connelly states:

"It was becoming clear that, as they waded through all 142 areas in detail, officials on both sides were discovering more and more areas of North South activity that were touched by EU law."

Connelly considers 'crucial' the manner in which EU responsibility for cross border co-operation in Ireland was divided in the Working Paper into two areas: economic integration and support for the GFA. He drives home the point by quoting the final paragraph from the Working Paper as follows:

"It consequently seems essential for the UK to commit to ensuring that a hard border on the island of Ireland is avoided, including by ensuring no emergence of regulatory divergence from those rules of the internal market and the Customs Union which are (or may be in the future) necessary for meaningful North South cooperation, the all-island economy and the protection of the Good Friday Agreement."

Responses to the Working Paper from British and Ulster Unionist sources have been predictably hostile. Writing in the *English Telegraph*, columnist Ruth Dudley Edwards stated:

"But now we learn from a leaked Commission paper that, far from allowing the parking of more intractable issues, Ireland would exploit Britain's difficulties by blocking access to the second stage of negotiations to 'exert maximum leverage' (as one EU source put it). It would demand that that the UK either stay in the customs union (which it has ruled out) or give Northern Ireland special status, which unionists would reject as a staging post to a united Ireland" (*Telegraph* 3.10.17).

GOVERNMENT SHOULD 'HOLD THE LINE'

South of the Border, opposition has come from former Minister for Justice Alan Shatter in the form of a letter to the *Irish Times*. In the letter (21 November), which was headed, 'Brexit—Government must tread carefully', Shatter argued that it was time to recognise that Irish concerns about the Border could only be definitively addressed in tandem with a trade deal between the two negotiating teams, and

that Irish opinion should not lose sight of "the importance that Northern unionists attach to their British identity". This argument was answered the following day by a John Naughton of Leopardstown, Dublin 18, who advised the Taoiseach and Minister for Foreign Affairs to 'hold the line' on the grounds that failure to agree a solution regarding the Border in phase 1 of the talks would risk relegating the issue to a 'bargaining-chip status' in the wider trade talks in phase 2.

Neither of the correspondents chose to focus attention on the underlying threat to the GFA that the Working Paper highlighted, but Mr Naughton at least understood that a Government climb-down in response to UK pressure at this stage would send the wrong signal. Conceding to British pressure on this issue would represent a betrayal of the million people living in Border areas whose vital interests are affected.

In describing the lower status that the issue of the Border would receive in phase 2 Naughton referred rhetorically to the two teams of negotiators as 'the Brussels bureaucrats and the mandarins of Perfidious Albion'. In the context of recent developments a disparaging reference to EU officials is misplaced. The particular team of Brussels bureaucrats that produced the Working Paper on Ireland have shown a commitment equal to, if not greater than, that of the Government to defending the gains of the Northern Peace Process.

Still, regardless of the threat of a complete breakdown in the negotiations or of a DUP-induced UK General Election, responsibilities that both lie firmly with the UK side, John Naughton's message of support to the Government, 'hold the line', represents the best advice that can be offered in current circumstances.

Dave Alvey

Review, Part 4

Vincent Morley, Lords and Poets

There's an idea around that the rulers of Gaelic Ireland were peculiarly oppressive and cruel to the lower-class population. Also, there's an idea that the Gaelic poets were extreme snobs, hirelings and flatterers of the lords, who never stood for anything larger than the lord's interest. I think both these ideas are wrong. All I can do here is throw out a few thoughts at random, to conclude what I've had to say about *The Popular Mind in Eighteenth-century Ireland* by Vincent Morley.

Until the French Revolution it was generally assumed throughout Europe that society should be and would be led by an aristocracy. This was the assumption in Britain, France, Spain and Germany, as well as Gaelic Ireland. When a poet like Dáibhí Ó Bruadair, making poetry a century before the French Revolution, speaks up for the native aristocracy, he's just being normal. A politically aware person elsewhere in Europe, in anything like a similar situation, would surely have done the same.

The Jacobite War of 1689-91 was the last great political and military effort of the remaining Gaelic and Gaelic-Norman lords. To increase the strength of resistance to the Williamite invaders, a decision was made to arm the masses. Or, at least, to encourage the masses to turn out with home-made weapons. This move was acknowledged by Ó Bruadair in one of his poems. He accepts that such people must come up in the social scale: they too deserve to figure among the winners

after a successful conclusion of the war.

The appeal to the masses seems not to have turned out well. It appears the irregular forces were very undisciplined and behaved destructively. However, the significant point is that this move was actually made and that Ó Bruadair accepted it. In his later poems he is trying to deal with all that has since happened. He defends the decision of the lords to make a treaty and go abroad, and in reasoned statements he criticises the irregulars or rapparees. To wastefully slaughter huge numbers of cattle; to plunder many poor people who were supporters of the cause—how could this possibly bring good results?

Ó Bruadair's response was ignorantly distorted by Sean O'Faoláin in the first chapter of his biography of Daniel O'Connell, *King of the Beggars*. It would be good if some fair-minded person took up this theme again and set out what can reasonably be said for Ó Bruadair and against him.

Anyhow, Ó Bruadair was a highly trained *file*, the most gifted of his time. In his openness to popular movements and sensitivity to popular conditions he might be seen as a transitional figure, connecting the older professional poets with those 18th century poets whom Morley writes about. (One should note that the latter also, the great majority if not all of them, still saw merit in a native aristocracy—as did most people throughout the length and breadth of Europe. For this they are subjected to Sean O'Faoláin's demagogic scorn.)

THE PROFESSIONAL POETS

The older poets certainly had grander airs. But even they were not really the monsters of snobbery that O'Faoláin and Frank O'Connor liked to claim.

A top-class poet would expect to be highly paid and respected. But it seems that such a poet went around with a group of artists and performers, some of them anything but grand and snobbish—for example, the professional gamblers called *cearrbhaigh*, or the *meirdrighe* (usually translated as prostitutes, but I think they had some kind of striptease act). The lower-order artists were part of a fraternity, and they had some protection. And the top ranks of poetry had a certain intake of ideas, themes, literary forms, and even personnel from the ranks below them.

As I mentioned in last month's article, formally a top-class poet was required to be the son and grandson of top-class poets. In practice, new names keep appearing in the record over time. Even the surnames of some elite families indicate descent from lower-class poets: Mac an Bhaird, Ón Cháinte.

The *croisín* were very disrespectful poets, and in some of the ancient laws they are even called diabolic. But in the course of time their type of performance, *croisántacht*, was taken into the elite poets' repertoire. In reconstructed form it consisted of passages of verse in a very graceful regular metre with elaborate harmonies. Between those verse sections there were passages of a kind of comedy, where the poet cracked jokes and told provocative stories.

Similarly, the metre called *droighneach* ("briary metre"), which was associated with lower-class poets, was worked up to produce a virtuoso poem with breath-taking rhymes. And eventually the same thing happened to the most popular of all the forms of poetry, the *amhrán* or song.

In the *Book of Magauran*, the earliest surviving family poem-book, there's a 14th century poem which begins with complaints about the current fashion for *amhrán* amongst the nobility. This leaves "*the true poet*" in difficulty, with the inferior article being preferred to his high-class work.

"Amhrán has got rid of profit and art; the amhrán of women and labourers has drained colour from true poetry.

Only princes who hoard their wealth and give no time to their pleasures find more charm in the peddlers of mean amhrán and in shapeless crooked poetry."

The poet points out that for payment it's enough to give the *amhrán*-makers their dinner. Unlike the true poet, they're not looking for cattle or gold. The sad result is that "*all the sweet poets are being*

overwhelmed".

From this we gather that the lower orders too could get poetry to their tastes ("*the amhrán of women and labourers*"). Not just that, but at the time when this poem was composed the lower-class taste had spread to the higher class. The poet puts it all down to economy, but one suspects there was more to it than that.

Two centuries later the same problem arose again. This time round the elite poets decided they couldn't beat the *amhrán*-makers and proceeded to join them. In the late 16th century Tadhg Dall Ó hUigín and other masters produced highly artistic versions of some of the *amhrán* forms, and these "*art song*" types remained in currency for the next two centuries. Simpler or rougher types of *amhrán* were also being made, of course, but down to the time of Seán Ó Tuama and beyond him to Eoghan Ruadh, there were artists who kept an upward pressure on standards by insisting on making the best.

THE GAELIC LORDS

Much has been written in denigration of the Gaelic lords. I would simply say that, if they really were as bad as they've been painted, it's remarkable that the English had to make such a long and costly effort to get rid of them and, having got rid of them, that they weren't able to replace them with any system able to win popular acceptance.

One way of thinking about Ireland sees it as *Hibernia Anglicana*, "English Ireland" (the title of a book by the great Ascendancy historian Richard Cox, which appeared in 1689-90). Cox's argument was that Ireland only begins to amount to anything when the English take it in hand. A later work in the same vein was *Ireland Under the Normans* by Goddard Henry Orpen. Orpen was a very energetic researcher (even allowing for the fact that his wealthy wife relieved him of the need to work) and a masterly writer—if you ignore the footnotes, the four volumes of *Ireland Under* can be read almost like a novel. He ends his narrative in the early 14th century, at a moment of failure: that is when English monarchical order begins to lose out to "*Celtic tribalism*", which will eventually have to be suppressed by the Elizabethans.

But all of this has an artificially narrowed context. The fact is, fragmentation of power did not make Ireland unique in Europe. Contemporary Germany was a similar patchwork of principalities, except that these were not partly products of a recent conquest. There would be as much justification for referring to "*Teutonic tribalism*", but so far as I know this is never done.

One has to try to see things as a reasonable person within the Gaelic culture would have seen them at that time. For example, there's a substantial work of history from the 1350s, the *Caithréim Thoirdhealbhaigh*, which begins by noting that the English invasion of 1169 was a disaster for Gaelic Ireland. Politically, whatever had been developing was vivisected. Afterwards there was inescapable complication.

How would a reasonable Gael have viewed the state of things about 1350?

I think he was easily able to imagine a simplification and a more coherent Ireland, while knowing there was no quick way to achieve that. Given the fragmentation wrought by the invasion, it followed that the shaping of Irish power would be a slow process. Many years might be required; it would take patience and perseverance. (This, I believe, was the view of the poets, who were primary agents in giving the Anglo-Norman lords a new culture and a sense of new prospects.)

A generation ago Katharine Simms published *From Kings to Warlords*, her description of how the rulers of Gaelic Ireland allegedly changed their political natures. In this context she ignored the Anglo-Norman barons. However, one could deduce that they too, though they had never been kings, were to some extent drawn into the degenerative process of Gaeldom. As for the poets, her essay on "*Bards and Barons*" includes the sweeping dogmatic statement: "*Bards did not influence their patrons' culture and politics, they reflected them*". In other words, they were mouthpieces, mere decorators of the lord's individual interest.

To my mind, this is a restatement of Orpenism. Katharine Simms trivialises the character of the Irish princes, who in reality remained as much princes as their German contemporaries, and doubly trivialises the poets who kept vigour in the princely culture. If the poets had been no more than the mouthpieces and hirelings of lords, it is impossible to believe that their lineal successors could have remained an inspirational and central presence in Gaelic culture, for a couple of centuries after Elizabeth and James and Cromwell had driven the lords overseas and confiscated their lands, including the poets' rent-free estates. The truth is that the *filidh* were not principally servants of individual lords. First and foremost, they were servants of a culture and a tradition.

John Minahane

Series Concluded

Between Two Civilisations

A common explanation of why the West is in turmoil is the "populist" risings against the ascendancy of "liberal political and cultural elites". But the root cause of the disorder lies further back: in the aftermath of the nuclear massacres of Hiroshima and Nagasaki when the West failed to repent, as it had repented the Jewish Holocaust. Those massacres and that subsequent failure signalled that the European civilisation that Europeans had brought with them to America had begun to end.

The French Revolution and the German Nazis had wanted to end it but had failed. The Russian Bolsheviks were still hoping to end it but were anticipated by America, leading the West, when it not only refused to repent for its nuclear massacres but hammered that refusal home by continuing to manufacture atomic bombs and working on making hydrogen bombs. Britain and France followed the American lead.

Thus the West, led by America, entered an intercivilisational period* as Western Europe had done in the fifth century when Germanic and Slavic peoples overran Roman civilisation in the Western Roman Empire—a period whose start has been called by historians the Age of Migrations or of Chaos. An intercivilisational period, such as we are now experiencing, is inevitably a period of socio-political, moral and intellectual disorder.

Official America attempted a repair that took the exit from European civilisation into account. Previously, when the bomber crew had been about to take off for Japan with their lethal cargo, Official America, in the person of an air force chaplain, had still been using Euro-speak when he addressed a hybrid God of the Old and New Testaments in the following words:

Almighty Father, who wilt hear the prayer of them that love thee, we pray thee to be with those who brave the heights of thy heaven and who carry the battle to our enemies... May they, as well as we, know thy strength and power, and armed with thy might may they bring this war to a rapid end. In the Name of Jesus Christ, Amen.

Subsequent to those formally blessed massacres, Official America, recognising

* This corrects the subtitle of my 1996 book *Uncertain Dawn: Hiroshima and the Beginning of Postwestern Civilisation*. It has not been yet.

the changed situation and the need for corresponding adjustments, abolished Christian prayer in its schools. In the following years, the rejection of Europe was reaffirmed by American professors and students marching behind posters decrying the DWEMS –Dead White European Male philosophers and writers.

Official America introduced and imposed a hybrid Godless morality.

To the legitimisation of atomic massacre were added new rules for religion and sexual relations, for abortion and pornography, for the promotion of female and non-white people, and for correct language use. All this was overlaid on a layer of inherited moral rules from the discarded civilisation. This redefining of right and wrong was accompanied by a definition of people as individuals rather than communities, with a preference for individuals living multiculturally.

The new elements of this new framework for life were derived largely from the writings of American intellectuals who had called themselves left-liberals. After their ideology had been officialised, it occurred to its activists that they could better win acceptance by calling themselves plain "liberals", thereby suggesting they were continuers of the classical Liberalism which had won prestige and wide acceptance in late European civilisation—while implying by the small-l spelling of the word that they were simply broad-minded, generous people. The American state and business corporations, leading mass media included, perceiving the profit that could be made from the new rules of behaviour, language and societal definition, backed the 'liberal agenda'.

In competition with the Soviet Union's diffusion of its atheistic collectivist system into its East European satellites, America exported its new hybrid morality and individualistic sociology to its West-European satellites. "Swinging London" led the way with cheers from young and old for a new thing called "consumerism". Thus the West as a whole had acquired a stop-gap replacement for its discarded civilisation.

A stop-gap, not a new civilisation. A civilisation, we know from history, is a political and intellectual construct involving a large number of people. It has a coherent set of values and rules derived from a venerated source—god, seer, lawgiver, holy man or the ancestors—that

enables its members to see and feel sense in life. That last quality is the decisive reason why the societies we have called "civilisations", unless destroyed by suicide or external force, have lasted hundreds, even thousands, of years. If a political and intellectual construct lacks that critical quality, it presents, rather than a sense-making framework for life, senselessness.

In the case of the present Western stop-gap, the absence of a venerated source for the rules and their supporting values, combined with the hybrid and therefore incoherent nature of the whole, are the key factors producing this dire condition and the effects of it. It recalls the fate of "primitive tribes" when imperialistic Western powers made them add elements of European values and rules to their previously coherent moral systems derived from a venerated source. The result for the tribes was the absence of such a source for the now incoherent moral system with a resulting senselessness that produced anomie or normlessness: spreading alcoholism, sexual licence, suicides and falling fertility. Noting that last, there can be little wonder, given the similarly caused incoherence of the stop-gap's values and rules system, that in the USA the two lowest fertility rates are those of white people and of the Native Americans.

Instinctively, human responses to the encounter of consciousness with senselessness are one or other of three deliberate actions: temporary suspension of consciousness; narrowing of its range to a self-inflicted physical pain or its permanent elimination; effects producible by, respectively, mind-blurring drugs or binge-drinking, physical self-harm and suicide. The epidemics of drug-taking and binge-drinking and the high frequency of self-harming and suicide which have characterised the West since the 1970s reflect the widespread encounter of sensitive Westerners with senselessness.

After the fall of a civilisation there are always stop-gaps. In the wake of the collapse of Roman civilisation in Western Europe, transient Germanic kingdoms preceded the emergence of the new, European civilisation that restored sense in life, enduringly, for its multinational members. In some respects, notably its Christianity and in Continental Western Europe civil law, it continued its Roman predecessor.

But a successor civilisation is not inevitably, even partly, a continuation of its predecessor. The opposite was the case when Islam replaced Byzantine civilisation in the Middle East. Michel Houillebecq in

his novel *Submission* has dared to predict a Muslim future for France. And, on present showing, a post-European civilisation, if it came about within 50 years or so, would be likely to have Islam as its principal religion in Western Europe. At the opposite extreme of possibility is Chinese civilisation which has seemed always to succeed itself in essentials regardless of the political regime. In short, the possibilities for us, or perhaps for our children's children, are many.

Desmond Fennell

Dr. Fennell's autobiography *About Being Normal: My Life in Abnormal Circumstances* (Somerville Press) was published recently.

Several of his other works are available from Athol Books at

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

Reflections On Theatre

You don't have a national theatre in Ireland. What you have is English provincial theatre with one eye on the West End theatre of London or Broadway. But it doesn't even work as a try-out theatre, for no one in London theatre wants their stuff now, it has all gone so pathetic.

The Gate as provincial theatre is just another venue for successful stuff coming from England. They don't do *peasant drama* about serious issues within the country, North or South. Irish playwrights are told they are not well-known enough. Samuel Beckett is thought of as an Irishman who made-good in the European sense and his many pessimistic and suicide-note dramas reflect the dismal soul of the Irish nation. He once said he preferred France at war more than Ireland at peace (during WW2).

When I had productions on at the Abbey and Cork Opera House and at the Lyric, Belfast, it was because the plays had been produced in England first.

The Abbey can be found listed under provincial theatre in the British theatre publication *The Stage*. It's been like that for many years. No one at the Abbey thought to complain.

One of the sexual predators at the Abbey as I remember, back in the 1970s, was a leading female actor, highly intelligent and more nationalist-minded than most. The then female overall Director of the Abbey had to continually shift seats when she was present and at times run from her. She was having relationships with two other female actors at the theatre. Living also in England, she had heterosexual flings. I met up with her many times in

Dublin and London. Her personal life in no way interfered with my admiration for her wit, deep knowledge of theatre, and charm. She to me was a one-woman Irish National theatre.

Many Abbey operatives find well-paid jobs as directors in what is supposed to be Irish-American theatre because wealthy Irish-Americans, usually women, come sniffing around the Abbey to recruit. They recruit on the myth that the Abbey is a national theatre interested in serious Irish issues.

Like all organisations there is predatory sexual behaviour in theatre and everyone one knows who this very small element is. There are female heterosexual predators, lesbian ones, male gays, male heterosexuals: <https://www.atholbooks-sales.org/sexual>. But they are usually middle-class with a definite bourgeois outlook. Say just after 1917 the communist playwright Maxim Gorky came over to London with his play *'The Lower Depths'*, looking to have it produced. It would be if he allowed himself to be fucked by a gay impresario, followed by having to fuck the female theatre agent, then having a threesome with the director and his wife—would they then produce his play, and in doing so go against their Imperial interests? Gorky's work was eventually done in London by a small socialist theatre. But in sexual composition it was no different than mainstream theatre. With everyone contributing in writing, set-building and directing on a shoestring there was just polite dating.

You might ask at times about subsidised theatre in London—what sex is it at the moment? One well-known theatre has been lesbian controlled, so it was pointless to send anything there unless it involved them. It didn't work for them though they took so many of their kind into the running of it. Then it's back to being better-balanced sexually. Now it's all male gay and it might not be a good thing to send anything there. That imbalance didn't work out either despite their gay recruitment. Now it's back to being balanced again—the right number of gays of both sexes and the heterosexual in equal numbers. But there's a woman director, Scottish, Protestant, who won't look at anything Irish unless it is Ulster loyalist and, as most of it is of poor quality, it doesn't get done except in Protestant Scotland. She will do British Army stuff though. The English don't seem to notice what is going on because of her Imperial instincts.

Most of theatre is generally just full of

hardworking people. It's a small world and you soon get to know who is being leaned-on.

It might be a well-known gay director and a young male actor who was having a bad time with the director's intimidation (erstwhile National Theatre, London). He has complained to fellow-actors and they try and work out how to help him. Sometimes it's a female actor but years ago they weren't so helpful because the female is very pretty and it might be her fault. It can even be a gay being leaned on by another gay in a position of authority.

Theatre is a microcosm of society.

Wilson John Haire.

8 November 2017

African News

Chaos In Kenya, Peaceful Transition In Zimbabwe

Everything is going as expected:

All the scare headlines concerned Zimbabwe, while Kenya was ignored.

In Kenya, tribalism is the usual problem manifested in a disputed election with a very low turn-out. We will count the dead later, but it will only be black on black. Back in 2007, it was maybe a thousand, maybe more, they weren't counted, but they were of a different tribe: so what?! This is where a white colonialist can shoot a "native" and get off easy.

In Zim, obviously it's far more serious. Nobody is dead.

According to the Brit media, one butcher replaces another, but 'our kith and kin' are safe. The new President has promised compensation to the white land-robbers, so all is happy—except where is the money?

Oh, I forgot, there was all that was promised at Lancaster House in 1979. But surely that would trouble the great Irishwoman, Clare Short, who as a British Cabinet Minister in 1997 said nothing was owed as "New Labour" could betray Tory Government promises, because she was Irish, a colonised, rather than a coloniser. (Easy for her to forget her privileges as a beneficiary of a British grammar school education and career in the British civil service)

Tom Doherty

NB

Record numbers are growing tobacco in Zim and exports are soaring since 2009, earning 684m dollars for the country in 2016 (See London paper, **i**, 29.11.17).

The Russian Revolution

Lenin died in 1924, after being unable to direct his State for more than a year. His party was the dictatorial governing power. It had defeated the landlord/Tsarist insurgency in the Civil War, and had beaten off the military intervention by the Western Democracies at the end of the World War. But the social revolution it had actually accomplished was the bourgeois revolution in the countryside.

When the Tsarist State crumbled in February-March 1917, nominal state power fell to the urban middle class. But there was a disintegration of state power rather than an inheritance of it. The middle class became the nominal ruling class unexpectedly. It did not overthrow the Tsarist State, and it was taken by surprise by its collapse. The event might be called the bourgeois revolution, but in fact the event brought with it neither a functional bourgeois State nor a bourgeois social revolution. Both remained to be accomplished.

And Lenin accomplished the main body of the bourgeois revolution as the means of establishing a socialist state. He undertook to abolish the system of large landed estates and transfer land to the tenant-farmers—whom it is customary to call peasants in this connection, so let's call them peasants.

He accomplished the substance of the bourgeois revolution in rebellion against the middle class Provisional Government.

Something similar had happened in Ireland fourteen years earlier. There was a kind of middle-class Government-in-waiting headed by John Redmond. Its policy was to let things be until a favourable conjuncture at Westminster put it in subordinate command in Ireland. There was peasant discontent with the landlord system. The peasants had ambition to become landowners. A radical bourgeois intelligentsia—I think it is reasonable to give that name to the tendency represented by William O'Brien and Canon Sheehan—devised a scheme for the ending of landlordism, which they put to the British Government, which was then in the hands of the reforming Unionist administration under Balfour. The O'Brien/Balfour collaboration arranged for the abolition of landlord estates by means of state-subsidised peasant purchase.

The Redmondite Establishment oppos-

ed the scheme, fearing that the end of the grievance of landlordism would undermine the Home Rule movement. Balfour hoped that it might. O'Brien was certain that it would strengthen the demand for national independence.

That bourgeois revolution in the land was accomplished, against Redmondite middle class resistance, in the Southern part of the country in the course of a few years. One of the organisations active in it was the *Land and Labour Association*—in Marxist terms, a combination of contradictories.

Cork University set its face against this anomalous Irish bourgeois revolution, and in support of Redmond's disregard of it, about forty years ago. The moving spirit in this, as far as I can judge as a complete outsider from academia, was the frightened mind of Professor Dermot Keogh. Keogh was on the editorial staff of the Fianna Fail daily paper, *The Irish Press*, in 1972. He was present at demonstrations at the British Embassy in Dublin, in response to the Bloody Sunday administrative massacre in Derry. The Embassy was burned down. Government Ministers treated this as quite a moderate response to the Derry atrocity, but Keogh was overcome with a vision of Fascism. His remedy seems to have been to devise means of suppressing thought about the North, and the War that was going on in it, by directing the academic mind into a Byzantine maze of sociology.

Cork University has recently published what—at five kilos—must be the heaviest book published since Fox's Protestant martyrology, the *Book Of Martyrs*, in the 1640s. It is not about the Irish bourgeois revolution at all. It is only a poor attempt at a comprehensive account of the War of Independence. The revolution was accomplished a generation earlier. Nationalist Ireland had settled down into an orderly social structure when it voted in 1918 to have independent government.

The British decision to take no account of the Election and to govern by military power in defiance of the electorate was an incitement to social disorder. It found that very little disorder could be provoked. There was none worth mentioning during the first phase.

During the second phase—the 'Civil War', brought about by the insistence of

the democratic British Parliament that the Irish must take an Oath to the Crown in order to become independent of it—there was a small group of unexplained killings in West Cork which the History Department of Cork University supported British Canadian Peter Hart in magnifying into religious genocide. Apart from this concoction there was a mere hint at Communist revolution in a couple of Creameries.

The bourgeois social settlement of 1903, with its Land & Labour component, held fast through all the mayhem that Britain could generate, and through the Free State terror that it left behind it.

About fifteen years after Lenin's October Revolution, a Fascist movement was launched in nationalist Ireland by those Britain had left in command. When they lost the elections of 1932 and 1933 to De Valera's anti-Treaty movement they concluded that things were about to fall apart. The Universities were dominated by those who had made the Treaty settlement with Britain in 1921-2. Although the Treaty had been an incitement to a degree of political disorder, they imagined that it was the basis of all bourgeois social order. And they saw De Valera as the Irish Kerensky. (Kerensky was the last head of the incompetent Russian Provisional Government that Lenin swept aside.)

They saw De Valera as a weak figure-head behind which the Communist forces were mustering in the form of the IRA. At some opportune moment he would be set aside by these. A book with the title *Could Ireland Become Communist?* was published by a senior Treatyite academic. The answer was that it could. But an effective counter to Communism had been found since 1917: Fascism.

Fascism, a combination of radical socialism and nationalism, had been devised by Mussolini—a revolutionary socialist who became an irredentist Italian nationalist in 1914 and helped Britain to bring Italy into the War. In the immediate post-War period he formalised this combination as a political party and imposed national order on the social elements that were flying apart. And Churchill, as a senior British Cabinet Minister, went to Rome in the late 1920s to do public homage to him as the saviour of European civilisation from Communism—and who knows but that is what he actually was?

So the Treatyite Cumann na nGaedheal, that was becoming Fine Gael, did the right Treatyite thing in 1933 by becoming Fascist.

But the Ireland that was seen by

Treatyite eyes, through the prism of British political understanding, was a delusion. Bourgeois Ireland of the 1903 social revolution had settled down quickly and was essentially undisturbed by British provocations from 1914 to 1922. It was effectively hegemonic, with its Land and Labour element. It had no intention whatever of becoming Communist, but neither was it afraid of Communism. It was a secure property-owning democracy.

I grew up in it, in a family that did not own property, in the intensest period of the Cold War, and I know that there was no hysteria, and much informed understanding, of what had gone on in peasant Russia, despite the best efforts of the Bishops.

There was no fear of Communism in rural Ireland because rural Ireland had settled down within a bourgeois revolution. What Lenin swept aside in 1917 was a middle class Provisional Government which neglected to consolidate itself by enacting the bourgeois revolution that was asking to be made.

As for Dev being the Irish Kerensky—if he had been in Kerensky's place, there would have been no Communist revolution in Russia. He knew what a bourgeois revolution was, and he had the ability to act on what he knew.

*

Rosa Luxemburg's pamphlet on the Russian Revolution was written in a German prison, where she was confined for anti-War activities. It seems to have been written during the late Summer of 1918. She was released by what is called "*the German Revolution*", which was much like the Russian Revolution of February. The Kaiser's State collapsed under stress of the War—but in this case a war that had been forced on it. The Kaiser abdicated—and, since Britain and France were pretending that he had broken some international law and were intent on hanging him, he left Germany for Holland. A Government was formed without him, by the Social Democrats, and a Republic was reluctantly declared.

Luxemburg agitated against it as bourgeois and as having supported the War. It was a weak Government, lacking the basic organs of state. A condition of social chaos prevailed, encouraged by the victorious Allies who were changing the Armistice into unconditional surrender, and tightening the Food Blockade now that they could encircle Germany completely by occupying the Baltic.

A degree of order was maintained by groups of demobilised soldiers acting on

their own authority. One of these groups put an end to Luxemburg's democratic socialist agitation against the ineffective Social Democratic Government by killing her. The remains of her movement were later absorbed into the Leninist Communist Party. Her prison pamphlet on the Russian Revolution (which was quoted last month) was unsuitable for publication by the Communist Party because of its rejection of Lenin's policy and method. It was published by one of her colleagues around 1922, in criticism of the Party leadership, but it had little relevance to the condition of German politics at the time.

About forty years later it was made use of by the United States as Cold War propaganda against Leninism, which had come to dominance in half of the world as a result of Britain's irresponsible and chaotic second war on Germany. An English translation was published shortly before our discussion-meetings at King's Cross and it figured to some extent in these discussions.

Rosa Luxemburg was an advanced European intellectual of "*the revolution*"—Jewish and therefore of the most brilliant—in the latter days of the Hapsburg Empire. She was a systematic Marxist. So was Lenin, up to a point. Systematic Marxism similar to Luxemburg's could easily be extracted from his writings. He admired the outstanding practitioner of systematic Marxism, Karl Kautsky, right up until the War, long after Luxemburg had become impatient with Kautsky.

But, although he was saturated with Marxist theory, and could do it as well as anybody, his driving power did not seem to be an ideal vision of "*the revolution*", but a determination to destroy the political system that had executed his brother, who had been a revolutionary of the idealistic, bourgeois-romantic kind.

The Tsarist State was not a piece of incompetent backwardness left behind by history and waiting to die. It was a pioneering force of Western civilisation in Asia. It had its idealism, and its rationalists, and its practicality. Lenin therefore did not approach the task of destroying it as a mere idealist. He outflanked it in realism. He mastered Marxism as a realistic bulwark against idealistic illusions, while at the same time committing it to the realisation of its remotest ideal. He constructed a party dedicated to the realisation of that ideal, and held it to that purpose for a dozen years after the failure of the 1905 Revolution. He warded off temptations to settle for something less with his merciless

analytical laying bare of opportunist and liquidationist ideals. He would not let the party make a progressive accommodation with Tsarism. He made it stand in fundamental hostility until an opportunity for fundamentalist action appeared. And, if no such opportunity appeared in his lifetime, then so be it.

Cold calculation, and slow-burning, relentless determination, of that order was beyond Rosa Luxemburg's power to imagine.

Nietzsche—I don't know that Lenin ever mentioned him—described the State as "*the coldest of all cold monsters*". It must have seemed to Luxemburg that in Leninism the coldest of States had met its match.

*

I don't recall that Luxemburg herself said anything, in April 1916, about the Easter Rising. Many of those who were of her general way of thinking either condemned it or dismissed it as being irrelevant to the course of history. Trotsky did so, as did Karl Radek. Her close political colleague, Karl Liebknecht tried, before the Rising, to expose in the German Parliament the fact that the Kaiser was conspiring with Irish rebels, arming them to make war on their King, and was allowing Casement to try to raise an anti-British Brigade from British Prisoners of War.

The passage below from Luxemburg's pamphlet will serve to explain the framework of her understanding and to set the scene for consideration of the post-War era.

Karl Kautsky, the leading Marxist theorist of the Second International, adopted a position on the War that was intermediate between the "*Government Socialists*" and the anti-Government/Anti-War Socialists. After the War, when the Armistice as being manipulated into German unconditional surrender, he took a position in the Government formed by the 'Government Socialists', got access to the Foreign Office Archive, and published a collection of documents under the title, *The War Guilt Of William Hohenzollern*, i.e., the abdicated Kaiser.

And bear in mind that James Connolly, once the Socialist International reneged on its commitment to prevent war between the states by launching class war against capitalism, took a clear stand in support of Germany—a fact carefully removed from the historical record by Ruth Dudley Edwards and by all those who write Irish history in the British interest. And his support of Germany was expressed in his newspaper by translations of articles by

the German Government Socialists. His opinion, similar to Casement's but arrived at independently, was that Britain had trapped Germany into war for the purpose of destroying it as a commercial rival. And Britain, in its hour of victory in 1919, did nothing at all to falsify that opinion. (Connolly's view will be compared with Luxemburg's and Lenin's in a future article.)

Here is what Luxemburg wrote in the Autumn of 1918:

"The military adventure of German imperialism under the ideological blessing of German Social Democracy did not bring about the revolution in Russia but only served to interrupt it at first, to postpone it for a while.

"Moreover, for every thinking observer, those developments are a decisive refutation of the doctrinaire theory which Kautsky shared with the Government Social-Democrats, according to which Russia, as an economically backward and predominantly agrarian land, was supposed not to be ripe for social revolution and proletarian dictatorship. This theory which regards only a *bourgeois* revolution as feasible in Russia, is also the theory of the opportunist wing of the Russian labour movement, the so-called Mensheviks... On this basic conception... both the Russian and German opportunists find themselves in agreement with the German Government Socialists. According to the opinions of all three, the Russian Revolution should have called a halt at the stage which German imperialism in its conduct of the war had set as its noble task, ...it should have stopped with the overthrow of Czarism...

"Theoretically, this doctrine (recommended as the fruit of 'Marxist thinking' by ...Kautsky) follows from the original 'Marxist' discovery that the socialist revolution is a national and, so to speak, a domestic affair in each modern country taken by itself. Of course, in the blue mists of abstract formulae, a Kautsky knows very well how to trace the worldwide economic connections of capital which make all modern countries a single integrated organism. The problems of the Russian Revolution, moreover—since it is a product of international developments plus the agrarian question—cannot possibly be solved within the limits of bourgeois society.

"Practically, the same doctrine represents an attempt to get rid of any responsibility for the course of the Russian Revolution, so far as that responsibility concerns the international, and especially the German, proletariat, and to deny the international connections of this revolution. It is not Russia's unripeness which has been proved by the events of the war and the Russian revolution, but the unripeness of the German proletariat for the fulfilment of its historic tasks...

"The fate of the revolution in Russia depended fully upon international events. That the Bolsheviks have based their policy entirely upon the world proletarian revolution is the clearest proof of their political far-sightedness and firmness of principle and of the bold scope of their policies..." (*The Russian Revolution*, Ann Arbour translation, 1961, Ch/ 1).

The world is conceived here as an organic capitalist unity in which "*the revolution*" must be made in the whole in order to be able to succeed in any part. And this view is attributed to the Bolsheviks—not unfairly. But then Luxemburg is bewildered by Lenin's insistence of frittering away the coherence of Imperial Russia by making propaganda in favour of national rights during the Brest-Litovsk negotiations, and raising up nations where none existed before; and by his perverse policy of making Bolshevism an instrument of the bourgeois revolution of the peasantry in his revolutionary action against the Government of the urban bourgeoisie for the purpose of establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat, thereby creating a hundred budding capitalists for every established agricultural capitalist that existed before.

Capitalist-landlord Russia was ripe for Socialism. But Lenin subjected rural Russia, where the bulk of the population lay, to a process of mass bourgeoisification. Where did that leave 'the revolution'? The more Luxemburg thought about it, the more problematical it appeared to her.

There is much in Lenin's writing that agrees with Luxemburg's view of the world as an integrated capitalist whole. How did he reconcile this with his advocacy of national rights? He didn't. He adopted policies designed to undermine the Tsarist State, and then to sweep aside the ineffective urban middle class. Provisional Government, to which nominal authority had fallen. He did not disable himself as a revolutionary politician by engaging in theoretical exploration in advance of the event about the problems that his means of taking power might cause him after he had taken it.

Ever since I was drawn into this kind of thing by Pat Murphy I have been wondering what political intellectuals meant when they use the word "*historicism*". I have tried to get a definite meaning, but failed. A possible meaning is getting locked into a tight scheme of understanding of history as a closed system and as a consequence being unable to see the world around you. But the those who criticised historicism seemed to be locked into just

such a scheme.

Southey (the poet, who was still remembered when I was young) commented that Wesley, the Methodist, sometimes seemed to be on the brink of seeing the world as it was, so to speak, but his understanding always rose up and eclipsed his sight. I could understand that. He knew what must be the case and therefore could not see what was the case.

There is no Irish history of the Irish bourgeois revolution. That is partly because of the damaging 'Civil War' that the British democratic state managed to inflict on nationalist Ireland when compelled to go of it, and partly because of the sponsored cultivation of neo-Redmondism during the past half-century, in response to the War that broke out in the undemocratically-governed British region of Ireland, which British propaganda made the Irish middle class feel guilty about.

(A multi-volume *History Of Ireland* published in the early 1970s had volumes on the 19th and 20th centuries, written by Cork University Professors Joseph Lee and John A. Murphy respectively. The 19th century volume ended before the 1903 social revolution, which Redmond's party tried to prevent, while the 20th century volume began after the revolution was accomplished, and described the Irish social structure as *conservative*. The social revolution was hidden in the gap between the two.

The social structure brought about by the land revolution was certainly conservative: it *conserved* the arrangements that the revolution had brought about.

There is to my knowledge only one worthwhile account of that Irish social revolution. It was written by its organiser himself, William O'Brien, in his retirement. If it had been kept in print, it would, perhaps, have been sufficient. It was never reprinted, and the few comments on it by academics were dismissive. That incomparable account of how 20th century Irish society was forged became one of the moist difficult books in the world to get. I got a copy, thanks to the pioneering internet searches of Robert Burrage, a Tory who was an active member of BICO in Belfast when he lived there. (However, lack of human resources has prevented us from reproducing it so far.)

The Russian bourgeois revolution enacted by Lenin in October 1917 has been even more scantily treated than the Irish bourgeois revolution. There is little distinct awareness that it actually happened. But it did happen. And its

beneficiaries defeated all-comers—aristocratic and democratic—in the Civil War and the Wars of Intervention.

Lenin set aside the incompetent bourgeois Provisional Government by undertaking to enact the peasant-bourgeois revolution. He then established a proletarian dictatorship behind his bourgeois revolution, and it survived because it could not be isolated from the bourgeois revolution which it had brought about in order to be attacked. The way to it lay through the mass of peasant landowners.

Lenin did not skip over the bourgeois revolution, as orthodox Marxists accused him of doing. He enacted the substance of the bourgeois revolution in the Russian economy. And it was this entanglement of the two revolutions that saved the proletarian dictatorship in its most vulnerable phase. There was no clear space around it through which it could be attacked.

Regarding the matter theoretically and in the long-term, Rosa Luxemburg was right. Lenin, with his peasant policy for outflanking the urban middle class, magnified the forces of bourgeois resistance to socialism. And Lenin's response to Sukhanov's account of the revolution was cavalier in spirit, rather than scientific: When an opportunity presents itself, you seize it and then see what can be done.

One of his favourite quotations was from the staid Weimar bourgeois, Goethe: *"Theory is grey, my friend, but the eternal tree of life is green"*. And what Rosa Luxemburg could not have been expected to foresee was that the messy entanglement of the two, mutually exclusive, revolutions—the socialist and the bourgeois—was what would enable the most thorough form of socialist state ever established to survive and become a world force.

Brendan Clifford

To be continued

other words, Northern Ireland could not become a backdoor into or out of the UK. This would represent a special status for Northern Ireland and should not be ruled out." (Irish Times, 16 May 2017)

So, proposing designated special status for the north has been an effective intervention for Sinn Fein in the political turmoil arising from the Brexit vote. The case for special status as made by Sinn Fein has been expressed through the following points:

- 56 per cent of voters in the province voted to remain in the EU
- The re-introduction of a hard border together with the removal of important legal underpinnings of the Good Friday Agreement will place the Peace Process in jeopardy
- There is a long-standing recognition by the EU of the special circumstances that exist in the North of Ireland and the assignment of special status would merely extend that existing recognition
- The imposition of controls including tariffs along the Irish border will disrupt well developed all-Ireland trade arrangements that have existed for many decades
- Flexible arrangements devised between the EU and third countries in four different sets of circumstances show how exceptional accommodations can be agreed by the EU when needed. These special arrangements are:

- o o When the people of Greenland, a province of Denmark, voted to leave the EU in 1985, they were granted Overseas Countries and Territories (OCT) status and on the basis of that status were allowed continued access to the single market. The Greenland example being the inverse of the Irish case vis a vis Brexit is especially relevant
- o o Under the terms of the European Economic Area (EEA) Agreement three members of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, have access to the single market
- o o The EU has separate customs unions with Turkey, Andorra and San Marino
- o o The part of Cyprus that is held by Turkey is recognised as a part of the EU

a. 2. Infrastructural planning

Sinn Fein's position regarding the implications of Brexit for infrastructural planning is briefly described in a document entitled, *'How Ireland and the EU can fight the economic impact of Brexit north and south'*. The document is framed as a

Review of Sinn Fein's Brexit Policy

1. 1. Special Designated Status

The proposal at the heart of Sinn Fein's Brexit policy, special designated status for the North of Ireland, is a reasonable and pertinent demand in the circumstances created by the British exit. Identifying the North as a region that should retain some aspects of EU membership while the rest of the UK exits makes sense in the context of EU influence over both the Peace Process and the current level of economic integration between the two parts of Ireland.

Were special designated status to be granted to the North it would be perceived as a half-way house to a united Ireland. From a legal perspective a case could be made that the majority vote for Remain in Northern Ireland could not be taken as a vote for Irish unity or even for being treated differently from the rest of the UK. Nonetheless, Northern Ireland is very different from the rest of the UK and has always been treated as a region detached from mainstream British politics through not having the British parties stand for election there. Campaigning for the North to be exempted from Brexit has turned out to be an effective way of advancing the nationalist agenda amid the twists and turns of a complex development. It is a politic course even in the circumstances where the DUP is propping up Theresa May's Government; who knows what opportunities may surface in the side currents of the Brexit negotiations?

A measure of the success of the special status policy is the extent of the support it is receiving from other political parties and groupings. The following paragraph from a Sinn Fein document published in April 2017 indicates this:

"In February the Dáil voted in favour of designated Special Status for the North within the EU. In March the Joint Oireachtas Committee on Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation's recommended that as part of the Brexit negotiations, the North should be given special status within the European Union, a view supported at hearings held by the Oireachtas Committee on Regional and Rural Development. It is also a position supported by the majority of parties in the North and the many organisations who participated in the all-island Civic Dialogue on Brexit". (Securing designated status for the north in the EU, p. 3)

Notably, Leo Varadkar, in the course of his successful campaign for the leadership of Fine Gael, committed to the position that the North should remain within the customs union and the single market and that there should not be an economic border on the island of Ireland. Professor Brigid Laffan, a well connected academic with a high profile in the field of European studies also stated recently:

"Northern Ireland does not have many ports and airports. Therefore, systems could be developed that ensured that there was no leakage of goods that were not covered by agreement into Britain. In

set of demands the Irish Government should make on the EU. This approach to the question is understandable from a party with more MEPs than any other Irish party, but it is too focussed on the EU.

An editorial in the March edition of *Irish Political Review* addressed the question of infrastructure in the following terms:

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

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

Surprisingly this approach struck an immediate chord with some members of the public and various opinion formers. Professor Laffan endorsed it in her *Irish Times* article of May 16th as follows:

"Those sectors that are heavily reliant on the UK market, particularly the agri-food sector, need not just continued access to the UK market, but also diversification strategies so that they are less reliant on it.

Investment in more extensive transport links to the continent should be prioritised to avoid having to go through a third country that is no longer in the customs union."

A weakness in the Sinn Féin position on infrastructure is the absence of any reference to the need to diversify Irish trade so as to reduce dependency on the British market.

a. 3. Critical Engagement with the EU

The current attitude of Sinn Féin to the EU is summed up in the following paragraph:

"Sinn Féin has had a longstanding policy of critical engagement with the EU where we support measures that are in Ireland's interests and oppose and campaign for change on those which are bad for Ireland" (*The case for the north to achieve special designated status within the EU*, November 2016).

The *Irish Political Review Group* also views the EU from a stance of critical engagement. The alternatives to that are to support the EU uncritically, in other words to adopt a Europhile stance; or to oppose it outright and advocate Irexit, a position supported by many on the Irish Left.

In the context of Brexit, Irexit would entail a return to the orbit of the Anglosphere, an outcome that would cut against the whole thrust of Irish national development. Compared to the opportunities afforded by EU membership returning to the British sphere would incentivise the most craven tendencies in Irish society.

The claim that neo-liberal thinking has become embedded in the culture of the main EU institutions is true. Our group advocated a *No* vote in the *Nice and Lisbon referenda* for that reason. It is sometimes forgotten, however, that the EU *per se* is not a neo-liberal construct.

In the years when Jacques Delors was President of the European Commission (1985-94), an alternative vision to neo-liberalism was countenanced. In September 1988, when Thatcherism was at its height and British Trade Union leaders were being frozen out of the corridors of power, Delors addressed the TUC Congress and spelt out the meaning of the social dimension of the Single Market reforms of 1992. The measures he outlined included: no weakening of existing social protection; improved living, working and health benefits; collective bargaining rights; greater access to lifelong education for workers; and a Statute of European companies that would include the participation of workers or their representatives. The delegates responded by giving a spirited rendition of *Frere Jacques*. Some weeks later Thatcher replied by making a famous speech in Bruges in which she stated:

"We have not successfully rolled back the frontiers of the state in Britain, only to see them re-imposed at a European level with a European super-state exercising a new dominance from Brussels" (<http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/107332>).

That speech initiated a struggle between the UK and the rest of the EU in which the UK appeared to be isolated while, behind the scenes, British diplomats succeeded in diverting the Union away from a 'deepening' process by expediting the inclusion in the Union of the states of central and eastern Europe.

In the run up to the Maastricht Treaty the British were able to persuade the leaders of other EU member states that the

Commission needed to be weakened and this was effected through the Treaty. In later years the British case for neo-liberal reform found a receptive audience among the EU elite and in time the Commission itself was won over to economic liberalism.

Using the technocratic approach so beloved of EU officials, EU institutions like the Commission, the European Court of Justice, and the European Central Bank, became drivers and enforcers of rules-based neo-liberal reform.

Yet that was not an inevitable outcome of EU integration. The EU could just as easily have gone down a 'Social Europe' path as had been mapped out by Delors, and that option remains.

In holding to a hard left opposition to neo-liberalism the *Irish Political Review Group* holds a view of the EU that is close to Sinn Féin's position. However, we have clear differences with the party's formulation of critical engagement with the EU as a result of having a political perspective that is more favourably disposed towards the EU.

Clearly, EU member states need to defend their national interests within the internal deliberations of the Union, but they also need to commit to support for the European ideal if the Union is to have any chance of viability. Under the leadership of Fianna Fáil primarily, throughout at least the first four decades of membership, Ireland subscribed to the strategic aim of European integration on the grounds that it was based on the twin pillars of respect for the national identities of member states and support for specifically European institutions (that view was articulated by Bertie Ahern in a Thomas Davis lecture in 2002 to mark the thirtieth anniversary of Ireland's joining).

Joining Europe allowed Ireland to escape a debilitating dependence on the British market and thus enhanced Irish sovereignty; it was in line with the long term aims of the national movement. This perspective is absent from Sinn Féin's Brexit strategy.

Page 8 of the first statement of Sinn Féin's Brexit policy (*The Case for the North to achieve special designated status within the EU*) is headed '*Continuing to demand change at EU level*' and lists eight demands in a bulleted list. Seven of the demands would have the effect of weakening EU executive power in favour of returning powers to the member states.

While each of these demands would require separate discussion, their broad

thrust, if implemented, would undermine the coherence of the bloc and render it a grouping of squabbling states. The Euro is vulnerable as a world currency lacking the political backing of a State Apparatus. Sinn Fein's stance, by being antipathetic to the ideal of the European project, is unrealistic and would push the Union in the direction of collapse.

a. 4. Ambiguity regarding a bilateral trade deal with Britain

Taken as a whole the series of documents issued by Sinn Fein on Brexit suggest a degree of ambiguity on the question of whether bilateral agreements should be entered into between Ireland and Britain, especially regarding trade, in response to the challenge of the British exit.

Bilateral deals between Ireland and Britain would undermine the solidarity of the 27 members of the EU in the Brexit negotiations and play into the hands of the UK. It is clear from numerous media sources that the British view Ireland as their closest ally in the EU, an ally that can be counted on to support positions that would facilitate the British side in the negotiations. It is the view of the *Irish Political Review Group* that any efforts to cast Ireland in the role of a British proxy in the negotiations, whether pressed by British politicians (eg Nigel Farage, Hilary Benn and Edwina Currie) or Irish Anglophiles (eg Dr. Ray Bassett, David Mc Williams, *Sunday Business Post* Editor Ian Kehoe, Marian Finucane, Ruth Dudley Edwards, Bruce Arnold *et al*) should be firmly resisted.

On page 3 of 'The case for special designated status for the North in the EU' the argument is made that Sinn Fein is not alone in pressing for separate arrangements for the North of Ireland. A section of a statement made by the Joint Oireachtas Committee on European Union Affairs in June 2016 is then quoted approvingly as follows:

"That the Irish and UK Governments negotiate bilaterally to have Northern Ireland recognised (in an EU context) as having 'a special position' in the UK, in view of the Good Friday Agreement. Recommends further that special arrangements be negotiated at EU level in that context, to maintain North-South relations and Northern Irish EU citizenship rights and protections attached to such rights."

Much water has flowed under the bridge since that statement was issued; notably the Irish Government announced in December 2016 that no bilateral agreements would be made with Britain in

advance of the Brexit negotiations. Still, a positive reference to a bilateral deal remains in a current document on the Brexit page of the Sinn Fein website.

On page 7 of that same document a headed paragraph is devoted to the British Irish Council (BIC), one of the institutions established as part of the Good Friday Agreement. Reference is made to a provision whereby bilateral or multilateral agreements can be made between the different members of the Council. The members of BIC are: The British Government, the Irish Government, the Welsh and Scottish Governments, the Northern Executive and the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands Governments. A concluding sentence in the paragraph states:

"Sinn Féin believes it is in our interests to find common cause with other regions within the BIC who share our objective to also remain and work together to argue our case in forthcoming negotiations on Brexit."

This is further evidence that Sinn Fein has not ruled out bilateral agreements with the British regarding Brexit.

The economic aspects of Brexit are covered in two recently produced documents on the SF website: *'How Ireland and the EU can fight the economic impact of Brexit north and south'*; and *'Farming and agri-food—why the north must achieve special status within the EU'*. In both these documents there are references to the need for a trade deal with Britain. It is only when you read these documents in full that it becomes clear that the envisaged trade deal is between Britain and the EU.

Sinn Fein's ambiguity on the question of a bilateral deal with Britain may reflect the concerns of various constituencies represented by the party but it runs the risk of encouraging the Anglophile elements in Irish society who have been pulling out the stops to align Irish opinion with Britain in antagonism to the EU.

[Note: since this was written it has become clear that Sinn Fein would be against a bi-lateral agreement between Ireland and the UK while the Brexit negotiations are in progress.]

a. 5. Timing of a trade deal

In the pre-negotiations sparring that went on between Britain and the EU the British side let it be known that they wanted negotiations for a trade deal to proceed alongside the negotiations about exit. Different messages issued from the European side—some insisted that trade

talks could only commence when Brexit was completed while Michel Barnier was more conciliatory—but the EU side was adamant that certain matters in the Brexit negotiations needed to be agreed before the trade talks could begin.

In *'How Ireland and the EU can fight the economic impact of Brexit north and south'*, the second of two proposals regarding a trade deal with Britain reads:

"Ensure that a trade deal is in place prior to British withdrawal from the EU."

Given the danger of Ireland being used as a British pawn in the Brexit confrontation, it would be more politic to propose a transitional arrangement for the period of the trade negotiations which may take as long as ten years. Such an arrangement is proposed in another SF document, *'Securing special designated status for the north within the EU'*, which states:

"Transitional agreements should be put in place until Britain's relationship with the EU can be agreed."

As with the ambiguity regarding a bilateral trade deal between Ireland and Britain, the SF position regarding the timing of a trade deal between the UK and the EU is proposed without regard to the wider international implications.

a. 6. Conclusion

Through its special designated status for the North, Sinn Fein has effectively set the national agenda regarding Brexit and the party deserves credit for that. In some details outlined in this document the party's policy reflects its traditional bias against the EU. At a time when Ireland has become the cockpit of the 'battle of Brexit', when European attention is focussed on this country, the Irish national interest, including the achievement of a unitary state, is best served by the adoption of a pro-European stance. Ireland needs to steer a course supportive of the emerging Franco-German alliance that is aimed at bolstering the Eurozone while at the same time supporting the prevailing popular mood across Europe of opposition to neo-liberalism.

It is understandable that Sinn Fein should look to the economic self-defence of its electoral base but Brexit calls for a focus on the long-term constitutional issues. At this time Irish political parties need to steer clear of the quagmire that is the British debate about Brexit, welcome though Corbyn's successes have been. The UK State should not be allowed to meddle in Irish grievances as a means of

undermining the solidarity of the EU-27.

The EU elite embraced neo-liberalism with open arms and neo-liberal policies seem to have a particular attraction for the technocrats who occupy positions of influence in many European institutions and economic think-tanks. The machinery of the EU is cumbersome and the European Parliament probably deserves its reputation as a frustratingly impotent talking shop.

The ending of the Cold War should have been an opportunity for the EU to cut adrift from US hegemony instead of which European leaders adopted a stance of craven subservience to the American New Order. Yet with these and no doubt other faults there is always a possibility that the political leaders of the Union will find a way of being true to their Christian Democratic roots and the much vaunted vision of 'Social Europe'.

We believe that Ireland should be pro-EU, with all its faults. Present political circumstances are not so very different from the circumstances faced by the revolutionary generation who achieved the partial independence that currently obtains. Casement and Connolly, from different perspectives, saw the Irish cause as having a strong European dimension and their views were endorsed by the group that organised the Rising. In short the constitutional issues raised by Brexit—the nature of Ireland's relationship with Europe and the means by which a united Ireland can be realised—require the widest and most open-minded debate possible.

Irish Political Review Group

IPR Index: 2017

Labour Comment is edited by
Pat Maloney

January

Some Home Rule Truths. *Editorial*
Why the Kenny Government could get away with air-brushing the Irish/German Alliance of 1916. *Philip O'Connor*
The Border, the Common Travel Area, Schengen and Brexit. *Dave Alvey*
Readers' Letters: Killing Of Russian Ambassador To Turkey. *Pat Walsh*
Assembly Motion On RHI with Amendment proposed by *Sinn Fein*.
The Heating Scandal. Report from *Phoenix Gerry Adams* On Brexit. *Manus O'Riordan*
The Neutrality Bill: Putting The Government On The Spot! *David Morrison*
TDs Views on Border Poll. *Pat Muldowney*
When We Think Of Victory. *Wilson John Haire* (Poem)
Another Casement commemoration—examining an examination. *Jack Lane*

(including Correspondence with Ambassador Mulhall)
An Untenable Casement Diary Thesis. *Tim O'Sullivan* (Response to Paul Hyde's 'Casement: Précis of a Proof')
Legitimacy and Legality—Irish assertion v. British contention. *Eamon Dyas*
Roger Casement, Denialist!. *Pat Walsh*
Biteback: Too Close To Britain In Brexit Debate? *Dave Alvey, Irish Political Review Group*
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (General Tom Barry Annual Commemoration at Fitzgerald's Park, Cork 2016)
Labour Comment: Arthur Henderson's 1916, A Neglected Centenary

February

Shadow Of A Gunman. *Editorial*
T. K. Whitaker, Jack Lane
Trump, Trump, Trump. *Editorial*
Readers' Letters: Casement: Missing The Point. *Paul Hyde*. United Kingdom—Constitutional Change. *Ivor Kenna*
Len Green, Pat Muldowney (Obituary)
History Not Politics! *Dave Alvey* on Maurice Manning
The February/March Revolution. *Editorial*
Sinn Fein's London Meeting, Wilson John Haire
Sinn Fein Irish Unity Conference. *Dave Alvey*
The Limits of History. *Barry Keane* (Tribunal Hearing Report)
Casement not a homosexual!. *Jack Lane*
Transcendental Politics? *Brendan Clifford* (Part One)
Centenary Of The February 1917 National Democratic Revolution. *Manus O'Riordan*
Winding Up The Clock. *John Morgan* (Lt. Col., ret'd.)
Hubert Butler: The DVD. *Julianne Herlihy* (Part 5)
That 1841 Census Again. *Jack Lane*
Apprenticeship Reform in Northern Ireland. *Dave Alvey*
L'Angleterre d'Aujourd'hui. *Pat Walsh*
Getting Casement backwards. *Tim O'Sullivan* (Part One)
Biteback: Irish Times Reporting Of Sex Abuse in Church Of Ireland. *Dr. Niall Meehan* (Unpublished Irish Times Letter)
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Commemoration of the Battle of Kilmichael)
Eugene V. Debs On 1916. *Labour Comment*
CETA vote in European Parliament ENVI Committee. *Ming Campbell*

March

The Northern Election. *Editorial*
Lost In The Wilderness!. *Jack Lane*
Brexit: Irish fudge undermines EU solidarity. *Editorial*
Unionists In Stormont. *Report*
Readers' Letters: Divide And Rule?. *Dave Alvey*
Casement Diaries: An Untenable Thesis. *Tim O'Sullivan*
Thoughts On The Garda Sergeant McCabe Saga. *Nick Folley*
Justice As An Aspirin. *Wilson John Haire* (Poem)
Government Brexit Meeting. *Tim O'Sullivan*
Cork Business 'Forgets' EU. *Pat Maloney*
A Round Of The Irish Brexit debate. *Dave Alvey* (Part 1)
Anatomy of a Lie. *Paul Hyde* examines misinformation about Roger Casement

Prof. McConville And Casement, Donal Kennedy
Why has "the paper of record" failed to access its February 1917 records? *Manus O'Riordan*: Irish Times distortions about the 1917 Roscommon By-Election
How Redmond Won Irish Independence. *Brendan Clifford* (Transcendental Politics, Part 2)
Coogan's Bluff: Coolacrease Re-visited. *Pat Muldowney*
Biteback: Irish Policy And Brexit. *Blair Horan* (Report) with comments
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Asians Excel in Technology; Equal Pay for Equal Work?; Syrian War)
Labour Comment, Bus Dispute
Kickback Against Globalism. *Angela Clifford*
If Only (poem). *Wilson John Haire*

April

Thoughts on the Northern Election. *Pat Walsh*
Martin McGuinness, RIP, Editorial
Airstrip Two? Britain's Strategic Interest In Ireland. *Donal Kennedy*
Readers' Letters: Casement Diaries: Fact And Supposition. *Paul Hyde*
2017 Northern Ireland Assembly Election Summary. *David Morrison*
Brexit: John's Problem. *Jack Lane*
Asylum-Seekers in Ireland. *Eamon Dyas*
Glimmers in the Brexit debate. *Dave Alvey*
Northern Ireland: War And Its Exigencies. *Brendan Clifford*
Zimbabwe: a post-colonial episode. *Brendan Clifford*
European Council Blocks Positive Economic Governance. *Manus O'Riordan*
A Round Of The Irish Brexit debate. *Dave Alvey* (Part 2)
Commemorating Casement. *Tim O'Sullivan* (events, a song and an observation)
Deux: Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose. *Pat Walsh* (Part 2 of review of *Andre Siegfried's England's Crisis*)
State Funeral for Martin McGuinness?. *Pat Muldowney* (What the media did NOT report)
Standing Up. True North. *Wilson John Haire* (Poems)
President Trump's Military Budget. *David Morrison*
Cashless Society?. Report of *Chris McCrohan* letter
Mansergh And The Major Once Again. *Jack Lane*
Biteback: In Denial About Major McDowell's 'White Nigger' Remark *Martin Mansergh*, with unpublished response by *John Martin*
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (The media versus the Catholic Church)
Labour Comment: Protectionism And Fascism

May

May's June Election!. *Editorial*
Brexit And Michael Collins. *Jack Lane* on Fintan O'Toole's strange notion
Marian Finucane On The British Wavelength. *Dave Alvey*
Readers' Letters: Casement Diaries: Archival Realities. *Tim O'Sullivan*
North Korea Offensive. *Editorial*
Stakeknife: Under Cover!. *Wilson John Haire* (Book Review)
A Seminar On Haughey. *Dave Alvey*
The Remaking Of Hubert Butler. *Julianne Herlihy* (Part One)
Doing Without A National Identity. *Desmond*

Fennell

Brexit: Supermac's vs McDonalds. *Editorial*
Getting Casement backwards. *Tim O'Sullivan*
(Part Two)

A Second Round Of The Irish Brexit Debate.
Dave Alvey

Trois: Ah! Ne me brouillez pas avec la
République!. *Pat Walsh* (Part 3 of series on
Andre Siegfried)

Biteback: Brexit And A Snap Election. *Dave*
Alvey, Irish Political Review Group
Shite And Onions. *Donal Kennedy*

Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Electric
Cars; Flooding; Mediaeval Ireland and
Religion; Cork Cranes in \$130m Puerto
Rico venture)

Labour Comment. Democracy v. The Dollar!
What Happened At Glen?

Reflections On Irish Labour Party Conference

June

A Pointless Election. *Editorial*

Ireland and Britain must be 'shoulder to
shoulder' on Brexit—Edwina Currie. *Dave*
Alvey

Zionists And The First Eugenics Congress:
London 1912. *Pat Walsh*

Readers' Letters: Syria's Alleged Chemical
Attack On Civilians: can we be sure that
Assad was responsible?. *David Morrison*

The Remaking of Hubert Butler. *Julianne*
Herlihy (Part 2).

Unbalanced History. *Tom Cooper*

A Tribute To Peter Hart!. *Jack Lane*

Satire? *Brendan Clifford*

Martin McGuinness And Some Irish And Third
Reich Comparisons. *Manus O'Riordan*

Getting Casement backwards. *Tim O'Sullivan*
Brexit: Recent developments are all good.
Dave Alvey

War Games In WW2 Northern Ireland. *Wilson*
John Haire

Biteback: Nigel Farage and Irish EU
membership. *Dave Alvey*; Brexit and a snap
election. *Dave Alvey*; Fianna Fáil, Sinn Féin
and Abstentionism. *Micheál Mac Donncha*.
Dublin, Monaghan bombings; *Derek Davis*.
National Identity And The EU. *Dave Alvey*
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Leslie
Price, Bean de Barra)

Labour Comment. Karl Marx On The Fenians

July

Brexit: the British General Election,
Varadkar as Taoiseach and Continental
Developments. *Dave Alvey*

The Incomparable Compared! *Editorial*
Aspects of the Balfour Declaration 1917.
Pat Walsh (Part One)

Northern Ireland: Result Of British General
Election, held 8 June 2017

Readers' Letters: The One 'Whole Nation'
Nonsense!. *Manus O'Riordan*. Kilmichael:
Eve Morrison Got It Wrong. *Niall Meehan*.
Eve Morrison Letter

War Childhood In Northern Ireland. *Wilson*
John Haire

L(e)o And Behold!. *Jack Lane*

Revisionist Jamboree at Kilkenny Castle.
Tim O'Sullivan

The Remaking Of Hubert Butler. *Julianne*
Herlihy (Part Three)

Mary Kenny And Fascism. *B. Clifford*

Themes Of Times On Munitions & Mines.
Manus O'Riordan

Climbing The Money Tree. *Wilson John*

Haire

Biteback: Unbalanced History. Dublin-
Monaghan Bombings. *Tom Cooper*

Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (European
Culture; EU: A Single Market?)

Labour Comment: Engels Visits Ireland

GLEN: A Post-script

August

The DUP/Tory Pact In Context. *Editorial*
July Developments Show Brexit Still On
Course. *Dave Alvey*

Further Aspects of the Balfour Declaration.
Pat Walsh (Part 2)

Readers' Letters: Never The Order Of The
British Empire For Art Malik? *Manus*
O'Riordan

SF Abstention & The Government Majority:
the figures!

Abstention From Westminster: A Proven
Winner. *Donal Kennedy*

Poems: Of Tills And Pills. Did You Pack This
Bomber Yourself. *Wilson John Haire*

The First West Cork History Festival. *Jack*
Lane

The Elephant in the Room! *Aubane Historical*
Society Leaflet

Independence: Place And Politics. *John*
Morgan (Lt.Col. retd) (Review of Philip
O'Connor's Road To Independence)

Revisionist Jamboree at Kilkenny Castle. *Tim*
O'Sullivan (Part 2)

'Papers Of Record' On Swanzy's First Cork
Murder. *Manus O'Riordan*

Blasts Of Hot Air: Mansergh v. Harris.
Brendan Clifford

Irish Notables In Wartime France. *Wilson*
John Haire (Review of No Way Out—The
Irish in Wartime France 1939-1945 by Isadore
Ryan)

A Defence Of Gaelic Celtic Christianity. *John*
Minahane (Review)

Biteback: Grenfell Tower. *Michael Robinson*
The Labour Party – power and principle.
Raymond Deane

Trump and the Russian connection. *Philip*
O'Connor

Irish Times Silences Query On Where It
Stands On The Right To Trial By Jury. *Manus*
O'Riordan

Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Brexit)

Harpers Proclaimed! *Jack Lane*

Labour Comment: P.S. O'Hegarty Writes On
The Fenians

September

Unity By Consent? *Editorial*

Micheál Martin's Agonising.. *Jack Lane*

Brexit: can Varadkar and Coveney be trusted
to hold the line against Britain? *Dave Alvey*

Readers' Letters: "The Embers of
Revisionism". *Cathal Mac Swiney Brugha*.
Moral Equivalence? *Simon O'Donnell*

Re-writing American History? *Editorial*

Biteback: A Policy Of Exclusion?
Unpublished Article and Letters to Irish Times
from *Brian Murphy* *osb*

A Special Brexit Arrangement For Northern
Ireland?. *Sean Owens*

The Remaking Of Hubert Butler . *Julianne*
Herlihy (Part 4)

Kevin Myers. *Editorial*

Tourist Class. *Wilson John Haire* (Poem)

West Cork History Festival—some background
on sources. *Jack Lane*. *Meda Ryan* Letter to
History Ireland. *Niall Meehan* Letter

Did Gerry accept an 'Office of Profit' under the

Crown? *Madawc Williams*

A pro-EU defence of Irish Neutrality. *Dave*
Alvey

Biteback: Ulster Scots. *Manus O'Riordan*
Strategic Aspects of the Balfour Declaration.
Pat Walsh (Part 3)

Challenging The Dominant Canon On The
IRA Burning Of The Custom House. *Manus*
O'Riordan

Vincent Morley and the Hidden Ireland. *John*
Minahane (Part 2)

While You Ate American Pie. *Wilson John*
Haire (Poem)

Ghost Estates. *John Martin*

Irish Times Self-Censorship. *Manus O'Riordan*

Biteback: West Cork History? *Tom Cooper*
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Trotsky and
Silicon Valley)

Northern Ireland And The Blitz. *Editorial*
Labour Comment: Irish Bulletin. *Frank*
Gallagher

October

Northern Ireland: The End Of An Era?
Editorial

Fishing in the troubled waters of Brexit. *Dave*
Alvey

'Taming the Jew'.. *Pat Walsh*

Readers' Letters: A Balanced Approach? *Pat*
Muldowney

Es Ahora. Travels and some Reflections.
Julianne Herlihy

Catching Up With Aubane On The All For
Ireland League. *Manus O'Riordan* 10

The Catalan Question Is Tricky. *Philip*
O'Connor

Realpolitik and the EU/US relationship. *Dave*
Alvey

Blythe Spirits And Some Abbey Fact And
Fiction. *Manus O'Riordan*

The Myth Of 1960s Swinging London. *Wilson*
John Haire (Book Review)

Sean O'Callaghan, Betrayer, Informer—
Smoke & Mirrors *Richard Behal* (Report)

Biteback: The Taoiseach's Line on Brexit.
Dave Alvey

Quantitative Easing. *Stephen Brittain*

Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Quantitative
Easing; Pension Funds; Revisionism is alive
and well—well-organised I mean!)

Detecting Paedophiles. *Seán McGouran*

Labour Comment: Redmondism and Political
Violence. The Pig Buyers of Ballybricken:
Founders of Irish Democracy? *Pat*
Muldowney

November

Northern Ireland And Democracy. *Editorial*
Budget 2018 – more free market than centrist.
Dave Alvey

Centenary of the Balfour Declaration. *Pat*
Walsh (Final Part)

Readers' Letters: Memorials: A Balanced
Approach? *Simon O'Donnell*

Es Ahora. *Julianne Herlihy* (Bernard
O'Donoghue)

Sunday Independent: A Correspondence. *Jack*
Lane

An Atlas Which Is No Guide. *Jack Lane*
(review of Atlas of the Irish Revolution)

Coolcrease revisited. *Pat Muldowney* (review
of Atlas)

Revisionist Jamboree at Kilkenny Castle. *Tim*
O'Sullivan (Part 3)

Che *Mo Laoch* And Che's Own Hero. *Manus*
O'Riordan

Brexit: Ireland needs a leader of the quality of

Charles Haughey. *Dave Alvey*
 Israel has demonstrated a 50-year contempt
 for democracy. *Dr David Morrison*
 The Russian Revolution. *Brendan Clifford*
 (100th anniversary)
 Vincent Morley & The Poets. *John Minahane*
 (Part 3)
 The Naming, Name-Dropping, And Shaming
 Of A Child Sex Abuser—And A Questionable
 Testimonial From Fintan O'Toole. *Manus*
O'Riordan
 Biteback: 'Paper Of Record' Refuses To Correct
 Misinformation. *Tom Cooper*
 Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Kilmichael
 - Lest We Forget)
 Secret History Of Sinn Fein. *Donal Kennedy*
Labour Comment, Redmondite Politics: More
 On the Ballybricken Pig-Buyers!

Varadkar And The Poppy

Each November, Irish society is forced to endure sterile and divisive controversy concerning Armistice Day, poppy-wearing, and the commemoration of the thousands of Irish who died serving with British forces during the Great War. The Taoiseach, clearly in breach of the Oireachtas code of parliamentary standards, which bans the wearing of emblems of a political nature within parliamentary precincts, has taken to wearing a "shamrock poppy" in the Dáil.

Leo Varadkar cannot be unaware of the symbolism of the poppy here in Ireland which has a political subtext, functioning not just as a symbol of remembrance but as a veiled propagandist attack on separatist Irish nationhood. I wonder will Mr Varadkar, who is wearing the poppy to honour those Irish who gave their lives fighting for the freedoms of small nations in the Great War, wear an Easter lily to honour those Irish who gave their lives fighting for the freedom of this small nation at the same time?

Tom Cooper

Irish Times, 9.11.2017

Pig-Buyers concluded:

Not the US idea of a backyard but a small walled in yard at the back of every house which also contained the outside lavatory. They might have one or two pigs, mostly kept by Protestants on the Shankill Road. When I went back to Belfast for 18 months during the 50s I worked for Rank Mills delivering animal feed stuff and the Shankill was the place for pig rearing. When it was stopped by Belfast Corporation there was a hell of a protest.

Sean McGouran adds: ponies were bred along the Falls—some rows of houses formed squares, some quite large. They were, in effect, urban farms.

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

Last month we produced David Morrison's reply, published in the *Belfast Newsletter* on 19th October, to a letter from Doris Cotton. Steven Jaffe replied on the 25th (see below), but the paper declined the rebuttal, reproduced below

Israel's claim is to be the only democracy in the Middle East

Your correspondent, David Morrison denigrates this claim in the strongest terms ('*Israel has demonstrated a 50-year contempt for democracy*', October 19).

Perhaps David would like to share with readers in which other state in the Middle East he would like to live if he was a Christian, a woman, gay, or a member of the Communist Party.

According to an objective monitor of democratic rights around the world, Freedom House, Israel is the only free society in the Middle East which guarantees rights to all its citizens. Indeed, it is the only country in the region where the Christian community is safe and growing.

David's survey of democratic rights in the region neglects the Palestinian Authority.

Unfortunately, Freedom House characterises the PA as "unfree". There has been no elections there in over 10 years and the PA clamps down on freedom of the press and effective opposition.

Gaza is controlled by Hamas—the Islamic Resistance Movement—which seeks to destroy Israel and replace it by a radical Islamist state between the river Jordan and the Mediterranean sea. Does David, as a champion of the Palestinian cause, think that would be an advance for democracy and progress?

Steven Jaffe, London, Co chair *Northern Ireland Friends of Israel*

Israel has demonstrated a 50-year contempt for democracy

Steven Jaffe (*Letters, October 25*) writes that "Israel is the only free society in the Middle East which guarantees rights to all its citizens".

Is it really true that Israel guarantees equal rights to all its citizens? Not according to former Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert, who once decried what he called the "deliberate and insufferable" discrimination against Arabs in employment (*Haaretz, 12 November 2008*). He continued: "It's terrible that there is not even one Arab employee at the Bank of Israel and at the Electric Company Arab workers represent less than one percent of all employees". Remember approximately a fifth of the population of Israel is Arab.

It is true that Prime Minister Olmert was speaking nearly a decade ago and this awful discrimination against Arabs may have been addressed in the interim. However, if the US State Department is to be believed, it hasn't been eliminated—in its *2016 Report on Human Rights Practices in Israel & the occupied territories* (published on 3 March 2017) the State Department asserts that one of "the most significant human rights problems in Israel" is "institutional and societal discrimination against Arab citizens of Israel, many of whom self-identify as Palestinian, in particular in access to equal education, housing, and employment opportunities".

Clearly, Israel has some way to go to guarantee equal rights to all its citizens.

Dr. David Morrison

Britain's International Development Secretary forced to resign after over-stepping her brief by conducting foreign policy relations with Israel

"Another window on Israel's meddling opened briefly last week (early November). The BBC's political editor, Laura Kuenssberg, took to Twitter to relay a damning comment from an unnamed "senior" member of Ms Patel's party. In a clear reference to Israel, the source observed: "*The entire apparatus has turned a blind eye to a corrupt relationship that allows a country to buy access*" (Extract from: *What the Priti Patel scandal tells us about the dark operations of UK's powerful Israel lobby* (by Jonathan Cook, <http://www.jonathan-cook.net/2017-11-12/priti-patel-uk-israel-lobby/>).

A short time later, presumably under pressure, Ms Kuenssberg deleted the tweet. The BBC has not reported the comment elsewhere and the senior Conservative has not dared go public. Such, it seems, is the intimidating and corrupting influence of the Israel lobby.

David Morrison

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

ENGLISH IRELAND

The present continuous long-drawn-out exit of the UK from the European Union is throwing up some interesting political positions in Ireland. The Taoiseach, Leo Varadkar, Fine Gael, displayed his Poppy to commemorate all the dead soldiers of the British Army who died in all wars. But he tried to ride two horses at once by displaying his Poppy embedded in a green shamrock. Riding two horses is an acrobatic feat that used to be popular in circuses and Leo Varadkar was turning the Dáil into a circus by wearing his defaced Shamrock.

Ireland is a Neutral country and that is in our Constitution. We do have an army, navy and airforce which, because we are Neutral, are called the Defence Forces. Here we are in the middle of commemorating 'Our War of Independence' during which regiments of British soldiers burned, tortured, and killed our people and Leo Varadkar chooses to exhibit and flaunt the very symbol which the British have chosen to commemorate their appalling soldiering.

Also, the proceeds of sale of the poppy emblem is stated by the British Legion to be paid towards comforts and assistance for former British Army persons, which of course includes those now retired British Army who shot and killed Irish people in Derry as recently as Bloody Sunday.

It is said to us by mealy-mouthed people that we should "move on" and "forgive and forget", but is not the wearing of the poppy the evidence that the wearers will not move on and they will not "forgive and forget"? The British as a State is not for forgetting and the poppy-wearing is used as part of the continuing recruitment drive for the British Army. The British Army is still in occupation of the six counties of Ireland, even if their numbers have been much diminished. They haven't gone away—you know!

The Taoiseach's attendance in November at the new Enniskillen Monument with the British Army and the British Legion is of a slightly different order of infamy. Many innocent ordinary Irish

people were killed at Enniskillen and their memory should not be forgotten and it would have been quite appropriate for the Taoiseach to commemorate those who died and those who were injured. But it was frightfully inappropriate for the Taoiseach to attend what was a propaganda exercise for the British Army in Fermanagh, complete with poppy wreaths, British Army personnel, PSNI, and other trappings of the British State in occupation.

It is widely known that the IRA gave a warning of the bomb in Enniskillen, together with its whereabouts well in advance of it exploding and that the warning and its whereabouts were suppressed and withheld. Instead of the warning being acted upon in a proper fashion, innocent people were kettled by the police into the very area where the bomb was. So the commemorate those innocent people is an exercise of vile hypocrisy by the British forces—and Taoiseach Varadkar assisted in that hypocrisy by his official attendance.

The question arises: is Leo Varadkar capable of leading our Nation at this very important time, especially in context of Brexit from Europe? Taoiseach Varadkar is recently on record as saying there will be no border between the six counties and the Irish State. No border—hard or soft—or so he has declared publicly. This stance is being supported by Michel Barnier and the EU negotiators. Ireland is one island and must be treated as one entity. We need to keep our eyes wide open and all our antennae up when we are dealing with perhaps the biggest event in recent political history. Previous Fine Gael Taoisigh have exhibited what are referred to in some print media as Redmondite characteristics and the hallmark Redmondite characteristic is a longing for Irish unity and self-government under British sovereignty i.e. Ireland as a British commonwealth colony.

And so when Taoiseach Varadkar speaks of the necessity for a 32-county Ireland, he could mean either of two very different things. Either a free sovereign independent neutral 32-county Ireland or a self-governing 32-county Ireland as part of the United Kingdom. No true Irish Nationalist will want to even consider the second option.

THE POPPY BUSINESS

Is it at all appropriate for the poppy flower to be a symbol in the month of November? Real poppies flower in June to September. The poppy wreaths are made from coloured plastic in a factory which was, and probably still is, run by the Royal

British Legion. I remember about fifteen years ago the factory produced over 33 million plastic poppies every year. Where does all this money go to?

The following is an extract from Charles Carrington's book 'A Subaltern's War' published in 1929:

"...a little grass had still room to grow between the shell holes. The slope was held by tangle after tangle of rusty barbed wire in irregular lines. But among the wire lay rows of khaki figures, as they had fallen to the machine-guns on the crest, thick as the sleepers in the Green Park on a summer Sunday evening. The simile leapt to my mind at once of flies on a fly paper. I did not know then that twice in the fortnight before our flank attack had a division been hurled at that wire-encircled hill, and twice had it withered away before the hidden machine-guns. The flies were buzzing obscenely over the damp earth; morbid scarlet poppies grew scantily along the white chalk mounds; the air was thick and heavy with rank pungent explosives and the sickly stench of corruption."

At the time the poppy flower was considered to be a weed. The British Generals—who spent their war living in Chateaux commandeered from their French owners and usually about 10 or 25 km behind the fighting lines, knew the war would be over some time and knew they would be held accountable for the loss of life and their treatment of the dead bodies—organised for gardeners to be sent over to France from Kew Gardens to lay out cemeteries in which mostly grass was planted and, where flowers were planted, they were not poppies.

The poppy flower was romanticised later by poets. Only a small proportion of the numbers killed were buried in these "show" cemeteries because most of those who died were buried in the mud and earth thrown up by the bombs or buried in collapsed trenches or drowned in the muddy waters of the bomb craters.

The rows and rows of medals worn proudly on the jacket breasts of the Royal British Legion members at poppy events are not what they seem. Some ribbons and medals were awarded just for being present at an event, others for length of service and some—a very small number were awarded for bravery. Commanders in the battle-field who wanted promotion even invented battles to make themselves look important.

One such invention is recorded by Ronald Skirth in his memoir 'The Reluctant Tommy' published in 2010 by

Macmillan from the original diary held in The Imperial War Museum'. On page 230 we read of a totally spurious report of a fictitious battle in the Italian Alps, drawn up by Commander in Chief, the Italian Expeditionary Force GHQ Italy, the Right Honourable The Earl of Cavan and his co-conspirator Major R.A. Snow, R.G., Artillery:

"Their 'report' implied that Cavan was a military genius far superior to any Italian generals had put his finger on the one vulnerable spot in the Alpine defence line, and by 'holding' a surprise attack made against it—had prevented a major disaster. Snow being the perfect *yes man* in a situation such as this had collaborated. Now they were going to invent some heroes".

And there were casualties (that awful euphemism). In response to orders, one gun was misfired so that it blew up and another was fired at a cliff, causing an avalanche of rock which killed two of the gun crew and seriously injured five men. As a result of the false report, Major Snow was promoted to Lieutenant Colonel and awarded a bar for his DSO, another man was awarded the Military Cross, another (who had run away) got the Military Medal and one of the dead men was posthumously awarded the Distinguished Conduct Medal. Snow ended up as Lieutenant-General Sir Thomas D'Oyly Snow, KCMC, KCB. His big contribution was he to lead the retreat from Mons, snatching defeat from the jaws of victory.

His grandson, Jon Snow says, in 2010, that his grandfather was referred to in reverential terms by his family. He added that his grandfather spent the Battle of the Somme eight kilometres behind the lines in a rural chateau. Jon Snow is to be complimented for his honesty and bravery in writing the Foreword to Ronald Skirth's 'Memoir', of which the above description is a part.

A custom has developed in the Royal British Legion of sons, grandsons, granddaughters and other relatives taking part in their forebear's medals and taking part in the poppy-day parades as if they had themselves had been awarded the medals. There is a good trade in medals and ribbons in antique shops throughout the UK.

The poppy flower is not an emblem of anything glorious. The so-called Great War was pointless and unnecessary and horrific! Thousands were shot by their own army for refusing to "go over the top". They were the sensible ones and—is it not they who should be honoured and not those who survived?

And then also 11th November 1918 was not the end of the Great War. For a year afterwards the British Navy continued the War by criminally blockading German ports and starving the German population—an action which together with the humiliation of the Germans in 'The Treaty of Versailles' paved the way for the rise of Adolf Hitler. Therefore it is obvious to anyone that there is nothing to commemorate about the 11th November 1918 and the whole point of it is just to glorify Britain's wars and act as a recruiting agent for the former.

Michael Stack ©

Pig-Buyers

continued

mafia, gouging the rural and city pig breeders. Many people kept a sow out the back to make a bit of cash.

Redmond owed his political career to the Pig Buyers, whose specialty was organising and initiating booze-fuelled mob violence, with the complicity of the local Tories (or Unionists to you and me).

On the few occasions when Redmond was actually voted into office it was the Pig Buyers who got him elected by brute force. Likewise his son Captain Billy Redmond DSO. So much for Redmond's democratic credentials.

Pat Muldowney

[*Irish Times* from Friday, 12th March 1897, Lord Chief Justice, Sir Peter O'Brien, Bart., opening the Commission for the Assizes in the City Court "yesterday", i.e. Thursday, 11 March 1897:]

"...Nicholas Murphy, John O'Neill, Bryan Cunningham, senior, Patrick Henneberry, and Paul Caulfield, junior, were indicted for riotous and unlawful assembly. ... Mr. Ryan [Q.C., Prosecutor for the Crown] reviewed the history of the dispute in the bacon trade, and said the pig buyers got it into their heads that they had a sort of vested right to sell direct to the merchants, even though the farmers and others might think it better for their interests that they should not do so. Out of this dispute the unfortunate riots—the savage riots—which they were about to investigate, had arisen. On the 22nd of January the riots reached a culminating point, if they had not done so before, and the result was that whether terrorised or not, the men of Richardson's were afraid to act in the employment, and the merchants were obliged to import strangers to work the Yarra Yarra. They were attacked by a mob of the most violent description, and the police who were protecting them were obstructed and assaulted. He asked the jury, having heard the evidence, to find a verdict of guilty by doing which they would be asserting the law

and assisting in putting down violence and outrage.

Acting Sergeant Tobin, Cahir, examined by Mr. Cherry [Q.C, Prosecutor for the Crown], described the attack upon the workers at the Yarra Yarra. He saw Henneberry strike one of the men with a stick, and there there was an attack made upon the police. They were struck again and again, and the police were obliged to draw their batons and repel the onslaught. He saw Bryan Cunningham strike a man named Kavanagh several times with a stick and he pursued him. Paul Caulfield said, "Don't mind that man", and made a stroke at witness. In the melee he got a terrible blow on the nose which broke it.

Cross-examined by Mr. Redmond [Defence, and an MP]—I presume you are very familiar with the appearance of the city? No; there were two or three hundred people in the crowd, and all I am able to identify are the defendants.

The jury found Henneberry and O'Neill guilty. Sentence deferred. ..."

Freeman's Journal/March 2nd

THE BACON TRADE DISPUTE
RELEASE OF PRISONERS AT WATERFORD
Waterford, Monday:

The bacon trade dispute continues unrelentful. To-day Messrs Cunningham, Fitzgerald and Ryan, who were sentenced to three months imprisonment at the Winter Assizes for assaulting bacon merchants, were released. They were met by a number of friends, and yielding to the wishes of the Pigbuyers Association no demonstration took place, and absolute tranquility prevailed. The three men looked well and in good spirits, except Fitzgerald, who could not suppress his grief at entering his home, which was made terribly desolate by the death, during his imprisonment, of his wife, mother of eight children.

Waterford, Monday night:

Late-to-night there was an imposing popular demonstration in celebration of the release of the prisoners. The large multitude was accompanied by a band and fifty torchbearers.

Photo of police escorting pigs to slaughter during 1897 "strike" can be found at:

<https://www.facebook.com/waterfordcivictrust/photos/a.128723807236071.23945.128687730573012/899968556778255/?type=3>
https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=899968556778255&substory_index=0

A HISTORICAL NOTE

Wilson John Haire notes that pigs were kept in Belfast into the 1950s. They were reared in small backyards by the women.

continued on page 31

ARMAGH continued

people got nothing but roseate promises which failed to blossom, and during the time that Irish interests were scandalously sacrificed and he thoroughly deserves the fate which has overtaken him. Mr. Devlin's return was expected from the start, but his opponent's poll was heavier than was anticipated. Captain Redmond was re-elected by a narrow majority. If, as we have said, there had been no compromise over the eight Ulster seats, the great Irish Parliamentary Party would consist of two members without a leader. The "Party" was swept out of Leinster and Connacht. Captain Redmond was the only member who retained his seat in Munster, and were it not for the arrangement we have referred to Mr. Devlin would be the only member of Mr. Dillon's party representing Ulster. Under the compromise Messrs. MacVeigh, Harbison, Donnelly and Kelly were re-elected through the loyal support of the Sinn Feiners.

It is evident that in seven out of these eight seats the agreement between the two parties was honourably observed. But in East Down the treachery of the AOH [Ancient Order of Hibernians] and other local supporters of Mr. Dillon showed itself even before the polling day, with the result that 4,321 votes were cast for Mr. Johnston, Mr. Dillon's candidate, who was supposed to have stood down and the seat was handed over to the Unionists. The net result of the elections is the return of seventy-three Sinn Feiners, while Mr. Devlin has five followers, or, with T.P. O'Connor thrown in, the full strength of the Irish Party will be seven, and the Unionists will return to Parliament with a party of twenty-six as compared with eighteen in the previous House of Commons. The Liberals have disappeared. Sir Thomas Russell's constituency was merged into other divisions of Tyrone, and Mr. John MacNeill won Derry City, the only other Liberal seat.

East Down, a new constituency largely formed out of a division formerly represented by a Nationalist, was by Party treachery given to the Unionists. This is the only direct gain from the Nationalists, the other seats which they won being new Unionist constituencies created by the redistribution. The Unionists did not do as well as they expected. They calculated on winning thirty-two seats in Ulster alone, and would probably have won thirty had it not been for the Ulster compromise. They

now hold twenty-three seats in Ulster against sixteen in the last Parliament, while the Nationalists of both sections have fifteen, which was their number before the Dissolution.

In the metropolitan area the Unionists contested four constituencies and hoped to win three. Their only success was in Rathmines, a new constituency which, we believe, would not have gone Unionist in a straight fight with a Nationalist. But the local supporters of Mr. Dillon put forward a third candidate after the Unionist and Sinn Feiner had been in the field, and so poor was the support accorded him that he forfeits his deposit. As it was, Sir Maurice Dockrell, who won the seat for the Unionists, only beat the combined Nationalist total by 54 votes, and it is more than probable that a number of Nationalists abstained from voting in the circumstances of the contest. However, if a Unionist was to be returned for any Dublin seat, we, in common with most of the citizens, would prefer Sir Maurice Dockrell to any other Unionist.

In the other Dublin contests the Unionists fared badly, and the results in Pembroke and South County Dublin must have surprised them. With the exception of Rathmines, the Sinn Feiners made a clean sweep of all the Dublin City and County seats and of the rest of Leinster. Mr. Clancy, Mr. Nugent and Mr. Field have been defeated, though Mr. Nugent [AOH National Secretary] was confident his seat was a safe one. His constituents, however, gave Mr. Nugent, who should never have been a member of Parliament, his *conge*, despite all his wirepulling and the strong Unionist vote he received.

We regret that Dublin and the country lose the services of Alderman Alfie Byrne, who while in Parliament proved himself a thoroughly useful member.

Madame Markievicz is the only woman candidate in the United Kingdom to be elected. We have no admiration for, and cannot approve of, her extreme brand of politics, and we only regret that some other lady candidate was not found for St. Patrick's Division. This lady MP has proved herself to be lacking in that mental balance which we would like to see in people, be they man or woman, occupying responsible positions, and we think that placing her on a pedestal will do little good either to the Sinn Fein Party or to the country. However, she routed Mr. William Field, one of the "Party" humbugs, and it is evident that she was not the only Sinn

Fein candidate in whose case personality was cast aside and principles voted for. In fact, in many of the contests any candidate would have won for Sinn Fein. (*The Irish Independent*-Monday, Dec. 30, 1918)

SOME NOTES AND COMMENTS

The *Irish Independent* was formed in 1905 as the direct successor to the *Daily Irish Independent*, an 1890s pro-Parnellite newspaper, and was launched by William Martin Murphy, a nationalist businessman and staunch anti-Parnellite.

During the 1913 Lockout of workers, Murphy was the leading figure among the employers, and the *Irish Independent* vigorously sided with its owner's interests.

The *Irish Independent* described the 1916 Easter Rising as "*insane and criminal*" and called for the shooting of its leaders. In December 1919, during the Irish War of Independence, the IRA destroyed the printing works of the paper, angered at its criticism of the Irish Republican Army's attacks on members of the Dublin Metropolitan Police and British Government officials.

For most of its history, the *Irish Independent* gave its political allegiance to the Pro-Treaty party Cumann na nGaedheal and later its successor party, Fine Gael.

During the 28 year Northern War in Ulster and ever since, it has adopted a pathological hatred of the Republican movement and has jettisoned all claim to any rational or objective analysis of the political situation in the Six Counties, and more especially the role of the British Government. Culturally, it could easily be mistaken for an organ from the 'home counties' of south-eastern England.

In 1961 the Harp became the symbol of the *Irish Independent* which originally appeared in black but was changed to green in 1972.

The Pig-Buyers Again

The newspaper extracts below concern aftermath of Waterford Pig Buyers "strike" of 1897, and John Redmond's involvement.

The extracts are from <https://www.flickr.com/photos/nlireland/6797347614/in/photostream/> and they include a photograph which supposedly shows the Lord Chief Justice leaving the Imperial Hotel to take a coach round to the Court House a couple of hundred yards away for the Pig Buyers trial. If you click on the photo you see details like a man holding a jar (of liquor?).

The Pig Buyers were a kind of local

continued on page 33

ARMAGH continued

which to strike down England, and aim an assassin blow at the heart of the Empire. A native Parliament they have tried to foreshadow as a sort of Bolshevik despotism, in which the Protestant minority would be hopelessly at the mercy of a party bent, not on making Ireland a nation of prosperous freemen, but on utilising their new-found powers for a fresh campaign of unrest and disaffection. That is not what the Nationalists of South Armagh desire. They want an end to the age-long struggle. They desire the restoration of their stolen Parliament. They are anxious for an opportunity to build up a new and prosperous Ireland based on Irish ideals and living its life on terms of mutual friendship and complementary benefit with the sister countries. Above all, they are eager for a solution that will enable Catholic and Protestant, Orange and Green, to work together for the common good. All these things Home Rule can accomplish; all these things De Valera's mad campaign of a hopeless republicanism would certainly imperil and probably destroy.

Mr. Donnelly's smashing victory is a warning to the apostles of disruption that the methods of intimidation by armed gangs, imported from outside districts will not be permitted to overawe the country into submission to the insolent dictates of an overbearing Sinn Fein autocracy. The Nationalists of South Armagh were not slaves to be cowed by Mr de Valera's revolver-men. Fighting for national freedom they were not going to be deprived of their own liberty of thought and action. The sturdy voters who have repelled the invading hordes of republicans, have given the Sinn Feiners a much needed lesson in what freedom means. The green flag still floats triumphantly in Ulster; and beneath its folds the manhood of the North will march to assured victory, a victory that will result in the restoration of Ireland's stolen Parliament with powers and privileges undreamt of in the days of Flood and Grattan and the Volunteers of '82.

We hope the lesson of South Armagh will be taken to heart by the visionaries. Their programme and there propaganda can only spread disunion, engender hate, and entail disaster. They have been fairly and squarely beaten in South Armagh. They had at their command immense resources, able and energetic workers, enthusiastic emissaries, and they called to

their assistance other auxiliaries of a less pleasing kind; and they have failed. Time is fighting against them. Illusions are being dispelled. Their bag of tricks is nearly played out. The Republic they promised is never going to materialise. The one way in which they can "deliver the goods" is by beating the British Empire to a frazzle, and the most gullible devotee of a "ten-foot pike" no longer dreams of that. Why not own up, have done with *ramies*, and let Ireland unite on the old lines laid down by Charles Stewart Parnell and concentrate on a demand for a broad and generous scheme of legislative freedom? If not, Nationalist Ireland must set her house in order. South Armagh has given a gallant lead. And as the North began, so will all Ireland step into line until a free nation sends her delegates once more to legislate in a Parliament really representative of Ireland one and undivided. (*Evening Telegraph*, Dublin-Saturday, February 2, 1918)

The *Evening Telegraph* was launched in 1871 by a former Irish nationalist, Lord Mayor of Dublin Edmund Dwyer Gray. The newspaper was unavowedly Irish nationalist in its politics. It was originally a weekly newspaper but soon became daily (except Sundays).

The paper was published between 1871 and 1924. It was taken over by the *Freeman's Journal*, the main daily Nationalist newspaper.

The *Freeman's Journal* was established in 1763 and ran continuously till 1924 when it was absorbed into the *Irish Independent*. It had been a Pro-Parnell organ during the split in the Irish Party but later changed its allegiance and supported the anti-Parnellite cause. Until the 1990s, the *Irish Independent* included the words 'Incorporating the *Freeman's Journal*' in its mast-head over its editorials. In the editorial article below, it is about to do another political somersault, which ultimately would have disastrous consequences for Republicans.

GENERAL ELECTION, 1918 (Polling Day: 14 December; Declaration of Polls: 28.12.1918)

As a result of the 80 contested elections in the counties, boroughs and universities, and the unopposed return of 25 Sinn Fein candidates, the representation of Ireland stands as follows:—

Sinn Fein..... 73
Unionists..... 25

Independent Unionist 1
Irish Party..... 6

SNOWED UNDER

(*Irish Independent-December 30, 1918*)

It is not so very long ago since Lord French and Mr. Shortt were congratulating themselves that Sinn Fein was on the wane, and that with plenty of firm government i.e., Prussianism, it would soon dwindle to extinction. This only proves how slight is our rulers' knowledge of Ireland and how futile are Prussian methods. The Irish people showed by their votes at the General Election their disapproval of the present system of governing Ireland and their disgust at the humbug, muddling and treachery of the Irish Parliamentary Party. The withdrawal of the Irish Labour and Independent Parties from the contests left a clear issue between Sinn Fein and "Party" men in the whole of three provinces, except a few Dublin constituencies, Westmeath and Cork City. The results announced today show that the rout of the "Party" was even greater than the average Irishman anticipated. It was an overwhelming landslide.

The people expressed their wrath in the polling booths and wiped the discreditable and corrupt "Party" practically out of existence. If there had not been compromise affecting certain Ulster seats the remnant of the "Party" would have consisted of Mr. Devlin and Captain Redmond. But this compromise arranged to prevent the handing-over to the Unionists of eight seats made a present of four of them to Mr. Dillon's late party, which now consists of six members, or seven with T.P. O'Connor [Liverpool-Scotland Division], as compared with the one-time solid eighty-five, or with the present Sinn Fein Party of seventy-three. It is a pitiful position for a once-powerful Party to occupy. For many years it enjoyed the full confidence of the people of Ireland. Now it has been scouted out of public life in a manner without precedent, and all because of its humbugging antics, its corruption, and its scandalous neglect and betrayal of Irish interests. The steadily rising wave of public discontent at last engulfed the "Party". Today Mr. Dillon, beaten two to one in a constituency which he represented for 33 years, and nearly all of his followers find themselves without seats.

Mr. Dillon was Mr. Redmond's right-hand man during all the years that the Irish

continued on page 34



1918: A tale of two elections!

ARMAGH ABU!

(Evening Telegraph-Saturday, February 2, 1918)

**The North began; the North held on
The strife for native land!
Till Ireland rose, and quelled her foes—
God bless the Northern land!**

SOUTH ARMAGH BY-ELECTION

(February 2, 1918)

Patrick Donnelly (Nationalist) 2,324
Dr. Patrick MacCartan (Sinn Fein) 1,305
Thomas Wakefield Richardson
(Ind. Unionist) 40

Never was the blessing more thoroughly deserved than to-day, when, answering the wreckers' challenge, South Armagh, the sentinel of that North of which Davis sang, has hurled back the invading forces, and with magnificent emphasis renewed her pledge of loyalty to the old cause and of fealty to the men, who through long years of ceaseless labour and sacrifice, in the teeth of cowardly calumny and malign misrepresentation, have given freely of their manhood, their intellect and their energy that Ireland might be free.

This hour of glorious triumph compensates for many long months during which it seemed as if the Nationalist cause was to go down under an avalanche of falsehood and terrorism. But through it all there were true hearts and brave hands that never faltered; men of courage and determination, who knew that when the whirlwind of passion had exhausted itself and reason resumed its sway, the country would swing back into line and refuse to allow the great purpose of Parnell to be sacrificed to the mad dream of impracticable visionaries.

The return of Mr. Donnelly for South Armagh will give new heart and hope to every Irishman anxious for an era of freedom and progress. It is the first definite

declaration from the Nationalists of Ulster, who have shirked no sacrifice and shunned no danger, but who are not prepared to be fooled with transparent blatherskite about nebulous republics that are as likely as Utopia or the Millennium. Mr de Valera with his ten-foot pikes, his Peace camouflage, his ludicrous plebiscites and "constituent assemblies," and the gigantic joke of disfranchisement, imported from Hungary, makes no appeal to the seasoned and serious Nationalists of the North. The men who all these years in Ulster have carried on the National Cause mean business. They want to see this old land given a chance of building up her nationhood. Not fifty or a hundred years hence, but here and now, they want to see the good work started within Ireland's grasp, if she will but take advantage of the opportunity, is the great prize for which, from the days of O'Connell to those of Redmond, generation after generation has struggled and sacrificed. What consummate, colossal folly and infamy it would be to wreck it all for the sake of what Cardinal Logue described as "*a dream*

which no man in his sober senses can hope to see realised."

By none of our race will the news be received with greater joy and enthusiasm than by our exiled kith and kin the great free Republic of the West. South Armagh has sent across the Atlantic the cheering message that Nationalist Ulster repudiated Sinn Fein's "Gallant Allies in Europe," whose menace to free institutions and democratic progress compelled America to unsheathe the sword. South Armagh declares that Irish Nationalists repudiate and abhor Mr de Valera's insulting suggestions of potential hypocrisy against the American President.

As John Devoy, the most implacable of the Clan-na-Gael enemies of the Constitutional movement, has been forced to admit, Ireland's hope during the war rests exclusively on the pressure President Wilson can bring to bear on England. Only a party capable of the egregious ineptitudes that have characterised Sinn Fein would at such a juncture have put forward as their candidate a man whose election would be regarded as a slap in the face to the American President. South Armagh has saved Ireland and the Irish cause from the danger that so criminal a blunder would have involved.

The triumph of reason and patriotism in South Armagh comes just at a moment when a victory for republican lunacy would have encouraged the Die-hard champions of ascendancy to fight tooth and nail against any settlement. It has all along been the cue of the ascendancy faction to represent Ireland as irrevocably committed to a policy of Separation, and willing only to accept Home Rule as a weapon with

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

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

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

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

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

You can also order from:
<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>

continued on page 35