

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

February 2018

Vol.33, No.2 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.32 No.2 ISSN 954-5891

Barry McElduff's resignation in its context

About A Loaf Of Bread!

Humbug and hypocrisy have a part to playing the smooth running of a functional political system. But they are all that there is in the Northern Ireland system, which is not a functional political system at all.

We have been saying for more than forty years that the nationalist tactic of currying favour with the Unionist community by a rigorously applied hypocrisy of ultra-correct politeness is a waste of effort. The Unionists will not be impressed. Neither will Fianna Fail or Fine Gael as far as Sinn Fein is concerned. Both have been in denial about the realities of Northern Ireland ever since their foundation.

The Unionists have no need to be politically correct in return. They can play the part of virtuously rejecting the advances of a rapist.

Barry McElduff has been browbeaten into resigning his seat in the Parliament which he never attended—and to which he was elected for the declared purpose of not attending it. And the reason is a bit of clowning in a supermarket with a loaf of Kingsmill 50/50 bread.

We have no idea if he had an intention beyond clowning, or, if he had, which bit of the loaf was the message. But the 50/50 would seem to be what is most relevant to the present state of affairs. The Protestant/Unionist majority, if it still exists, is wafter thin, and a Catholic Unionist presence has yet to make itself felt.

Ian Paisley hoped to cultivate a Catholic Unionist development by pleasant relations. The Unionist community was offended by this and rejected him, and the Official Unionists moved into his party in large numbers, so that it no longer knows what it is. All that can be said is that his policy of cultivating pleasant relations with Sinn Fein has been rejected by the DUP.

continued on page 2

Brexit and the future of the EU:

views from Sinn Fein and the political fringe

Since the British referendum in June 2016 much attention has focussed on the various shifts and changes in Government thinking that have followed in the wake of Brexit, but responses from radical sources have also been important. Sinn Fein's policy of demanding a special EU status for the North is a case in point. Relatedly, it is not so long ago that the first *Nice* and *Lisbon Referenda* were won by fringe elements from right and left, especially from the left, showing that anti-EU sentiment emanating from the fringe can be influential. A number of recent initiatives from those quarters are worth looking at.

In early February a conference being organised in Dublin on the theme of '*Ireland: free to prosper*' is to be addressed by Nigel Farage. In early December the Peace and Neutrality Alliance (PANA) rallied opposition to PESCO (Permanent Structured Cooperation on security and defence

continued on page 9

Passport Blues

The UK Government was very pleased to announce in December the return of the 'iconic' blue British passport from October 2019, which British citizens will be able to admire as they wait in the lines for non-EU passport holders at European airports in the post-Brexit future.

An unrelated 'passporting' issue has been increasingly preoccupying the UK's financial services industry however. This relates to the authorisation, or 'passport' required by

firms which wish to market financial services, and in particular fund management services, within the EU after Brexit.

Currently London-based firms enjoy these passporting rights and according to the *Financial Times* up to a third of $\text{€}22\text{tn}$ (that is € trillions) of EU client money is managed in London generating billions in management and transaction fees, so it is a very big deal indeed (FT, *Asset managers fear delegation changes post-Brexit*, 19.01.18).

This money is composed of EU savings,

bank deposits, pension funds, insurance funds, company reserves etc and is managed through a variety of structures, some of which are arranged according to individual member state regulations, but many according to EU standardised fund structures, such as '*UCITS*', Undertakings for the Collective Investment in Transferable Securities, or '*AIFs*', Alternative investment Funds.

The point of these standardised

continued on page 14

About A Loaf Of Bread! Editorial. <i>Barry McElduff's resignation in its context.</i>	1
Brexit and the future of the EU: <i>views from Sinn Fein and the political fringe.</i>	
Dave Alvey	1
Passport Blues. Seán Owens	1
Readers' Letters: Barry McElduff MP. Pat Walsh (with Report of Andrew Madden's <i>Class Clown Persona Falls Flat</i>)	3
Northern Ireland And Professor Nicholas Mansergh. Martin Mansergh.	
Some Comments. Brendan Clifford	4
The O'Connor Column (Abortion: supporting a "conscience vote"; Vinegar Hill and <i>Irish Times</i> memory; Merkel's socialists; Did MI5 order the assassination of Charles Haughey?; The Blueshirts and Queen Vic; New Unionism?; Trump brings clarity to US "foreign policy")	6
Shannon Airport Should Not Be Used To Cheer Troops On To War.	
Shannonwatch (Press Release)	12
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (A World of Books)	13
Bielenberg does what he condemns in Peter Hart. Jack Lane	16
Some thoughts prompted by a reflection on the role of Bishop O'Dwyer of Limerick in the Easter Rising. Brian P. Murphy osb (Part 1 of review of <i>The Atlas of the Irish Revolution</i>)	17
Dev—maths teacher? Pat Muldowney	19
Cynical <i>Sindo</i> Suggestions Of Sinn Fein Assassination. Manus O'Riordan	20
Special Nature Of Hiroshima-Nagasaki. Desmond Fennell	22
The Russian Revolution. Brendan Clifford (100th Anniversary. Part 3)	23
January Brexit Summary. Dave Alvey	25
Biteback: Looking Back Through The Iron Curtain. Donal Kennedy	
Courts Set The Tone For The Garda. Tom Cooper	27
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Bitcoin Bubble; Gender Balance)	28
Child Varadkar at Davos. Jack Lane	29

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

Fake News and Micheál Martin

(back page)

Dark Days Ahead For Our Infrastructure

Michael Robinson

(page 30)

Is 'Ulster' preparing to fight if it goes down to 49?

The Dublin Establishment is certainly encouraging it to repudiate the democratic principle of majority decision if it ceases to be the majority.

51% is ample for the legitimization of the Union but would not be good enough for Irish unity! So says Fine Gael and Fianna Fail—parties which until 19 years ago denied constitutionally that Britain had any right to hold the Six Counties in the United Kingdom. What they now say, in effect, is: *Ulster is British, regardless.*

Barry McElduff might have been telling the Unionists that they are a declining people. They were given a 'State' in which they were 66% and have managed to reduce themselves to 50%.

Or maybe he was referring to the massacre. (But, if that is credible, why does the murderously sectarian bread continue to be sold in the North?)

But doesn't everyone who lives in the reality of the North on the nationalist side

know what this massacre was about and what its social effect was? (Or are there some who are able to live in sanctimonious denial every instant of their lives?)

It was a massacre to stop massacres—and at least it did the job much better than the Great War to end war. (Catholic families in the area had been targeted, some constitutional nationalists, others not in politics at all. If there was a common element, it was that the families were well-established in their communities.)

The IRA denies that it did it, and there is good reason to suppose that it didn't. The capacity for purposeful action in the crisis that began in August 1969 preceded the formation of what we know as the IRA. The *Defence Committees* were impressive before there was an IRA as we know it. Most of them were driven towards the IRA by Jack Lynch's reckless prosecution of John Kelly in 1970, but in some areas the IRA was effective in conjunction with local organisations that did not depend on it.

Well, a massacre was carried out that took pains to be seen as 'sectarian', and that was not in the Republican style. The message seemed to be that, if the Protestants wanted sectarian war, they could have it. And it seemed that they decided not to have it.

The Protestant community was in the extraordinary position of being the majority population in a region where a War was being fought, and having their future at stake in the War, but not being a party to the War.

They had precipitated the War by the action of their communal police force and paramilitaries in August 1969, which brought a new IRA into being. But the IRA made war on the State, not on them, and they were in some very important respects not properly a part of the state which they insisted on being 'connected' with. Their devolved apparatus of state was brushed aside by State authority in September 1969 because of the trouble it caused. It had failed in its role as a buffer between the only legitimate State authority and the projected appearance of a Six County 'state' which it had required the Unionist community to operate as a condition of maintaining "*the British connection*".

Devolved authority, disconnected from representation in central state authority—an extraordinary arrangement, not repeated with Scottish and Welsh devolution—had provoked instead acting as a buffer. The government of the actual state had to assert itself in its Six County region. And the new IRA declared war on it.

Fianna Fail, Fine Gael and Labour were bewildered by the turn of events in the North, and they didn't know what was going on there. But Rory O'Brady, orientated in the reality of things by his loyalty to the *Living Dáil* of 1921, knew what was what. He declared war on the Government of the State with the intention of letting the Unionist community be. He hit at the State, reducing the Unionists to the role of onlookers. But all Unionists were not content to be onlookers in a war between others which would decide their fate. They wanted to be involved. And the way they saw to be involved was to kill Catholics for the purpose of encouraging them to turn against the IRA.

(It is quite likely that British Intelligence infiltration of the Loyalists promoted this tactic, which had been used in other colonial situations. Certainly it could claim an honourable precedent. The innocent civilians of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were

exterminated by President Truman in order to put pressure on the Japanese Government to surrender, and has never been judged to be immoral by any one of the many United Nations institutions which stand for law, morality, benevolence, mothers and apple pie. Another American motive, even less connected to saving American lives, was to tame the Soviet Union which did not have nuclear weapons at the time.

The probability is that Kingsmill saved lives. But this is something that cannot be said. It is something that is well known but that must not be said. (Well, Susan McKay managed to say it quickly on Radio Ulster on January 17th, after a week of moral humbug, but the programme was quickly hustled away from the subject.)

So we support the Kingsmill Massacre, do we? If stating the whys and wherefores of it can be understood only as supporting it by certain minds—and that is probably the case with many minds down South who keep themselves in virtuous ignorance of Northern realities—well we can only leave them to understand it in that way.

Some time before Kingsmill, Merlyn Rees, the (Labour) Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, guided the Sunningdale Agreement to destruction. Sunningdale was the work of Tory Prime Minister Ted Heath, and his old ruling class assistant, William Whitelaw. Heath, though middle class, had a competent Imperialist grasp of many things. The Bloody Sunday massacre in Derry is most realistically understood as an *administrative massacre* to test the strength of will of the nationalist community. Jack Lynch phoned him up, seething with indignation, but offered to overlook it if Heath promised that nothing like it would ever happen again. Heath brushed aside the protest and treated the request for promises with contempt. Then he got together with Whitelaw, a highly competent, emollient remnant of the old aristocratic ruling class, and hustled the Unionists and Nationalists into the Sunningdale system of weighted majority rule, without any definite weights, to be conducted under the handling of a Secretary of State. Then Heath lost a General Election and Merlyn Rees took over the Sunningdale system. He was petty bourgeois Labour, with a head full of irrelevant ideals, and effectively the Connolly Association as his adviser. Sunningdale was on the rocks in months.

The *Times* correspondent in Belfast, Robert Fisk, then wrote a book about the

Barry McElduff MP

Some people may not have seen the McElduff video, which eventually led to his resignation. To me he was simply making a fool out of himself in a garage shop, pretending he couldn't find any bread while having a loaf on the top of his head. He does that kind of thing all the time—self-mocking. I presume it was sheer coincidence that the loaf was Kingsmill and it was the anniversary. I am quite shocked nobody has defended him. The whole thing is quite ridiculous and the victims have crossed the line into politics. It is hard to see why he would intentionally cause offence. Obviously there was no one there to tell him of the tenuous connection but eagle eyed unionists wanting to make it.

Pat Walsh

Editorial Note: The *Irish News* joined in the general accusatory commentary on the 'Kingsmill' incident, except for some brief remarks from Andrew Madden:

"Class clown persona falls flat

Barry McElduff is well known for his zany sense of humour. Famed for his "class clown" persona, the west Tyrone MP frequently posts light-hearted videos on social media. Last year, he posted a video of himself going into "DUP territory" in the Stormont buildings to get a chocolate bar from the vending machine.

Strangely, Mr McElduff does seem to have a habit of taking pictures of himself with drink and foodstuffs on his head. In the past 24 hours, at least four such pictures of the MP balancing drinks tins and a chocolate bar on his head have emerged online.

In December 2015, the then-west Tyrone MLA even graced the stage at Daly's Comedy Club in Omagh for a stand up comedy set, however, the politician did not pursue this career for long.

Mr McElduff is also known to have performed comedy sets at various Sinn Féin functions.

The Tyrone man has also ventured into the literary world, publishing two non-fiction books to date.

His first book, *Keep er' Lit*, contained 92 short stories and anecdotes garnered from his experiences of republicanism, GAA and community activism. His latest offering, *Sustain the Flame*, looks back at how he has embraced social media..." (12.1.18).

Ulster Workers' Strike called *The Strike That Broke The British In Ulster*. But the demand of the Ulster Workers' Council was not the abolition of power-sharing, but a slowing down of the implementation of the Council of Ireland dimension of the agreement, in the light of the recent re-assertion of the Dublin Coalition of the Sovereignty claim of the Republic over the Six Counties. (That was in its pleading in response to a legal action brought against it by Kevin Boland.) Rees refused to negotiate with the UWC. When the Strike proved effective, he just pulled down the whole Sunningdale system—which had not been a demand of the Strike. And he drew the same conclusion as Fisk—that British rule in the Six Counties was about to end.

He then assembled Protestant paramilitary leaders at Conferences on the Continent, told them that Britain was going to be pulling out, and advised them to prepare to take matters into their own hands. That was his *Ulsterisation* policy.

Ulsterisation meant war between the Protestant and Catholic communities in place of war between the IRA and the British Army.

The Kingsmill response of 5th January

followed a spate of killings, most notably on the day before when three members of the Reavey family and four members of the O'Dowd families were gunned down. It was an indication that, if Ulsterisation took off, there were effective resources within the Catholic community to fight 'Sectarian' as well as Republican war. It acted as an effective deterrent. And within the Republican movement the line was held against Ulsterisation by Gerry Adams and his associates.

These things cannot be dealt with honestly, largely because of ongoing denial by 'Constitutional Nationalism' (SDLP, Fine Gael, Fianna Fail) that there was ever a Northern Ireland War.

A British Army of 26,000 was deployed in Northern Ireland, which was always declared to be an integral part of the United Kingdom state. After more than a quarter of a century of military effort by the State it was acknowledged that the War was unwinnable. An agreement was struck under which prisoners of war held by the State—as internees at first, and then under spurious criminalisation—were released, de-criminalised, and invited to play a part

in such government as Northern Ireland enjoys.

What is the name for something like this? A war. And what kind of war? Since it was settled within the state in which it was fought, it must be a civil war.

The Free State/Republic asserted a right of Constitutional sovereignty over the North the whole time the War was being fought.

It did not recognise the legitimacy of either belligerent in the War.

It denied that the Six Counties were legitimately held within the British state, and it denied that the Nationalist third of the population in the North had the right to resist the unconstitutional government to which it was subject.

It did not authorise the Provisional IRA to make war on the unconstitutional British Government of the North. But neither did it revoke its assertion of sovereignty over the North. It reserved to itself the right to make war with Britain in the North—that was made clear by the Court Pleading of Drs. C.C. O'Brien and G. FitzGerald against Boland in 1974. That Government said it would never avail of its right to make war on Britain in the North, as did all succeeding Governments, but it reserved that right to itself and condemned the IRA for acting without its authority.

However, the Judicial part of the 'separated' Powers of the state did recognise that the IRA had war-making rights in the North under the Eire Constitution and the Courts prohibited extradition to the North for military actions committed in the North.

And, on top of all of that, the Dublin Establishment, while being bound by the Constitution to deny that Britain had any right to govern the North, also denied that the form of British government in the North was grossly undemocratic by any standards that could be applied. (The Parties that governed the state excluded the Six Counties from their sphere of operation, and that Party connection between the electorate and the Government of the state is what constitutes democracy in its modern meaning.)

When the Agreement ending the War was made between the IRA and Whitehall in 1998, Dublin got in on the act, and eminent figures were heard to say that this was the concluding act of the Anglo-Irish War—i.e., the one that started in 1919. But the Dublin Government refused to act

in accordance with this view. It did not release its prisoners taken in the course of the War and wipe the sheet clean for a fresh start—which Whitehall did in great part.

It used to be the case when Wars were ended by agreement that all events of the War, instead of being raked over as if they were the acts of individuals committed in peacetime, were covered by an Act of Oblivion, either formal or tacitly understood. There was on the British side a substantial gesture in that direction, but in Dublin there was a complete refusal to see incidents in the War as anything but criminal actions committed by people of evil disposition.

And, when Sinn Fein emerged as a major Party in the South—gaining support, not despite its part in the War in the North but because of it—the established Parties began dragging up incidents of the Northern War against it as criminal actions, denying that there ever was a War.

What was required at the end of the War was closure in the form of official consensus that there had been a War—a war of a very unusual kind because of the very unusual kind of government that provoked it—and that individual incidents should be treated as incidents of war.

If that had been done, then individual incidents in the War would long since have entered experience as war incidents. It was chiefly the conduct of the Dublin Establishment that ensured that personal resentment should be the form of remembrance—personal resentment given one-sided public expression.

This is possibly an ongoing effect of the British-imposed, and essentially spurious 'civil war' of 1922-3, encouraged by the Oxbridge influence to which Southern academia offered itself up about forty years ago. But, whatever the cause, it is despicable and inexcusable—unless we have all become Lutheran disbelievers in free will.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR · LETTERS TO THE EDITOR · LETTERS TO THE

Northern Ireland And Professor Nicholas Mansergh

I note that *Irish Political Review* January 2018 contains a promotion for a book by Brendan Clifford entitled *NORTHERN IRELAND: WHAT IS IT? Professor Mansergh Changes His Mind*. The problem is that he didn't, not on this subject.

The issue involved is the proper description of the status of Northern Ireland, past and present. I agree with Brendan Clifford that Northern Ireland is not a state. It is obviously not a sovereign state, but nor is it a state in the sense in which, say, Alabama is a state under a federal system. Because Northern Ireland had up until 1972 certain institutions normally associated with a state called the Government and the Parliament of Northern Ireland, numerous historians, commentators and politicians, including occasionally even a Sinn Féin one, have loosely called Northern Ireland a state, though never with a capital 'S', as would happen, officially at least, in Alabama. In fact, two books coming from very different directions, *The Orange State* by Michael Farrell and *States of Ireland* by Conor Cruise O'Brien, have the offending word in their title. Even Brendan Clifford refers to it as a pseudo-state at the end of his book, which is accurate in substance, even if pejorative in tone.

Whatever the rights and wrongs of a

commonly found loose usage, Clifford's main indictment is directed against Nicholas Mansergh, one person who did *not* describe Northern Ireland as a state, and who did not change his mind on the subject, between the publication of his early political science book *The Government of Northern Ireland: A Study in Devolution* and the early 1980s. The claim that he did seems to be based solely on the fact that he wrote a foreword to a book published in 1983 called *British Policy and the Irish Administration 1920-1922* by John McColgan, which describes in some detail the transfer of power administratively to the Irish Free State and Northern Ireland at the time of their formation. Writing a foreword to any book rarely implies blanket endorsement of the entire content of the book or of all of the terminology the author chooses to use in it. The US-based author, while thanking Professor Mansergh for his support and criticisms and a number of well-known UCD historians in particular in his preface, begins with the caveat 'all errors and inaccuracies of this work are my own'. This is of course ignored by Brendan Clifford, who attributes them exclusively to Nicholas Mansergh. In the body of the work, without arguing any special point about it, McColgan makes a handful of scattered references to Northern Ireland as a state. Perhaps he should have

been pulled up on this, but there was no change of mind by Professor Mansergh, because if there had been it would have been reflected in his own subsequent written work, and it wasn't.

In 1991, the year he died, Yale University Press published my father's final book *The Unresolved Question: The Anglo-Irish Settlement and Its Undoing 1912-72*. It includes two chapters on Northern Ireland, which is described in several places as 'a political entity' (influence of Charles Haughey's 1980 expression, perhaps?) and as 'a devolved region in the United Kingdom', but not as a state. Indeed, he wrote that Section 75 of the Government of Northern Ireland Act, 1920 could hardly have been more explicit in asserting a single sovereignty, not coordination but subordination, and he is dismissive of an early criticism that the UK had turned into some class of a federation, the only basis on which Northern Ireland could strictly be described as a state.

The scaffold around which Brendan Clifford constructs his indictment of so many professional historians writing about Ireland, the premise that Professor Mansergh changed his mind about the status of Northern Ireland in 1983 as part of some speculative British-led ideological conspiracy, collapses on closer inspection. That an author would write a book of 270 odd pages based on a contention bereft of any substantial supportive evidence is bizarre. I do agree, however, with his preliminary remark to the effect that the material for this book, which was to have been part of another project, got out of hand.

Martin Mansergh

Some Comments

Northern Ireland: What Is It? is of course not academic. Nobody paid me to write it. Nor is it polemical, as virtually all academic writing on the subject is, and as Martin Mansergh's letter is. It is an objective political attempt to describe what Northern Ireland is and to review the polemical academic literature about it. It concentrated on Professor Mansergh because he was the British academic presence where Irish affairs were concerned, and was also an influential presence in the administration of the State, and in the influential State/Political overlap, Chatham House, which has no equivalent in Ireland.

Ten years ago there was a securely established academic consensus that said Northern Ireland was a state. Lord Bew of the Queen's University had been saying it since the mid-1970s. He got himself made semi-official historian in the British administration by saying it and, poor lost soul, he eventually found peace in the Lords rest-home. In Cork University Dermot Keogh, who had seen a vision of Fascism at the burning of the British Embassy (in Dublin) in 1972, cultivated the notion as a means of disowning all Irish responsibility for the North. I had been pointing out for decades that Northern Ireland was not a state. Then, by way of taking leave of the Northern Ireland question, I wrote the book about it which gave prominence to Professor Mansergh's view on the essential question. And seven years later Fianna Fail politician Martin Mansergh takes issue with it over its subtitle: *Professor Mansergh Changes His Mind*.

Protestant culture lays great emphasis on the word, the bare word as distinct from the thought. I have often noticed this and attributed it to the ongoing influence of the inspired *King James* version. A Queen's academic, Walker, in a book which I do not have to hand, crushed my case by finding a use by Mansergh of the term '*Northern Ireland state*' and listing it in the Index of his own book without any further explanation or reference.

The instance of Mansergh's change of mind that I gave was the part he played in a book of 1983, John McColgan's *British Police And The Irish Administration 1920-22*. The '*Northern Ireland state*' propaganda in defence of British policy was already dominant academically by then and this book played into it. Martin Mansergh snatches at straws to explain away his father's part in this book. But in fact his father had succumbed to the '*Northern Ireland state*' propaganda long before 1983 in the course of his rise from mere academic to academic-political status.

His *Ireland In The Age Of Reform And Revolution* (1940) has a section on *The Unionist State*, in which he remarks that "*Stormont is the offspring of no wanton extravagance, but rather it is the symbol of the permanent stability of the Northern State...*"

And a quarter of a century later in *The Irish Question* (1965) there is again a section entitled *The Unionist State*. And: "*No government in Europe, is the boast, has been so stable. In this respect,*

therefore, the calculations of 1920 have been well-founded".

But he writes about The Northern Ireland State while still knowing very well that it is not a state: "*The forms of democracy remain, but its spirit can scarcely flourish in a political atmosphere so frozen that up to 70% of the seats have been uncontested at general elections...*"

Of course it was abnormally stable because it was not a state. It was rigidly stable until it blew apart.

It is was and was not a state. It was given the semblance of being a state for certain purposes but it never lived the life of a state.

"*Even Brendan Clifford refers to it as a pseudo-state*". So he does. What is "*pejorative*" about that? It uses the term *pseudo-* as it is used in many other combinations. It is a sham appearance projected by the actual state.

Mansergh senior never followed through on his 1935 writing. As a mere academic he pointed out that it was not a state but did not say what it was in what concerned democratic government. Later on, as he entered the corridors of political power, he wrote about it as a state without accounting for what he had written five years earlier. He behaved opportunistically. British democracy is a powerful incentive to opportunism. Northern Ireland populations were excluded from the possibility of opportunist reconciliations which never acknowledge themselves as such.

"*in Ulster victory has lain with the extreme Right*" (Mansergh 1940 p182). This is a judgment delivered within the spectrum of the political life of the British state—the very thing from which the Six Counties were excluded.

If Northern Ireland is not a state, then it was set up to be an undemocratically-governed region of the British state, and the state which undemocratised it has the responsibility for what happened in it. Mansergh junior now agrees that it is not itself a state but denies all that follows from that.

And, if he is concerned to establish that it is not a state, he should take issue with all the public figures, academics and political institutions that maintain the notion that it is, rather than waste his time with me.

Brendan Clifford

The O'Connor Column

ABORTION: WHY THE 'COLUMN' (RELUCTANTLY) SUPPORTS A "CONSCIENCE VOTE"

Functional democracies are organised not around direct representation but party politics. Parties are the vehicles that form and organise the expression of the public political will. The 2011 surge in the election of Independent TDs represented a type of temporary anti-party rebellion in protest at the unfortunate form in which the Great Irish Boom came to an end. This phenomenon is now quite plainly coming to an end. The effect of weak parties is to deliver undue influence to non-democratic self-appointed forces, whether in the media, the world of NGOs, the economy or wherever. The restoration of party power in the system has to be welcomed.

Conscience votes can be described as a functionally necessary cop-out. The alternative is the breaking of the basic 'civil war' divide that in its broadest sense provides substance and direction to Irish politics in shaping Irish sovereignty and the purposes of the state, and its replacement by "*identity politics*", necessarily driven by unaccountable extra-parliamentary forces. Imposing whips on the abortion issue would have the effect of re-aligning Irish parties along such socio-cultural identity lines, inducing a further Americanisation of the political arena.

By allowing a conscience vote, the 'civil war' can be temporarily suspended to allow the solving of the dysfunctional legal situation in relation to abortion provision, with a resumption of normal 'civil war' politics once it is resolved.

This does not absolve political leadership of its role, as a political decision must be made on the Eighth Amendment and what comes after its repeal, assuming its repeal will be supported by the electorate. Leaders need to take unequivocal positions on the issue, as Varadkar, Martin, MacDonald, Boyd Barrett and others, to be fair to them, have been doing. Thereafter the nuances of varying views across society and in different parts of the country can be reflected in the stances of individual TDs.

In the circumstances, clear leadership preferences combined with a conscience vote is the optimal way forward to

preserve the robustness of Irish party politics. May the most coherent side win!

VINEGAR HILL AND *IRISH TIMES* MEMORY

Two great *cause celebres* of the 'sectarian' school of Irish history (a fake history which presents centuries of events in Ireland as a long and absurd catalogue of injustices by Catholics against Protestants) were the Fethard-on-Sea "boycott" of the late 1950s and the Scullabogue incident during the 1798 Rebellion, when somewhere between 100 and 200 loyalist prisoners were killed when the barn they were held in went on fire. A great acreage of newsprint, with *The Irish Times* to the fore, countless articles in *History Ireland* and numerous academic treatments were devoted to these two incidents in the late 1990s, all invariably portraying them as examples of a shameful Catholic sectarian history.

But of course Fethard was not the simple morality play its latter day promoters pretend. Firstly the children concerned had been spirited away to "Ulster" with local connivance by one of the parent's families, who were connected with militant Protestant evangelicals, and the consequent boycott of Protestant businesses in Fethard rapidly collapsed after it was condemned by then Taoiseach de Valera. The Scullabogue incident was similarly far from straightforward. Some of those killed were Catholics: it was an anti-loyalist rather than anti-Protestant event, occurring in the midst of a conflict involving many far worse massacres by the Yeomanry. No one seriously disputes these contexts today.

But endlessly repeating them serves a purpose. As recently as February 2017 *The Irish Times* yet again recalled Fethard and Scullabogue as two events still burned into the minds of Protestants in the south-east, forever kindling fears of Catholic sectarianism (*The hidden history of southern Protestants*, IT 10.02.17).

A recent notable archaeological find using new ground scanning techniques was made at Vinegar Hill near Enniscorthy. This was the scene of a major battle during the 1798 Rebellion. A mass grave was discovered on the north face of the hill containing the remains of between 1,500 and 2,000 people, mostly women and children. The archaeologists have reason to believe it is just one of several such mass

graves in the vicinity. The victims were slaughtered following the withdrawal of the Irish forces when the English yeomanry and their local Irish loyalist allies stormed the hill. Massacres on such a scale were commonplace during the 'suppression' of the 1798 rebellion. According to recent (revisionist) conventional wisdom—which clashes with pre-revisionist nationalist memory—rebel casualties at Vinegar Hill had amounted to only "*between 500 and 1,000 including camp followers*", with British casualties "*about 100*" (thus Kevin Whelan, *Reinterpreting the 1798 Rebellion in County Wexford*, in Keogh & Furlong eds., *The Mighty Wave—The 1798 Rebellion in County Wexford*, 1996, p. 28). Hopefully we will hear from Whelan in relation to how the new discoveries impact on his theory.

The find was reported in the local press, and also in low-key reports in the *Irish Examiner* (09.09.2017) and *Irish Independent* (16.09.2017). Don't expect even a fraction of a rood of the acreage of newsprint devoted to Fethard/Scullabogue to be expended on this significant historical discovery—no point raking over all that etc. Incidentally, a scan of *The Irish Times* for 2017 indicates it did not cover the story at all. Huge massacres of natives do not bear dwelling upon and can only be divisive. The mantra of the *Times* on such issues is "*we must move on*". While 'overlooking' the Vinegar Hill story, *The Irish Times* did not, of course, forget to provide us with its annual Fethard/Scullabogue reminder.

MERKEL'S SOCIALISTS

The 1960s witnessed post-War Germany's first "*Grand Coalition*". The term had a distinct meaning at the time: a *rapprochement* in the common interest between the two great blocks in German politics, the largely middle class and/or rural and mostly Catholic Christian Democrats (CDU/CSU) and the labour-movement-based Social Democrats (SPD). For the first time since the War the tiny business/elite Liberal Party (FDP), which had driven the *Wirtschaftswunder* would be removed from government power. The formation of that "*Grand Coalition*" was widely regarded as representing a historic transition, easing the traditionally oppositionist post-War "socialist" Social Democrats and their

largely working class constituency towards the responsible exercise of democratic state power at the national/federal level in the client state of West Germany.

There were further CDU-SPD "*Grand Coalitions*" in the more recent post-2005 period, which had no historic meaning other than coping with the consequences of unification and keeping the ecologists and new and much feared parties from the East well away from power.

The current shenanigans in Berlin are being touted as the formation of yet another "*Grand Coalition*". But this time it is difficult to detect any historical meaning in it at all apart from seats at Cabinet for their own sakes. Rather than representing broad swathes of society between which a historic compromise is required, the coalition of the CDU/SPD now being formed is a marriage of convenience between two parties that jointly muster the votes of barely over half the electorate. Some minor adjustments in social spending—and both CDU and SPD are big social spenders—are being presented as the SPD achievement in the coalition deal, and the pro-business media has moaned of the threat of being "*taxed to death*" ("*Total besteuert!*", FAZ 12.01.18). In reality, 'stability' requires a further Merkel Government, of whatever configuration, while the SPD, having achieved its lowest vote since the 1920s, would seem to have nowhere else to go.

The SPD is Germany's oldest political party, formed in 1891 from an amalgamation of the impressive Prussian Socialist movement created by Ferdinand Lassalle, and the confused Socialist/Liberal party from Saxony created under the influence of Karl Marx. Christian Democracy, though not called that at the time, is arguably a much older force in Germany. In 1959 the SPD abandoned its "Clause Four"-type socialism (a nationalised industrial economy) but remained the party of the labour movement and the champion of mixed economy "*Keynesianism*". In 1997 Gerhard Schroeder threw all that out, embracing the neo-liberal "*Third Way*" and deregulated labour market of Clinton-Blair, and the party has been in steady decline ever since. Schroeder at least provoked a pre-Corbyn Corbyn-type internal revolt, led by Oskar Lafontaine, which however was against the *Zeitgeist* and soon either defected to the East German-based *Linke* ("Left Party") or fizzled out. Now headed by Martin Schulz, a "*grey blur*" political apparatchik from the European Parliament, the SPD is undergoing something of an internal convulsion directed against his leadership, and inspired in part by the British Corbyn

phenomenon. The SPD since the Great War has tended to be excessively influenced by British trends, few of which have brought it much luck.

The main result of the German election will be the continued rise of Emmanuel Macron to the role of head of Europe, though without the economic power base to carry that role convincingly.

Did MI5 ORDER THE ASSASSINATION OF CHARLES HAUGHEY?

State Papers for the eventful year 1986-87 were released at the end of December. To judge from the almost identical coverage these received across the media, the journo who scrambled down to the National Archive were directed towards the same few items of trivia and casual gossip. One exception were papers on a letter from the UVF received by Haughey as Taoiseach, informing him that MI5 had ordered it to assassinate him, provided much logistical information to assist in the operation, and that it had also launched a smear campaign against him.

On this issue, media coverage diverged in an interesting manner. The early online 31st December edition of *The Irish Times* did not cover the story at all. As far as this writer could establish, it appeared first on RTÉ and was also then covered by the *Irish Examiner* and *Irish Independent*.

The fullest report was the *Examiner's*, which recounted that the State took the threat very seriously and dispatched military units to counter the threat. *The Irish Times* obviously then felt forced to add the story to its report on the papers release, and it began featuring on its website. It is interesting to note that in its coverage it referred to the letter only and omitted the information on the counter-measures initiated by the security services. The tone of the article was that, as it was inconceivable that the British Government would ever do such a thing, the letter was probably a hoax. Nevertheless, within hours the report was featuring at the top of its "most read" items.

Readers have been left to make up their own minds on what is surely a highly important find, and we can only hope that the tendentiously truncated report in *The Irish Times* does not mislead them. If an equivalent letter implicating Putin in a similar manner emerged at the Washington inquiry, that would be regarded as reasonable ground for a nuclear strike. How serious was the threat the UVF revealed to Haughey? Well, one thing of which we can be certain is that, if we have to rely on the investigative journalism of Tara Street, we will never know.

THE BLUESHIRTS AND QUEEN VIC

Queen Victoria has always represented something of a schizophrenic problem for those of a Redmondite hue at the Fine Gael-Official SF (Workers' Party) end of the Irish political spectrum. A titbit from press coverage of the trivia we were presented with from the recent annual release of State Papers nicely illustrated this. After the Second World War de Valera, who until then had had more pressing things to attend to, finally got around to ousting the bulky statue of Queen Vic that had adorned the forecourt of Leinster House and decamping it, appropriately enough, to the vaults of the Royal Hospital in Kilmainham, at one time a resting home for old Imperial warriors. When, as part of Charlie Haughey's first state-building Government of 1980-82, the Royal Hospital was selected for renovation as a national showpiece, Vic was disinterred and deposited to an OPW storehouse in Deangain, Co. Offaly. What happened next to her is recounted in an inadequate *Irish Times* report (29.12.18), which readers will have to decipher for themselves:

"In June 1986, the Irish Ambassador to Australia, Joseph Small, received a request from the office of the lord mayor of Sydney asking if it would be possible to send the statue to Australia on loan.

"A government decision to transport the massive bronze piece to Australia was vigorously opposed by the then minister for finance John Bruton and the director of the National Museum of Ireland John Teahan, but was backed by then taoiseach Garret FitzGerald."

Bruton's stance may, as implied here, have been due to financial considerations, as in 1986 the country was virtually broke, the National Debt having trebled to 140% of GNP under the coalition regime. On the other hand, however, this is unlikely because, while Garret FitzGerald, for all his faults, was never a Redmondite, John Bruton has been a self-declared one for many years. The coyness of *The Irish Times* in not telling us Bruton's reasons is amusing.

The motivations of another leading light from the same end of the political spectrum in the fate of another statue of the Empress Queen were at least on view for all to register. This statue of the "Famine Queen" had been inaugurated in 1849—before the end of that holocaust/famine—on the "*highest gable of Queen's College Cork*" in the presence of the monarch herself, but had been removed in 1935 and buried, whole, under the lawn of the President's Garden. In 2011, in welcoming QE2 to

Cork University, Professor Emeritus John A. Murphy, once regarded as 'close to the thinking' of Official SF/WP and a staunch campaigner against Republican commemorations and memorials, was veritably gushing in introducing the current royal to the restored statue of her forebear.

Thanks to his exertions the statue had been unearthed and re-erected in a hall of UCC's Tyndall National Institute. The Professor recounted that "*even though they did not like Queen Victoria*", the 1930s College authorities had been "*too civilised to break it up*" and "*would have been philistines to have destroyed it*". The 1930s "*authorities*" had of course been UCC Chancellor Alfred O'Rahilly, to whom we will return in a future 'Column'.

NEW UNIONISM?

During the last weeks we had the announcement that a new Trade Union has been formed, with the inspiring name "*Connect*". It is being formed from the TEEU and UCATT, both themselves previous amalgamations, the former of various electrician and fitter Unions and the latter of various building trades. It is thus a new block representing traditional industrial skilled workers. It claims to have 45,000 members and to represent over twenty trades. If so, and let's be generous, it is a welcome development. *Connect* has declared that it will be targeting the spread of zero-hour contracts and "*bogus' self-employment in building industry*" (*Irish Times* 17.01.18). What is sorely needed is the punching power of organised labour in the private sector, where credible CSO survey data indicates Trade Union 'density' is now hovering between just 12% and 15% of the workforce.

There was also the announcement of a consolidation of Union strength in the public service, where density is still over 80%, with the amalgamation of IMPACT, the CPSU and PSEU to form "*Fórsa*". These old Unions represent the mass of public service (health and local authority) workers and executive (middle-management) and lower grades in the civil service, and the combined membership will be 80,000. In terms of labour-power bargaining, this too is to be welcomed.

A 2012 decision by the ICTU conference to move towards a consolidation of all Unions into a new and more centralised force—in the tradition of the old Transport Union's mantra of the "*One Big Union*"—had seemed to be still born. But with the arrival of *Connect* and *Fórsa*, and the new climate towards State service provision and nationalised industry engendered in

Britain by Corbyn/Momentum, perhaps we may be allowed hope that a new dawn for working class representation in the economy is approaching? The big issue will be the willingness of Unions to cede real power and resources to a coherent central body, of which the ICTU is currently but a shadow.

TRUMP BRINGS CLARITY TO US "FOREIGN POLICY"

American "*foreign policy*" is the euphemism for the imposition of a global order, which US neo-conservatives define as the achievement of "*full spectrum dominance*". Euphemisms are important. A hundred years ago, at the height of its power and when it apologised to nobody, Britain had a "*War Office*", but once its Imperial slide began, it needed to rebrand, from which point the honestly named "*War Office*" became the "*Ministry of Defence*". America's right to dominate the globe was justified morally by the most moral President ever, Barack Obama, on the basis that America was the world's "*exceptional*" power and had not only a right but a duty, before God and man, to dominate it. The foreign policy of every other state in the world today essentially consists of a set of rational calculations on how to trim to, duck and dive, and, especially, avoid incurring the wrath of, the *Exceptional Power*.

During the US Presidential race, Hilary Clinton vowed to continue with the liberal agenda of global domination and regime change, while Trump questioned it on commercial grounds. He declared he would withdraw from "*wasteful*" wars that had cost the US trillions in "*treasure*" and thousands of US lives for "*nothing in return*". He did not express any regret or opposition to the mind boggling destruction which the wars of the Bush-Clinton-Obama era had wrought. Things began to look up as, on taking Office, he allowed some level of 'de-escalation' cooperation with the Russians in Syria, effectively enabling the Syrian Government to bring the Islamist insurgency abetted by Obama/Hilary to an end. But the US can't help itself, and is now, as Ms Michael Jansen in *The Irish Times* put it, manipulating the Kurds to "*keep the pot on the boil*" there. Trump, for all his entertaining tweets, does not stray far from the line pre-ordained by the "*swamp*".

Under the Clinton-Obama regimes, destructive US military operations included, most notoriously in Libya, replacing functioning but allegedly (i.e. not actually) uncooperative states with a *tabula rasa* of anarchic mayhem. The same fate was

planned for Syria. These policing operations were accompanied by other "*full spectrum*" strategic investments, such as wrapping a "ring of steel"—a string of missile bases cheek by jowl with the coast—around China. The number of military bases around the African continent too were more than doubled, Hilary declaring the new US "*strategic*" aim of "*challenging Chinese penetration*" of Africa. Dark forces were rumbled in Ukraine to end the worrying trend towards European cooperation with Russia.

But the most remarkable feature of Trump's first year in power is the relative non-belligerence—beyond verbal—of the US on the world stage. There have been no new wars, escalations of existing ones, or new "*strategic deployments*" such as were a regular feature of the Obama years. Existing programmes continue of course, such as the destabilising of Venezuela and other states (though there are signs of the Venezuela operation being scaled back), the back-door arming of Ukraine, or special ops in the anti-China front in Africa, which we were reminded of recently when a number of US operatives were killed while on some shady mission. US manipulation of the Kurds is another legacy policy. Also, Trump's bully-boy bluster over North Korea seems to have led to a pacific outcome.

The Middle East Peace Process has functioned as a cover for the Israeli colonisation of Palestine since the early 1990s. Of the half million or so illegal Israeli "*settlers*" in the West Bank and Jerusalem, about 90% were planted during the years of the Clintonesque "*Peace Process*", whose terms explicitly prohibited such plantations. The hullabaloo over Trump's "*recognition*" of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel belied the fact that this has been US policy, voted regularly by both Houses of the democratic-imperialist US regime, since the 1990s, and that Trump was simply blurting out that he would implement it. He exposed the hypocrisy at the heart of exceptionalist 'foreign policy'. At least Palestinians now know where they stand and can dispense with the game of mirrors they have been forced to play.

The Iran nuclear 'deal' with the US, which also includes the EU, Russia and China as co-signatories, while viewed by the world as a peace deal allowing a re-integration of Iran into the world market, was driven on the US side by an intent to disarm Iran and render it vulnerable to Israel, which remains a nuclear state. Democrats have said as much in attacking Trump for claiming to wish to renege on it. It was, they said, only Part One of the

strategy, and could he not see that? Given Trump's de-escalation of the neo-con global strategy on other fronts, it would be surprising if he allowed a few hothead Zionists among his family and inner circle to instigate an open Iranian/Saudi conflict in Israel's interests, though that remains to be seen.

Trump denies that he referred to several countries in Africa and the Caribbean, all notably US 'Aid' dependencies, as "*shit-hole countries*". It would be surprising if he didn't, as that is a fairly standard term used informally about such places by US "*foreign policy*" operatives. Obama's agent in Ukraine, Victoria Nuland, when warned of possible negative consequences in Europe of US destabilisation operations there, casually replied "*fuck the EU*". Hilary herself used some choice language to describe Libya before ordering its destruction, and was filmed laughing as she watched a video of Gaddafi being sodomised to death, joking "*we came, we saw, he died!*"

There is a refreshing honesty about the non-politician Trump in his handling of the Imperial affairs he inherited. While the Liberal Imperialists seethe at him in apoplexy and rage, he seems to have called a halt to some of the expansionist activities of the war-state.

Maybe that is the problem, though ultimately it is not credible that Trump will actually reverse the 'foreign policy' trajectory of the dominant global entity.

Brexit and the future of the EU continued

in the EU) as the Government signed up to it following a hurried Dail debate. In October Sinn Fein MEP Matt Carthy launched a discussion document entitled, '*The Future of the Eurozone*', which he commissioned from his party colleague, Emma Clancy. And in December Sinn Fein launched '*No Return to the Status Quo*' by party national chairperson Declan Kearney, an analysis of the Peace Process since 2010 taking account of Brexit, the role of the EU and the collapse of the Northern Executive in 2016.

Each of these developments raises questions regarding Ireland's relationship with the EU. In defending Irish national sovereignty should we follow Britain by supporting Irexit? How can Irish neutrality be defended in the light of the increasing militarisation of the EU? Has the Eurozone been designed to impose austerity on the weaker member states? Can the architecture of the Eurozone, including the

European Central Bank, be subjected to greater democratic control? Will Brexit reinstate a 'hard' Border and in the process weaken an already fragile Good Friday Agreement? And will such developments hasten the achievement of a united Ireland?

Some of these questions can only be answered when the final Brexit deal is agreed and others are more long-term, but the overriding question of how Ireland should relate to the EU is a matter for the immediate agenda.

A push for a deepening of the EU is likely to start up as soon as the next German Government is settled in Office. Admittedly this question poses real difficulty for all sections of Irish opinion. Given, on the one hand, Ireland's affinity for being an EU member state and our vested interest in the survival of the Euro, and on the other, the threat that Northern Ireland will become further cut off from the South and the dependence of Irish agri-food and other sectors on tariff-free access to the British market, the obvious complexities of the issue cannot be denied.

Whatever happens to Ireland's relationships with Europe and Britain in the coming years will radically affect both living conditions for hundreds of thousands of citizens and cultural questions associated with national identity: it behoves us to investigate these matters with as much open mindedness as we can muster.

IREXIT

The Irexit conference scheduled for February is being organised under the auspices of *Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy*, the grouping in the European Parliament to which British party UKIP belongs. It is likely that Nigel Farage is one of the prime movers behind it. Other speakers at the event include Cormac Lucey (finance lecturer with the Irish Management Institute), John Waters (former *Irish Times* columnist known for quirky conservative views), and an independent Galway Councillor, James Charity. Lucey is interesting because, as an advisor to Progressive Democrat Minister Michael McDowell, during the years 2002-2007 he was a cheer leader for the neo-liberal consensus. In 2014 he wrote a polemic entitled, *Plan B: How Leaving the Euro Can Save Ireland*. Lucey's case was found "*unconvincing*" by Karl Whelan, an economist who has been critical of the EU's role in the Irish banking collapse.

Having been a subject of polemical debate since the Brexit referendum result, Irexit has conspicuously failed to establish

any real traction. When efforts to drum it up failed in 2016, the former Irish Ambassador to Canada, Ray Bassett, proposed that Ireland should threaten to leave the EU as a bargaining tactic but even that idea, which was backed by considerable media fire power, fell by the wayside. Nor can the failure of Irexit be ascribed to a lack of articulate defenders; Anthony Coughlan on the left and Ray Kinsella on the right, both retired Professors, have presented the case as well as it can be presented.

The core weakness of an Irish exit from the EU in current circumstances, of course, is that it would force Ireland to return to the orbit of the UK. As described in the main editorial in the December *Irish Political Review* it would effectively mean rejoining the UK. There is value in pausing to visualise how that might look. In one dimension it would seem to have a positive effect: the threat of a hard Border would disappear and the way would be cleared for removing the Border altogether through creating a united Ireland in a Customs Union with Britain and in the Commonwealth. Such an outcome would probably meet the wishes of the Ulster Unionists and would be warmly welcomed by the Anglophile lobby south of the Border. Yet, as a rejection of the historical legacy of 1916, and of the achievement of national independence, it would signify a collapse in the national culture of independent Ireland.

In an era when historical legacies are viewed as "*narratives*" that can be invented or discarded at will, it is vain to expect understanding of the influence that history exerts on current society, but a society that renounces its own history would be taking a major risk.

National culture is far more important than is generally acknowledged, as the coincidence of Brexit with the election of Donald Trump is causing the international community of scholarly experts to latterly recognise. The achievement of Irish independence in the 1920s and 1930s reflected the culmination of a historical process that had been long in the making. It was not, as the revisionists have tried to argue, an aberration. It reflected the deep will of the majority of the population, and despite numerous obstacles and disadvantages, the independent State that arose from 1916 eventually emerged as a solidly stable entity.

A united Ireland in union with Britain, through being an entity constructed against the grain of history, would rest on an unstable foundation that would give rise to '*no end of trouble*'.

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF AN IRISH STATE OUTSIDE THE EU

The imposition of the EU's common external tariff on goods and services emanating from Ireland would constitute an existential threat to the large number of US firms that have invested in the Irish economy. Since the reason why those firms established Irish operations in the first place was to gain access to the EU market, losing that access would very likely cause the flow of foreign direct investment to dry up. In the wake of the Brexit result, Irish officials working with foreign investors reported that, above all else, investors wanted reassurance that Ireland would be remaining in the EU. The exit from Ireland of US and Japanese companies would impact on employment levels, supply chains, native service providers, and educational partners; it would also initiate the return of what was once a major scourge for the Irish economy: Balance of Payments deficits.

Much has been said in the Brexit debate about the dependence of Irish agri-food on the British market but Brexiteer Britain has identified the achievement of lower food prices as a key objective. This would be engineered through trade deals with states that provide cheap agri-food products like Brazil, Argentina and New Zealand. Britain's cheap food policy was one of the historical factors that militated against Irish economic development before both States joined Europe;

in circumstances where both States left the EU the likelihood is that the same problem would re-emerge. The old exploitative dependence on the British market would re-appear. Leaving the EU would also deprive Irish agriculture of its income stream from the EU's Common Agriculture Policy (CAP), a funding source that is unlikely to be replaced by the Irish State.

The other variable in the equation is the dislocation that would accompany Ireland's exit from the Eurozone. An advantage that this would bring is that theoretically Ireland would regain the ability to devalue its currency. If such devaluation was possible, it would make Irish exports cheaper on international markets, thus giving them a competitive advantage but it would also make imports more expensive. For a small open economy that relies heavily on imports, devaluing the currency would quickly generate inflationary pressures. However, the more likely scenario is that the Irish currency would peg to Sterling, thus leaving Irish monetary policy in the control of the Bank of England.

Whether Ireland redeveloped its own currency, pegged to Sterling or fully joined the Sterling area, the value of foreign debt owed in Euro would increase dramatically the moment that the connection with the European Central Bank was cut. Most people familiar with current affairs will know that the Irish State has a relatively high public debt (75% of GDP in 2016) as a result of the bank bailout and the ensuing crisis in public finances. This public debt would increase very significantly as a result of the change in currency.

What is less well known is that Ireland also carries a heavy burden of private debt. Writing in the *Sunday Independent* (9 July 2017) economist Dan O'Brien estimated that Irish companies and banks owe foreign creditors a "*scarcely conceivable*" €4.7 trillion, a figure that would jump significantly as we switched currency. O'Brien considers that exiting the Eurozone would immediately push many of these companies and banks into bankruptcy. While Brexit poses a looming threat to the Irish economy, that threat is relatively minor compared to the catastrophe that would ensue if Ireland embarked on an Irexit.

It would be wrong to deduce from the weakness of the case for Irexit that it has no support among political activists at either end of the political spectrum. On the contrary, the extent of antipathy for the EU across the diversity of those categories is such that any proposal having the effect of undermining Brussels is guaranteed to receive a sympathetic hearing. Nigel Farage and the other speakers at the Conference on February 3rd are unlikely to instigate a viable campaign, and they may even encounter vociferous opposition, but they will also find an appreciative audience.

PESCO

Pesco stands for permanent structured cooperation in security and defence matters inside the EU. Designed as an incremental process having the aim "*to gradually deepen defence cooperation within the Union framework*", its legality derives from Articles 42 and 46 and Protocol 10 of the Lisbon Treaty. According to an extract from an EU document quoted by the socialist academic, Kieran Allen, the long term vision for Pesco "*could be to arrive at a coherent full spectrum force package—in complementarity with NATO, which will continue to be the cornerstone of collective defence for its members*" (Irish Times, 15 December 2017). Among the aims which Allen describes for structured cooperation are "*a regularly*

increasing defence budget in real terms, in order to reach agreed objectives" and the creation of a more competitive European arms industry.

Political moves to realise Pesco started in September when Defence Ministers were asked to agree the set of activities in which cooperation will take place. It was formally launched at the December summit of the European Council with 25 Member States, including Ireland, signing up to it. Denmark and Malta are the two non-signatories. The areas of cooperation include military training, medical evacuation field hospital units, cyber security and relaxing restrictions on the movement of military equipment and personnel across EU borders. It is widely speculated that the timing of the move on Pesco is a direct result of the UK's withdrawal from active participation in EU affairs because, prior to Brexit, the UK used its influence to obstruct progress on EU defence cooperation. However, Boris Johnson has expressed support for Pesco while not wishing to join it.

Pesco was debated in the Dail on December 7th. A Cabinet decision to propose joining it was made on November 21st but notice for the debate was withheld until the last possible moment. In the event, the decision was supported by the Government and Fianna Fail while Sinn Féin, Labour, Solidarity-People Before Profit, Independents4Change, the Green Party, the Social Democrats, and a number of Independents opposed joining it. The final vote was 78 for, 42 against—a victory for the two main parties but a respectable showing from the defenders of neutrality.

PANA OPPOSITION TO PESCO

One reason why commitment to the traditional neutrality policy remains high in the Dail is because a lobby group, *Peace and Neutrality Alliance*, has been keeping the political class informed of developments in the area for 21 years. PANA has group as well as individual members and the group members include political parties, Trade Unions and campaign/interest groups. A publication which it produced before Christmas entitled, "*The European Union—Democracy or Empire*", has contributions from Sinn Fein MEP Lynn Boylan, long-term anti-EU lobbyist Anthony Coughlan, Gerry Grainger of the Workers' Party, Tipperary TD Seamus Healy of the Workers' and Unemployed Action Group, Frank Keogh of the People's Movement and General President of the TEEU, retired Professor Ray Kinsella, Solidarity TD Paul Murphy, Kevin Squires of the Ireland

Palestine Solidarity Campaign, and Roger Cole, who edited the pamphlet. It also has interesting contributions from two foreign MEPs, one from Denmark and one from the Die Linke party in Germany. Roger Cole is the Chair of PANA and a campaigner with a long track record in the area; he was one of the main organisers of the massive 2003 protest march in Dublin against the Iraq War.

The common thread running through most of the articles is that the EU has become a militarist Empire which should be relentlessly opposed with the aim, as Cole states in the Introduction, of transforming it into a '*Partnership of independent democratic sovereign states without a military dimension*'. In other words the present Union should be brought to an end.

It is entirely understandable that PANA and the cross section of opinion that it represents should perceive the EU in those terms. Most of the contributors are veterans on the *No* side of the many referenda on EU Treaties that have been contested in Ireland. For as long as most people can remember, Brussels has been an active agency of neo-liberalism, and its role in global affairs was plainly revealed in the overthrow of Ukraine's democratic Government that took place in February 2014—not to mention EU support for US interventions in Afghanistan, Libya and Iraq. An article for PANA by David Morrison, a contributor to *Irish Political Review*, shows how EU leaders quickly adjusted to the US-backed Maidan *coup* of 22nd February 2014, the day after they had signed an agreement for a very different governmental arrangement addressing the Ukrainian crisis. Morrison states:

"Despite its illegitimacy and the ultra-nationalist credentials of some of its ministers, and the fact that it is not representative of the east and south-east of Ukraine, the EU (and the US) has backed the new authorities in Kiev wholeheartedly and the 'prime minister', Arseny Yatsenyuk, has been feted in Brussels (and Washington)..." (*The Ukrainian regime is illegitimate - but the EU backs it to the hilt* 12 March 2014, from the 2014 archived articles on the PANA website).

Anyone harbouring doubts about the rightness of opposing PESCO should check out the EU's dealings with post-Communist Ukraine, dealings that have been characterised by Nigel Farage as stirring up the force of Ukrainian nationalism to "*poke the Russian bear*". It is hard to disagree with that assessment. There can be no doubt that, at the very least, the EU acted as a willing accomplice of the

US in that venture. It still maintains sanctions on Russia, imposed because of Russian actions necessitated by the subsequent destabilisation of a very delicate situation.

While agreeing with the thrust of PANA's criticism of the EU, *Irish Political Review* and its sister publication, *Irish Foreign Affairs* bring a different perspective to the debate about Ireland's relationship with Europe. The following two paragraphs from an editorial in the first edition of *Irish Foreign Affairs*, dated April-June 2008, explain that perspective as follows:

"This support for imperialist aggression is anathema to the founding principles of the Irish State. If the British vision of Europe has supplanted that of its founding fathers—Monet, Schuman, de Gaspari—the European project should be abandoned before it inflicts any more damage on the world.

However, we are of the opinion that the original EU project is not irretrievable and that the Irish have a key role to play in its renaissance. The first step is to stop the momentum for enlargement and call on the EU to define the borders of its territory."

The chances that the EU can be re-directed to a path of mutually beneficial integration with a strong social dimension have been increased by the Banking Crash of 2008 and the ensuing collapse of confidence in neo-liberalism. Brexit and the catastrophic failures of US foreign policy in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria and Libya are further factors helping to transform the political discourse about the future of Europe. The case against the EU has many strong cards but there are also cards on the opposite side. From a pro-EU perspective, it can be argued that outright opposition to the European project on the part of the European Left runs the risk of handing the initiative back to the defenders of free market liberalism when the pendulum of history is swinging strongly away from them. Either way there are no certainties or inevitabilities: it makes sense to keep track of what is happening in the EU and to keep options open.

Before leaving the subject of PANA it is worth noting that not all of the contributors to its recent pamphlet subscribe to a leftist analysis of the EU. Ray Kinsella asserts that the EU has been "*almost wholly detached from its Christian Democratic roots*", a development which he sees as

"...part and parcel of a wider social and cultural re-engineering of Europe into an essentially Marxist construct—

the toppling of Reason, the deconstruction of laws and institutions based on objective moral values and the 'privatisation' of God..."

He concludes by dismissing the Universities as institutions that no longer uphold Reason and Truth, seeing those principles as now being defended by "*churches that have not been captured*". It is to the credit of the Editor that the Kinsella article was included in the pamphlet. In the past we of the Left have been overly partisan in rejecting out of hand views expressed by people holding religious or conservative convictions.

TWO RECENT DOCUMENTS FROM SINN FEIN

The purpose of Sinn Fein's 70-page discussion document, *The Future of the Eurozone*, is set out in Matt Carthy's Foreword and Emma Clancy's Introduction. Carthy says it is "*to challenge the European elite's prescription for permanent austerity*" and Clancy describes it as focussing on "*the ways in which the Eurozone's architecture, policies and ideological basis have attacked the rights and conditions of ordinary people across the monetary union*".

A concluding chapter contains a number of observations offering "*solutions to pressing problems*", while deliberately parking the question whether the Eurozone is "*a viable arrangement in the long term*"; they are solutions a contemporary left-wing audience would warmly approve, but many of them either lack credibility or would require massive legislative change. The headings are: restore fiscal policy to member states (may be possible but would require revoking the Fiscal Compact); make monetary policies work for people (give newly created ECB money to Governments and people rather than using quantitative easing through the banking system—unrealistic since the supply of money is expanded through the banking system); expand the ECB's mandate (to include growth and employment in addition to inflation—makes sense but would require major legislative change); a real investment plan (as opposed to Juncker's cosmetic Investment Plan—may be viable through a major increase in European Investment Bank assistance for infrastructural projects); structural reform of the Eurozone (proceed with the European Deposit Insurance Scheme, set limits to trade surpluses and remove the rules prohibiting state aid—all commendable but requiring major legislative change); regulating the banking system (ring-fence bank deposits from investment or trading

activities—makes sense); flexibility and fundamental change (allow member states to exit the Eurozone, avoid forcing member states to leave, in line with proposals by Joseph Stiglitz, allow separate currency areas—runs major risk of undermining the currency); dealing with debt (hold a European debt conference to write off the unsustainable debt of crisis countries and confront the question of non-performing loans frequently created by austerity policies—dangerous given the position of Government bonds in the financial system but worth debating).

If the beginning and end of the document appear to be predictable, the chapters in the middle provide a lot more detail than is usually found in Sinn Féin statements on the EU. The five chapters cover: austerity, the history of monetary policy, trade imbalances and debt crises, conditions needed for a monetary union to work, and the ECB. To the best of my knowledge, this attempt to grapple with the complexity of the Euro crisis represents a new departure for Sinn Féin. Carthy and Clancy have made a useful contribution to the debate about Europe on the Irish Left. The document requires a more detailed treatment than can be given here (see note at the end of this article).

Declan Kearney's pamphlet, *'No return to the status quo'*, is a summary of Sinn Féin's position on Brexit, the ongoing impasse in the North, and the dangers facing the Good Friday Agreement (GFA). He sees the collapse of power-sharing in January 2017 as a culmination of the "negative indifference" on the part of the two Governments since the coming to Office of the Tories in 2010 and Fine Gael in 2011. Pressure, he argues, needed to be applied "to keep political unionism properly engaged", and that has not happened.

He describes the '12 Apostles' faction in the DUP as resolutely opposed to the GFA and is scathing of the obstruction tactics used by the DUP leadership since 2013. In seeking to express his party's frustration he encapsulates the Sinn Féin position in a pithy sentence: "Equality is not a concession".

The SF position on Brexit and the EU is expressed in a carefully worded paragraph as follows:

"While Sinn Féin has a critical analysis of the European Union, we believe the required reforms can only be made within its structures. In that strategic sense, Ireland is better inside rather than outside the European Union" (p. 18).

The solidity and consistency of the SF

position on Brexit and the Peace Process can be seen in the way Kearney is able to quotes from the resignation letter of Martin McGuinness. This reads:

"Over this period, successive British governments have undermined the process of change by refusing to honour agreements, refusing to resolve the issues of the past while imposing austerity and Brexit against the wishes and best interests of the people here" (p.20).

In conclusion, the loathing for the EU that is felt by many Irish political activists from the Left and Right is justified, given its enthusiastic embrace of neo-liberalism and its subservience to US militarism. In the fast-moving politics that Brexit is generating, however, the strategic approach to the EU that Sinn Féin has developed is probably the most sensible course to follow.

Dave Alvey

Note: it is hoped to start a multi-part article on the subject of austerity, Greece and the Euro in the March edition of *Irish Political Review*.

**Press Release (Shannonwatch,
22 January)**

Shannon Airport Should Not Be Used To Cheer Troops On To War

Shannonwatch strongly condemns the facilitation of a meeting between US Vice President Mike Pence and US troops at Shannon Airport on Saturday last. The use of the airport by foreign troops on their way to a war zone is in breach of Irish neutrality, and the decision to hold a public display of support for a foreign leader promoting war on Irish soil is dangerous and unwelcome.

"Having diplomats and senior politicians transiting through Irish airports is not a normally a problem", said Edward Horgan of Shannonwatch. "But when they publicly insult Irish sovereignty by addressing troops on their way to war zones, it is unacceptable. US Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld addressed US troops at Shannon in February 2004, and US President GW Bush did the same in March 2006 without any protest by the Irish Government. The latest offender, US Vice-President Pence, addressed US troops at Shannon last Saturday, again without a word of protest from the Irish government. Have they forgotten that we are an inde-

pendent sovereign state, and not the 51st state of America?

"Despite Leo Varadkar's support for Irish neutrality he appears to have no interest in upholding it", added John Lannon also of Shannonwatch. "He was in Shannon at almost the same time as US Vive President Pence. Yet he failed to condemn this alarming breach of our neutrality".

US troops transiting through Shannon are in breach of international laws on neutrality, and the armed aggression being waged by the US in Syria is in breach of Article 2.4 of the UN Charter which states that all member states shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. On January 17th the New York Times reported comments from US Secretary of State Rex Tillerson suggesting that US commitments to Syria included Syrian President Assad's departure from power, as well as US military support for Syrian Kurdish rebel forces. Both of these are in breach of the UN Charter.

"The UN Secretary General and Security Council have been silent on US breaches of the UN Charter in Syria, and on the Turkish military invasion of northern Syria" said Edward Horgan. "The silence and inaction of our Irish Government in these matters is also arguably in breach of Sections 1, 2 and 3 of Article 29 of Bunreacht na hÉireann".

US Vice President Pence has long been a supporter of US policy that in recent months led to the designation of Jerusalem as Israel's capital and to the curtailment of aid for Palestinians. As he passed through Shannon he was one his way to Israel, which is a major recipient of military aid from the US.

"The decision to allow Mike Pence to address troops at Shannon, by whoever made it, is tantamount to accepting the arming of one of the biggest threats to peace in the Middle East, Israel." said John Lannon. "This is not something we, the Irish people should be associated with."

Independent polls have consistently shown that Irish people do not support participation in war, nor do they agree with the US military use of Shannon Airport. Most recently a 2016 Red C Poll has shown that 6 out of 10 Irish people want neutrality to be enshrined in the Constitution.

**For more information email
shannonwatch@gmail.com** ■

es ahora *

"Not since Montefort stood had there ceased to be vigilant measures against the nightcomer; all being part of the hostile watch kept by now eyeless towers and time-stunted castles along these rivers. For as land knows, everywhere is a frontier; and the outposted few (and few are the living) never must be off guard. But tonight the ceremony became a mockery: when Antonia had done bolting and barring she remained, arms outstretched like another crossbar, laughing at the door. For the harsh-grained oak had gone into dissolution: it shut nothing out."

'A World of Love'
by Elizabeth Bowen.
Jonathan Cape. 1955.
1st Edition. p. 116.

A WORLD OF BOOKS

Towards the end of every year there is an annual round up of (so-called) 'best books' by the *literati* and in *The Irish Times*, 9th December 2017: the time for the ritual back-scratching by the usual suspects. Probably what really surprised me was the book that was not selected by anyone—not even the resident "poetry" expert, Olivia O'Leary, who presents *The Poetry Programme* on RTE Radio 1. She began her reviews by stating the following which utterly startled me:

"I was on the streets in Belfast in May, 1974, watching loyalists building barricades across the roads as part of the Ulster Workers' Council strike to bring down the powersharing executive set up by the Sunningdale Agreement. British soldiers stood and watched. All I could think of doing was to pester the British officers asking:

"Why don't you stop them? They're breaking the law. Why don't you stop them?" Their silence told me everything I needed to know as we watched the first attempt to create consensus government in Northern Ireland disappear down the drain. So if you were there, and even if you weren't, *'Sunningdale: The Search for Peace in Northern Ireland'* by the eminent Irish diplomat Noel Dorr is required reading for anybody who wants to know what led to Sunningdale; or anyone who wants to trace the development of Irish and indeed British policy on Northern Ireland."

I have to admit that the idea of *pestering British military officers* by asking such nonsensical questions with an obvious southern Irish accent and only getting

"silence" as a response had me rather surprised. If anyone asked me right now, did I believe her word for word account of what happened, I am afraid to say I simply cannot bring myself to do so. It seems such an asinine way to behave for an obviously professional journalist at one of those times of such high tensions that I have to believe that she—like Roy Foster—one of her heroes—is "*making it up*". As a journalistic observer, surely such a response—such as she now portrays—would at the very least—be a rather mad intervention with probably bad consequences. But then this is O'Leary's story (sorry readers—I just can't seem to get away from Foster) and she is sticking to it.

After watching her on that appalling Hubert Butler DVD (as transcribed by this writer in five editions of the *Irish Political Review* last year) and hearing her abject obfuscations and falsifications of history along with Roy Foster, Fintan O'Toole, etc. I would be very wary—at the best of times—of what she has to say.

She then goes on to write that all her other "*books of the year are poetry*" and name checks Colette Bryce, Sinéad Morrissey, Tara Bergin, Mark Roper and Conor O'Callaghan.

John Banville on the other hand, gave me a good old laugh because one of his choices had everything to do with careerism and nothing absolutely to do with merit. He had to go back to 2016 because, as he tells us:

"Although it was published last year I have just caught up with Eileen Battersby's *'Teethmarks on My Tongue'*, a big, dense, tense novel that is yet light and sleek as a show-horse leaping effortlessly over a high fence. A wonderful debut from a wonderful critic daring to turn her hand to fiction."

Only Banville would have the nerve to use adjectives such as "*big*" "*dense*" and turn abruptly into "*light*" and "*sleek*" with an in-house simile about horse-show jumping. Battersby is of course the *Irish Times* big-gun literary critic whose main hobby is actually horse riding. But her book was a dismal failure, show-casing how sometimes a long term critic can't translate into being a successful novelist. And because of her work at *The Irish Times*, there were a lot of reviews—not least in her own paper—but her novel was truly bad and no amount of sugary reviewery could help—even I got as far as ten pages and just thought life is too short and I binned it.

There is a brilliant book '*Reviewery*' by

Christopher Ricks brought out in the USA in 2002 and in the UK by Penguin in 2003. He was then a Professor of the Humanities at Boston University having previously taught at Oxford and Cambridge. He is a prolific biographer and critic. Writing about the Bloomsbury Set (which could so well describe the Dublin/London/New York *literati* axis today), he stated:

"The earliest example in the dictionary under Bloomsbury—'A school of writers and aesthetes' [sic] "living in or associated with Bloomsbury, that flourished in the early 20th century' is from Keynes in 1914:

"'She' (an anonymous hostess) 'is asking no one but a few of my "Bloomsbury set"!'"...

They wished to be thought of as *a set* when it suited them and not when it didn't. Having profited from group publicity and group groping, they found it prudent to insist on their independence of one another because it would otherwise be less than authoritatively disinterested for them to laud one another."

Above all, Ricks is mindful always of how "*laudable praise*" can sometimes turn into "*a P.R. job*" for, not just the reviewed, but the reviewer.

Naturally "the monumental '*Atlas of the Irish Revolution*' from Cork University Press, as John Bowman calls it, is on many of the critics' list. Bowman opines that it:

"not only challenges with its provocative range of scholarship but it is also a phenomenal publishing achievement which it is difficult to see being surpassed during the decade of centenaries".

The poet Eavan Boland writes:

"The most remarkable book this year seems to me '*Atlas of the Irish Revolution*'. The new arts and sciences of mapping and data open up the events of the revolutionary period: local, regional, national, making it all of a true adventure even for the reader who thinks they know this subject well."

Colm Tóibín avows that:

"*Atlas of the Irish Revolution*' collects all the best scholars of the period in one definitive, weighty tome. It is a book that no revolution should be without."

Roy Foster avoids the *Atlas* and weighs in instead on Valerie Pakenham's '*Maria Edgeworth's Letters from Ireland 1782-1849*' and praises her editing as—

"exemplary, informative, judicious and lively, with a moving postscript about Edgeworthstown after the death of its famous inhabitant".

Connal Parr's '*Inventing the Myth*:'

Political Passions and the Ulster Protestant Imagination' is according to Foster—

"an impressive intervention in cultural history, highlighting dramatic writing from Sam Thomson to Gary Mitchell and beyond. Parr's description of this tradition as 'fiercely inventive' is powerfully borne out by his penetrating analysis".

Foster also focuses on *'Russia in Revolution: An Empire in Crisis 1890-1928'* by Steve Smith. He says:

"By covering the pre-revolutionary world in detail, highlighting themes of religious as well as political culture, and continuing the story through the convulsive civil wars of the 1920s, Smith illuminates both why the revolution happened, *and how it went off course*" (Italics –JH). "He also shows how continuities as well as dislocations marked this extraordinary period, and echo forward to our own."

Fintan O'Toole praises the poet Paula Meehan's *'Geomantic'*—

"so dazzlingly beautiful that you scarcely notice the technical brilliance of her arrangement of 81 poems, each of nine lines, each of them of nine syllables. It was also a great relief from the political madness so brilliantly captured in Anthony Barnett's analysis of Brexit, 'The Lure of Greatness' and Luke Harding's very scary but utterly compelling *'Collusion: How Russia Helped Trump Win the White House'*."

Leave it to Fintan to make sure fake news was not absent from his summing up of the best books of 2017!

His survey includes Malachi O'Doherty's—

"stringent and deeply researched 'Gerry Adams: An Unauthorised Life'... sheds new light on one of the most enigmatic figures in Irish history. And from the microscopic to the panoramic, the remarkable *'Atlas of the Irish Revolution'* does the indispensable job of complicating the past by mapping a period of violence and upheaval in astonishing detail."

In fiction he gives predictable nods to Roddy Doyle's *'Smile'* and Colm Tóibín's *'House of Names'*, which tells the story of "Agamemnon, Clytemnestra and their children from wholly new angles and with a hypnotic power".

Catriona Crowe, former head of special projects at the National Archives of Ireland was the only critic who praised Fintan O'Toole's *'Judging Shaw'*, which even *Books Ireland* managed to yawn at. His infamous biography of Richard Brinsley Sheridan got him good reviews, if some-

what rightfully tepid, both here and in the UK but, when it crossed the Atlantic to the *New York Review of Books*, it earned O'Toole a fair old battering for plagiarism. The latter tried to say that it was only a very small section that had been unfairly picked up and that he never meant his biography to be a definitive scholarly highly researched tome but a popular biography for the ordinary public. The American scholar was having none of it and thereafter the matter dropped out of the public consciousness discreetly. But there was no doubt that O'Toole was burned badly by the furore and nobody dares mention it here anymore, that is, if they ever did.

Even Crowe, who has worked with O'Toole before, is careful to state that the Shaw book is only "an addition to the *Royal Irish Academy's successful Judging series*". Crowe also stars the *'Atlas of the Irish Revolution'*.

Nevertheless, in the Books Section of *The Irish Times*, 28th October 2017, there is a nauseating and self-serving article by none other than Fintan O'Toole, who headlines his article *'World has never needed Shaw the sceptic more'*, and underneath this is the following:

"Among his many triumphs, George Bernard Shaw's finest was teaching people how to think. His critical eye and social criticism are vital again."

And just in case we might entertain doubts about this effusiveness, he seeks out spokesmen for quotations about Shaw. From Nehru to Churchill, Shaw is heroised. According to O'Toole, when Shaw died in 1950, Nehru "the first prime minister of independent India", said of him that:

"...he was not only one of the greatest figures of his age, but one who influenced the thought of vast numbers of human beings during two generations'. This is not mere piety of the kind that gushes up like a geyser when a famous and ancient figure passes away. Nehru had made a pilgrimage to see Shaw at his home in Ayot St Lawrence just over a year earlier, and had followed his writings since he heard him speak about socialism at Cambridge in 1912.... And in 1937, Winston Churchill, though no admirer of Shaw's politics (his first, unpublished 'literary effusion' was a 'ferocious onslaught upon him') described him as 'the greatest living master of letters in the English speaking world'."

Well if even Churchill gave Shaw his benediction who are we to quibble?

Finally, Diarmaid Ferriter writes of the *'Atlas of the Irish Revolution'* that it—

"is a marvellous achievement, combining layers of sound, accessible scholarship on contentious and absorbing issues with an extensive mapping of the conflict that breaks new ground and illustrates the value of collaboration between geographers and historians. It is also a great feat of design."

Thus easily did the *'Atlas of the Irish Revolution'* become the book of the 2017, so heavily hyped that it made all other books almost fade by comparison. That the Irish State itself was heavily involved in providing funds for its publication and—far more important—for its distribution makes clear to all what kind of history it wants to promote. For decades the word *'Pravda'* was so heavily propagandised that everyone in the West saw its meaning in Soviet style indoctrination and falsehood. But the Soviets aren't even at the races when it comes to modern Ireland—now *de facto*—so historically censorious that voices outside of State endorsement are silenced and mocked. We—the dissenting—are even called "mad" and that category thus legitimises the complete avoidance of dialogue, making modern liberal Ireland a truly cold place for *other voices*.

Julianne Herlihy (c)

Passport Blues

continued

structures is that they provide high levels of transparency in the management of the funds and they can be marketed (and regulated) EU-wide. A UCITS for example, is structured like a limited company, with shares or 'Units' held by investors according to the amount of their investment. The funds thus invested are managed by a financial manager (who creates and markets the fund) according to the prospectus of the fund which specifies the nature of the investments (which sectors, types of financial instrument, acceptable levels of risk etc).

The financial manager is usually paid a fee out of the total assets under management of the fund, typically around 1% per year for actively managed funds where the manager actively buys and sells financial instruments (stocks, bonds etc) for the benefit of the fund. In addition to management fees, the management company may also earn performance fees if the performance of the fund, the increase in its value, over the course of a year is

better than a given benchmark (which is specified in the prospectus).

Management fees for funds which are not actively traded by the manager, but which merely follow or track the performance of a given market index (tracker funds) are paid at a lower rate and are not linked to performance.

There is a high degree of specialisation within the fund management industry as different types of investor, whether private individuals, pension funds or other institutional investors, have widely varying levels of risk appetite, liquidity needs (the ability to withdraw funds in cash where necessary) and investment horizon (the length of time the funds will be invested).

To take a simple example, a young person in stable employment seeking to save or invest money for retirement will typically have a long investment horizon, a low need for liquidity and can sustain a higher level of risk since for them short term downturns in financial markets will be offset over the longer term by upturns. An individual in or nearing retirement on the other hand, will have a much shorter investment horizon, will typically seek a much lower level of risk and may potentially have a need for immediate or short term liquidity. A good financial advisor would therefore recommend in the former case an investment fund with a portfolio based on company stocks with high potential value growth and in the latter case a fund comprised of mainly 'safe' assets with a moderate rate of return such as government or corporate bonds which pay an annual rate of interest known as the 'coupon'.

On a grander scale, pension funds such as company pension schemes will have a longer investment horizon, with a moderate risk appetite, but also an ongoing need for liquidity to pay out on existing and forthcoming pension claims. They would therefore seek to diversify their holdings with a combination of 'growth' funds (mainly stocks) designed to increase in value over time and 'income' funds (consisting of stocks which pay out regular annual dividends or bonds paying a coupon).

A large pension fund or other institutional investor will seek to further diversify its holdings by investing in particular sectors, geographical regions and types of financial instrument at different times depending on perceived changes in economic growth or business cycles. In order to do this it may seek to employ specialist fund managers with a given

expertise. It may invite a number of fund managers to tender for this business and choose the one with the best combination of track record, financial stability and administrative competence within the field concerned.

In order for the fund to be able to offer its services within the EU however, it must either be registered as an asset management company within the EU (to benefit from the 'passport' mentioned above or, if based outside the EU, it must act in partnership with an EU-registered asset manager, in which case it will carry out its services as a 'delegated manager'.

The UK has been to the fore in developing, and has benefited hugely from, the regulatory system designed to ensure transparency in the way fund management services are offered across the EU. The UCITS, AIF and other EU regulated structures have become an international gold standard for the regulation of the fund management business since they address, albeit imperfectly, the critical problems of transparency across different legal jurisdictions. As a result they attract investors from far beyond the EU and London's growth as an international, not just European, financial centre has been partly based on this.

There is of course another side to the financial services industry which belies the image of well-regulated transparency described above. The Luxembourg fund 'LuxAlpha' was a UCITS fund established by Bernard Madoff in order to act as a 'feeder' fund for his investment management business in the US. LuxAlpha took in funds from investors in Europe and 'delegated' their management to Mr. Madoff in New York. During the period when the fund was active, the transparency and reporting requirements for UCITS were not as stringent as they are now and as a result Madoff was able to get away with fraud on a staggering scale.

What made his fraud remarkable was that it was not based on embezzling the mites of widows and orphans, or mis-selling to small retail investors as is sometimes the case, but on winning the confidence of wealthy professional investors and institutions who really should have known better.

The Madoff case was a spectacular bust, but impropriety in investment management is a day in-day-out occurrence and does not require the presence of a sociopathic fund manager to take place. A routine example would be where a UCITS fund is established specialising in

a particular sector, renewable energy, for example. This is a dynamic 'growth' sector of the economy but, as is typical in such sectors, it has its winners and losers. The prospectus of this particular fund might state that, in order to ensure diversification of risk, the fund may hold up to 40 different stocks with a maximum holding of 5% for any single stock. This is intended to ensure that, if any of the 40 or so companies crashes, it will not impact more than 5% of the portfolio.

The fund manager will naturally seek to invest more in those companies with the best prospects, but if S/he is already invested up to the limit of 5% of the assets in one particular company and the value of that company's stock subsequently rises, then it will automatically come to represent more than the 5% maximum. In such a case the manager is obliged to sell the stock, despite being convinced of its quality, to bring the holding back down below the allowable limit. Needless to say this is a tough ask, and many managers seek to chase their winners in an attempt to register higher performance and thereby higher performance fees. These performance fees for the asset management company in the past translated into bonuses for the fund manager concerned, so a real contradiction exists between the prudential risk management requirements of the fund and the all-too-human motivations of the fund manager.

In a well-run asset management company the holdings in the funds should be monitored and, where a fund's risk limits are exceeded, the risk management system should flag up the excess to a risk manager who can take the fund manager to task about it. The fund manager may however chose to ignore this or may receive permission from superiors to override the risk management system. The fund prospectus may even provide for this up to a certain extent with time limits for reducing excessive holdings etc, but risk management systems have their limits and every once in a while a company just blows up and that is when everyone sees the importance of risk limits once again.

The greater the distance, physically or organisationally, between the investor and the actual fund manager, then the greater the chance that excessive risks will be taken with the funds invested and it is for this reason that the EU's financial regulatory authorities are looking closely at Brexit and its implications for European fund management. They are insisting in particular that where fund management is delegated from a management entity in

the EU to a manager outside the EU, that the EU entity should be a real management company with senior management in place accountable to the regulator and not just a brass plate or 'letterbox' affair.

This means that post-Brexit, UK fund managers will not be able to simply set up 'letterbox' companies in Ireland or Luxembourg (as they do at present for tax and administration purposes) and carry on managing as before. They will be forced to set up proper subsidiaries within the EU, adding an extra layer to their costs, and will be subject ultimately to the same EU regulatory standards as they were before. Moreover, they will no longer be able to use their influence and veto, post-Brexit, to prevent the EU moving forward with measures to reduce the degree of reckless risk-taking (with other people's money) in the pursuit of personal gain which masquerades as good management in the City of London under the banner of free markets and competition.

Brexit offers the EU a heaven-sent opportunity to free itself from the City of London *incubus*, which was always, not only incompatible with the development of the single currency area, but actively in competition with it and seeking to undermine it.

The UK will seek to salvage what it can from this, but it is no good trying to argue, as David Davis tries to do, that both goods and services should be freely tradable after Brexit. Services, particularly financial services, require a level of ongoing monitoring and regulation after they have been sold that goods do not. They are qualitatively different and that is why they have never been included in a free trade agreement before.

By leaving the single market and removing itself from the jurisdiction of its regulatory authorities (including the European Court of Justice) the UK has chosen, quite remarkably, to put itself beyond the pale of what is, however imperfect, the most fit-for-purpose system of international financial services regulation ever devised.

From the point of view of the elements in the City of London who financed the Brexit campaign, this cannot have been anything other than intentional, with malice aforethought, in order to avoid the restrictions on bonuses and casino-like behaviour that EU regulation had put in place. The problem for the City of London is that post-Brexit, casino banking may be the only game left in town.

Sean Owens

Bielenberg does what he condemns in Peter Hart

In recent months Andy Bielenberg of the University College Cork History Department has been at pains to distance himself from the Hart sectarian thesis about the War of Independence. After being initially a vociferous supporter of the Professor twenty years ago this is very welcome. Better late than never. However Bielenberg is very anxious to agree with Hart that the events in Dunmanway, when 13 Protestants were killed between 26th and 28th April 1922, was sectarian. In the *Sunday Independent* he wrote "*While fully accepting that the Dunmanway massacre in late April 1922 (during the Truce) was a sectarian reprisal..*" (31 Dec. 2017). In the current *History Ireland* he introduces a letter saying that "*While I agree that the Dunmanway massacre (in April 1922) was sectarian, I reject Hart's wider conclusion*".

He concludes his letter in *History Ireland* with advice for historians:

"Hart's conclusions continue to 'perplex' because they remain difficult (if not impossible) to verify. Unfortunately, he did not name the 73 Protestant civilian suspected spies and informers he alleged to have been shot by the IRA in Cork between 1919 and 1923 (p.304, table 37). The sectarian thesis regarding the Cork IRA between 1919 and 1923 as postulated by Hart hinges on this group. Until such time as they can be individually identified and confirmed as killed by the IRA as suspected informers, the debate (if there is one) cannot progress. That is, if history is a discipline that proceeds on the basis of verifiable evidence, as opposed to unverified evidence, hypothetical possibilities and 'truthiness', arising from the slipstream of the Northern troubles."

This is very good advice but it's a pity he does not put it into practice regarding the Dunmanway killings. Where is the '*verifiable evidence*' to confirm his allegations about the motive? He says Hart's conclusions remain difficult to verify as he did not name the Protestant victims he alleged were killed for sectarian reasons. But what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Where are the names of the killers of the Dunmanway Protestants? Without this there are double standards at work here with knobs on.

By his own logic he is engaging in those methods he condemns in Hart, i.e., "*unverifiable evidence, hypothetical*

possibilities and 'truthiness'". Bielenberg imputes motives to people he does not name or know. Even the rawest Guard out of Templemore would not do such a thing as he soon learns that there can be nothing as misleading as an obvious fact in these type of situations.

For example, why were Catholics also targeted? Professor Hart was very coy about this and when he referred to it was simply treated as a footnote to his thesis, even though it ruined his 'sectarian motive' narrative. This was pointed out six years ago by John Regan but, as with much more of his critique, it is blithely ignored by Hart's apologists. The victims were selected, not killed in a large-scale way. Therefore there was no '*massacre*'.

Another question which arises regarding the 'massacre' allegation is, why did Republicans defend Protestants homes against attacks? Bielenberg gives us a perfect example of the '*truthiness*' he condemns. (See "*The 'Bandon Valley Massacre' as a Historical Problem*" by John M. Regan in 'History—the journal of the Historical Association', 25 January 2012.)

At the West Cork History Festival last year Mr. Bielenberg made excuses for Hart along the lines that he did not have sufficient information at the time he wrote. This was pathetic. Anyone who takes the slightest interest in the matter knows that it was Hart's abuse of existing information (and information that had been available since the Dunmanway events) that caused the controversy that surrounded his thesis. But again Bielenberg is falling into the same trap he alleges Hart fell into—he does not provide the evidence because I am certain he does not have enough information to make such sweeping and damning allegations.

He should learn the real lessons from the Hart debacle or his methodology will live on in the UCC History Department and elsewhere as it does in the case of Bielenberg on Dunmanway.

Jack Lane

[https://
www.atholbooks-
sales.org](https://www.atholbooks-sales.org)

Some thoughts prompted by a reflection on the role of Bishop O'Dwyer of Limerick in the Easter Rising

The French have an expression: *'c'est le premier pas qui coute'*—it is the first step which counts; and my first step taken in reviewing this book was shaped by a conference that I had attended a day or two before I received this book as a gift. The one day conference was held at Mary Immaculate Training College, Limerick, on 13th October 2017 and was designed to mark the Centenary of the death of Bishop Edward O'Dwyer of Limerick on 19th August 1917. Many aspects of the life of Bishop O'Dwyer were discussed and central to the debate was his role in support of those who had taken part in the Easter Rising. My first step, therefore, as I began reviewing the *Atlas* book, was to check the index and to locate references to Bishop O'Dwyer but his name was not in the index!

I then turned to articles relevant to the Easter Rising and to the Catholic Church in order to see if, by chance, he did appear in the text but not in the index; but his name was not to be found. Subsequently I came across a reference to him in an article by Ray O'Connor and Noreen Byrne on *'Horace Plunkett, the Co-operative Movement and the Cultural Revival'*. The article was very informative but made no mention of a close friend of Bishop O'Dwyer, Mgr. Michael O'Riordain, whose book *'Catholicity and Progress in Ireland'* (1905), presented a compelling challenge to the views expressed by Plunkett in his *'Ireland in the New Century'*. O'Riordain, as Rector of the Irish College in Rome, played a major role in shaping Bishop O'Dwyer's approach to the Easter Rising, which will be the main focus of this review.

Clair Wills in her article on *'Staging the Easter Rising'* concludes that it was "a symbolic sacrificial gesture" and Fearghall McGarry, in his article on *'The Easter Rising'*, while making some mention of the practical plans by the Military Council of the IRB "to mount a serious military challenge", ultimately highlights "the symbolic nature of the insurrection". In many ways McGarry's article appears at variance with his finely balanced account of these events in his book, *'The Rising,*

Ireland: Easter Rising 1916' (2010). He writes that Pearse, MacDonagh and Plunkett "appeared to see the spilling of blood as a prerequisite for the redemption of the nation" and concludes that "the rebels' behaviour and their propaganda attest to the symbolic nature of the insurrection". McGarry concludes that the rebellion was "revolutionary street theatre" which was "morally wrong", and he writes of Pearse that he was "a relative late comer to the conspiracy". This verdict on the morality of the Rising was largely based on the Address given by Eoin MacNeill, President of the Irish Volunteers, to the Volunteer Council in mid-February 1916. A copy of one of the pages of MacNeill's handwritten memorandum is to be found on page 230 of this book.

Recognition of the role of Bishop O'Dwyer tells a different story: not only about the morality of the Rising, but also about the context in which the Rising took place, in particular with reference to the First World War. The issues of *'blood sacrifice'* and *'staged theatre'* will be discussed after a survey of Bishop O'Dwyer's actions in these revolutionary years.

Even in the years immediately before the Rising, Bishop O'Dwyer merits attention for his criticism of John Redmond: firstly, for his support of England's war aims; and, secondly, for his rejection of Pope Benedict XV's many calls for peace. The Pope's first statement was made in November 1914, soon after he became Pope, and it was Redmond's failure to respond to a papal appeal in July 1915, *'To the People now at War and to their Rulers'*, which served as a prelude to O'Dwyer's most outspoken criticism.

In November of 1915 Redmond described some young Irishmen emigrating from Liverpool to escape conscription as "very cowardly". In a public reply, made on 10th November 1915, O'Dwyer declared—

"what wrong have they done to deserve insults and outrage at the hands of a brutal English mob... their crime is that they are not ready to die for England. Why should they? What have they or their forebears ever got from England

that they should die for her? ... This war may be just or unjust but it was England's war, not Ireland's."

The impact of O'Dwyer's statement was recognised by Augustine Birrell, Chief Secretary of Ireland, who told the *Royal Commission on the Rebellion* in Ireland in 1916 that "it was one of the most formidable anti-recruiting pamphlets ever written". Despite this British official recognition of Bishop O'Dwyer's influence on the recruiting campaign, there is no acknowledgment of his impact in John Horne's article on *'Ireland and the Great War'*. While there are interesting illustrations about the scale of recruiting, there is no mention of Bishop O'Dwyer or, for that matter, of Lord Wimborne, the Lord Lieutenant, who was head of recruiting in Ireland during the years 1916-1918.

Bishop O'Dwyer's trenchant criticism of the British war effort was probably influenced by his knowledge, through Mgr. O'Riordain in Rome, of the terms of the secret *London Treaty* of 26th April 1915. This Treaty between the *Entente* powers and Italy explicitly declared that the Pope's appeals for peace should be rejected and that he was not to have a place at any subsequent Peace Conference. This detail alone casts an interesting light on British war aims and the Treaty also confirmed that England and France should have special claims to Turkish territory in the Middle East after the War. The secret *Sykes Picot Agreement* of 19th May 1916 further clarified and extended these claims, while the public *Balfour Declaration* of 2nd November 1917 recognised a state of Israel in Palestine. Indeed, on reflection, it might be said that the zones of influence created by these Treaties persist to the present day and have contributed greatly to the contemporary wars in that area. No reference to these significant Treaties appears in the book.

Moreover, while some articles do mention the united nationalist Irish opposition to the British imposition of Conscription in April 1918, the precise formulation of that opposition is not spelt out. The *Mansion House Declaration* of 18th April 1918 stated that—

"the passing of the Conscription Act by the British House of Commons must be regarded as a declaration of war on the Irish nation. The alternative to accepting it as such is to surrender our liberties and to acknowledge ourselves slaves. It is in direct violation of the rights of small nationalities to self-determination."

It was agreed by all Irish parties: de Valera and Griffith for Sinn Fein; Dillon

and Devlin for the Irish Party; and representatives of the Labour Party. It was also supported by the Catholic Hierarchy. In short, all Irish parties had come around to the view expressed publicly by Bishop O'Dwyer in November 1915 that "*it was England's war, not Ireland's war*"; it was not '*our war*'. For that reason alone one would expect his name to appear in the book.

Bishop O'Dwyer's intervention on the Easter Rising was no less momentous than his role as anti-recruiting agent and opponent of the War. He is best remembered for his public attack on the policy of General Maxwell in May 1916—even that does not receive a mention in the book—but before that he was indirectly aware, through Mgr. O'Riordain, of events that were central to the planning of the Rising. He knew that Count Plunkett had visited Rome and, with the help of Mgr. O'Riordain, had a private audience with Pope Benedict XV, on 8th April 1916, and, at that meeting, the Count had received a Papal Blessing on the Irish Volunteers; not, it should be stressed, on the IRB nor on an armed rising.

It should be remembered that John Redmond had visited Pope Pius X in 1905 and received his good wishes that he might "*win that liberty which makes for the welfare of the whole country*". The Papal Blessing which Count Plunkett received was of the same character and it was designed to overcome the moral issues which Eoin MacNeill had presented to the Council of the Volunteers in mid-February.

Although Jérôme aan de Wiell has mentioned Count Plunkett's visit to Pope Benedict XV in his article '*Ireland's War and the Easter Rising in European Context*', he makes no mention of Bishop O'Dwyer and Mgr. O'Riordain. He has, of course, written extensively about them in his other publications but it is unfortunate that their important roles in this particular incident of the Papal Blessing have not been recognised.

When Joseph Plunkett informed Mac Neill of the Blessing, on 22nd April, he declared that he "*was then ready to take part in the rising*" and issued orders to that effect. Thomas MacDonagh was also happy to tell Brennan Whitmore that a Papal Blessing had been received. Within hours, however, MacNeill countermanded that Order, after news came through of the failure to land arms in Kerry and of the capture of Casement. The Rising, therefore, which had been carefully planned for Easter Sunday, 23rd April, took place amidst total confusion. It began on Easter

Monday, 24th April; Patrick Pearse's Ceasefire order was carried out on 29th/30th April; and the execution of 15 of the rebels took place between 3rd and 12th May. General Sir John Maxwell had arrived in Ireland as Commander-in-Chief of the British Army in the late evening of 27th April with orders to crush the rebellion and he was responsible for the policy of execution. It was in this context that Bishop O'Dwyer made his major contribution to the Easter Rising.

Bishop O'Dwyer's first public intervention on the Rising occurred on 17th May 1916, when he replied to two letters of General Sir John Maxwell which had been written on 6th and 12th May and which requested the Bishop to sanction two of his priests. He replied, on 17th May,

"the events of the past few weeks would make it impossible for me to have any part in proceedings which I regard as wantonly cruel and oppressive. Personally I regard your action with horror, and I believe that it has outraged the conscience of the country... your regime has been one of the worst and blackest chapters in the history of the misgovernment of the country."

Bishop O'Dwyer was the only member of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy to declare publicly for those who had taken part in the Rising. His letter, despite the restrictions of the *Defence of the Realm Act*, was publicised not only in Ireland but also in Rome, the USA and the rest of the world.

Bishop O'Dwyer's second public statement in favour of the Rising was made on 23rd June and was issued in a form of a public letter to the Tipperary Board of Guardians which had congratulated him on his previous letter. He thanked it for its approval of his response towards "*that brute Maxwell*" and added:

"while our young men are not afraid to die for her in open fight and when defeated stand proudly with their backs to the wall as targets for English bullets, we need never despair of the old land and your letter will be a comfort to those who reverence the memory of Ireland's latest martyrs".

This statement gained the same publicity as his first letter.

Bishop O'Dwyer's third public statement was made on 14th September 1916, in his acceptance speech to the Limerick Corporation, when he was awarded the Freedom of the City of Limerick. In the course of a long speech, he addressed the issue of the morality of the Rising and affirmed that—

"these Irish Volunteers imagined that Ireland had an inalienable right to govern herself (applause); that the deprivation of it was worse for every interest of their country than any number of bad laws in detail. That a foreign Government forced on an unwilling people was a usurpation, and resistance to it was a duty. (applause) ... The rebels were the true representatives of Ireland and the exponents of her nationality."

This statement received world-wide coverage and generated much sympathy for those who taken part in the Rising.

The Bishop's use of the term "*usurpation*" to describe the character of British rule in Ireland introduced a new concept which, if accepted, undermined the traditional principles which were required for a just rebellion against a "*tyrannical government*". The traditional principles, which had been presented by MacNeill to the Irish Volunteers in February 1916, required that the people be grievously oppressed; that there be no constitutional hope of redress; and that any opposition to the Government must have a reasonable chance of success. By introducing the term '*usurpation*' to describe the character of the English government in Ireland, Bishop O'Dwyer not only nullified the arguments of Eoin MacNeill and justified the actions of the rebels but also he has made an enduring contribution to the debate on political legitimacy.

Remarkably, and even Bishop O'Dwyer does not appear to have adverted to this fact, the word '*usurpation*' appears in the Proclamation of the Irish Republic. It states: "*we declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies, to be sovereign and indefeasible. The long usurpation of that right by foreign power and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished except by the destruction of the Irish people.*"

These considerations about the morality of the Rising, allied to Bishop O'Dwyer's brave and isolated stand against the horrors of General Maxwell's martial law regime, indicate forcibly that one cannot tell the story of the Easter Rising without mention of his name.

Brian Murphy OSB

Available from ATHOL BOOKS:

The Catholic Bulletin And Republican Ireland with special reference to J.J. O'Kelly ('Sceilg') by Dr. Brian P. Murphy osb. 314pp, Illus.

€24, £20

postfree in Ireland and Britain

Dev—maths teacher?

Why do academic historians and, increasingly, their followers indulge in the irritating verbal affectation of the 'historic present'?

"Brian Boru packs his bags and sets off for Clontarf. He arrives there and a ferocious Viking, whose name is Bruadar, smashes his head in."

These things happened in the distant past. Not today or even yesterday. Is it the case that using the present tense (or 'present historical') is an authority signal to the audience, just like a clergyman switching on his pulpit voice? As soon as you hear it you start to smell a rat.

Here is an example by UCD History Professor Diarmaid Ferriter in Myles Dungan's RTÉ Radio 1 history programme: "[De Valera's] *future is going to lie in teaching*" (31 December 2017). What a weird grammatical mixture of past, present and future!

Setting aside such affectations, other statements show that Ferriter still has some distance to go in recognising what de Valera really was: *"This is someone who was headed for a long and probably successful career as a schoolmaster."*

There is a whiff of condescension in this. The distinguished and elevated UCD Professor of Modern History generously acknowledges that Dev had it in him to teach the multiplication tables to rural urchins. Combined, no doubt, with salutary doses of Irish language preaching, GAA school team coaching, and lashings of Catholic religious devotions, from the narrowly austere and bespectacled schoolmaster.

Athletic youths and comely maidens stuff. Stern but kind, maybe. Certainly not a man of the world like us.

Anyone can hold a high or low opinion of de Valera's life and work. Neither opinion precludes a serious knowledge of the subject. For someone like Ferriter, who purports to be an expert in this field, a certain shallowness was on display here.

Somebody has to teach the multiplication tables, and they had better do it well. De Valera, on the other hand, was cut from different cloth. There are horses for courses. And there are plenty of comparisons to show Dev's particular kind of intellect might have made him a disastrous teacher of school arithmetic.

The social organisation, culture and paraphernalia of modern scientific research—a system which has not quite yet reached the end of its tether—originated in 19th century Germany. It took the form of specialised research establishments along with their journals, conferences and seminars. Its underlying spirit was probably derived at least partly from Prussia's Pietist version of Lutheranism which sought to overcome historic religious barriers in Germany by excavating and understanding the underlying core of religion. This manifested itself in a dedication to general improvement achieved by individual striving for self-knowledge, self-denial, and self-improvement.

German scientific research was so successful that by the end of the nineteenth century other countries made a definite decision to adopt its systems wholesale.

British mathematics stagnated after the 18th century because of a kind of early Brexit—due to British partisanship in a dispute between Isaac Newton and Gottfried Leibniz. The dispute was started by Newton over which of them had prior claim to invention of calculus. Calculus is a kind of algebraic or abstract calculation, using symbols instead of numbers, which enabled the astronomical and engineering advances of the following centuries.

Calculus remains at the core of mathematics even though the landscape has changed somewhat due to various new developments such as computers.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century the energies generated by the European research system, modelled on the German system, was opening up new vistas, and British mathematics sought to learn from this in order to find a way out of aridity.

In Ireland the situation was compounded by the political situation. Much of the credit for resolving it must go to de Valera.

The majority Irish population had a historic connection with European learning, but this was broken when the Jacobites were finally defeated in the 18th century. In addition to Trinity College other universities were set up in Ireland in the mid-19th century to fill the vacuum. These functioned as adjuncts to the British system, but did little to restore learning to the population at large.

The son of a shoemaker in Lincoln, George Boole was a self-taught English mathematician who, in 1854 in Cork,

published his *Laws of Thought*—the beginning of Boolean algebra which is used nowadays to model the workings of computers. Failing to break into the academic system, Boole had secured a position in Queen's University in Cork and, if he had lived, he could reasonably have expected to work his way up to a position in England which was commensurate with his achievement.

DUBLINER William Rowan Hamilton of Trinity College was another distinguished 19th century mathematician who functioned in Britain's off-shore outpost.

This was the rather alien landscape into which de Valera emerged. In his mathematical studies Dev was successful at the highest level and could reasonably have expected to make an impact in original research. Was he a potential Boole, Einstein, or Leibniz?

The question is not a ridiculous one. Pierre Fermat, of "*Fermat's Last Theorem*" fame, combined a career in law with a life of original discovery in mathematics. That could happen that in the early 1600s.

Throughout his life de Valera turned to mathematics for pleasure and relief from political stress. Not Sudoku, not puzzles, not brain-teasers, not games of chance, but high-level reasoning. However a life of political leadership and responsibility left no room for the degree of sustained intellectual effort and single-minded concentration which de Valera's original mathematical inclinations would have required.

Nevertheless, he made his mark in mathematical scholarship. The online MacTutor archive of mathematical biography includes de Valera, along with Archimedes, Boole, Einstein, Newton, Fermat and the rest. MacTutor does not include the ordinary, pedestrian, everyday mathematicians who might be ranked alongside ordinary, pedestrian, everyday academic historians like Ferriter and his ilk. (Perhaps not alongside. More like a cut or two above the latter in terms of intellectual power and rigour.)

To see why, despite abandoning his original mathematical calling, Dev is placed alongside the greatest mathematicians in history, here is an extract from *MacTutor*:

"The most important contribution de Valera made to mathematics both in Ireland and internationally was the foundation of the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies (DIAS) in 1940. The institute initially consisted of two schools namely, the School of Celtic Studies and the School of Theoretical Physics, and in 1947 a third school, the School of Cosmic

Physics, was added. It was the result of consultation between de Valera, his past professors Arthur Conway and E T Whittaker, as well as with the foremost American mathematician of the time, G D Birkhoff.

Before the foundation of DIAS, de Valera explored the possibility of securing the services of a world renowned mathematical physicist. The Institute, as proposed, would be under the guidance of these men or women who, it was hoped, would be able to begin in the Institute once it was established. The three names originally mentioned were Conway, Schrödinger, and Whittaker. Max Born and Albert Einstein were also mentioned; however, both had recently accepted positions—Born at Edinburgh and Einstein at Princeton. Contacting Schrödinger to offer him a position in the yet-to-be-established Institute was a cloak and dagger affair. Whittaker, in a letter to de Valera, wrote that since Schrödinger was 'much disliked' by the Nazis, any attempt to contact him outright would be 'frustrated', and that the Nazis, rather than dismiss him, might kill him. As a result, Whittaker contacted the German physicist, Max Born, who in turn contacted an associate of his, Professor Baer, who

then telegraphed a mutual friend of his and Schrödinger's, who promised to meet Schrödinger if at all possible. Less than four months later, on the 16th of September, a letter was received from Schrödinger accepting the offer to come to Ireland. Once DIAS was founded, it was discovered that only Schrödinger could accept a position. Conway had been recently made President of University College Dublin, and Whittaker felt he could not leave his university post due to the outbreak of World War II."

http://www-groups.dcs.st-and.ac.uk/history/Biographies/De_Valera.html

The Irish had not turned away from learning in the 17th and 18th centuries. It was violently removed from them. There was a place in off-shore Britain for George Boole, Bishop Berkeley, and William Rowan Hamilton. If a place had been made for the indigenous people as well they would probably have seized it gladly.

When he got the opportunity de Valera did his bit to bring his country into the mainstream of science. He deserves his place in the annals of mathematics.

Pat Muldowney

yards or so from the station and Gerard O'Callaghan, 29, was killed on the pavement outside the barracks. Brian Arthurs, his brother, was in America when he heard of the attack. Declan had 36 bullet wounds to his body... Brian Arthurs later served a sentence in the H-Blocks on explosives charges and was the last IRA prisoner released under the Good Friday Agreement. Given the current political arrangements, he feels that the IRA's campaign helped deliver changes for nationalists in the North. *'The British government denied republicans any political voice and their answer to our demands was given by the British army. Obviously we responded, we had no choice. When the volunteers were killed at Loughgall it didn't put people off joining the IRA. Far from it. There was a huge influx of new people who wanted to join the movement after Loughgall. The message from the republican community was that British oppression wouldn't be tolerated. Thankfully, we are in a better position today, where politics can work.'* ..."

"In this republican heartland, there is still huge sympathy for the eight IRA men. At a commemoration march held on 6 May, more than 6,000 people turned out. However, while the majority of republicans are supportive of the Adams-McGuinness leadership, there are those who have become disillusioned with what has unfolded since 1994. Pádraig McKearney was among the eight killed at Loughgall. A Maze escapee, he had reported back to the IRA and went on to become one of the most senior IRA people in Tyrone and Mid-Ulster. Avowedly militant, he was a soulmate of Jim Lynagh, who had developed the strategy of creating 'liberated zones' by attacking isolated rural RUC stations. During the Troubles, the McKearney family paid heavily. Three sons were killed, one in a premature explosion, another by UVF gunmen, and Pádraig at Loughgall. Tommy McKearney, Pádraig's brother, who also served a 17-year sentence, says that **perhaps Loughgall could have been avoided** 'if Paisley had shown the same leadership in the early days of the Troubles'. 'Since the start of the Troubles, Paisley and his like blocked every political initiative and of course that ensured the conflict would continue for as long as it did. The peace process has delivered benefits for nationalists in the North. I don't particularly have a problem with them sharing power with Paisley.' McKearney, a Marxist, says that Sinn Féin's dilution of policies such as corporation tax levels are more of a concern to him."

"McKearney also believes that by killing the Loughgall unit, the SAS had removed some of the most militant elements of the IRA. 'I think it is fair to assume that the British would have had an idea of what was going on internally within the republican movement at that

Cynical *Sindo* Suggestions Of Sinn Féin Assassination

"*Forgotton Troubles*" [sic]—see <http://politico.ie/archive/forgotton-troubles> for the link to the *Political* archive—was the title of an analysis posted last May 16th concerning two significant anniversaries that month—one a 10th and the other a 30th anniversary. Colm Heatley wrote:

"The historic day on 8 May when the Northern Ireland Assembly was reformed was also the 20th anniversary of the IRA's heaviest defeat since the civil war, at Loughgall. When Martin McGuinness and Ian Paisley shared a platform at Stormont, it was billed as a new dawn for the peace process. However, 8 May 2007 also marked the 20th anniversary of the IRA's heaviest defeat since the civil war. On that day in 1987, eight members of the IRA's East Tyrone Brigade were wiped out by an undercover SAS team as they attempted to destroy an RUC barracks in Loughgall, Co Armagh. The two events, separated by two decades, stand in stark contrast to each other, and demonstrate how political discourse in the North has changed irrevocably in the intervening years. In 1987, the IRA's 'Long War' strategy was virtually unquestioned within republican ranks, and the East Tyrone Brigade was at the forefront of the IRA's armed struggle.

With a reputation for militancy, and under the guidance of seasoned activists such as Jim Lynagh, Pádraig McKearney and Patrick Kelly, the IRA in east Tyrone was one of the most active in the North..."

"At Loughgall however, the IRA unit would walk into a trap designed to kill all of them. When their bodies were examined, it was discovered that all had head wounds, and there was strong evidence that most, if not all, had been shot in the head as they lay on the ground. For at least 24 hours beforehand, and probably a number of weeks, the SAS had known of the plan and dug themselves into positions around the Loughgall RUC station. How the British came to know of the attack beforehand has never been fully established... The day before the attack, 24 SAS members were dug into positions around the barracks and when the IRA eventually appeared in a blue HiAce van and a JCB digger, the trap was about to be sprung. As the IRA unit drove the bomb-laden digger through the perimeter fence of the RUC station, Declan Arthurs, 21, lit the fuse. Moments beforehand, two other IRA men began firing at the RUC station. Within seconds, the 24 SAS men returned fire. Six members of the eight-man IRA unit were killed in the blue van. Declan Arthurs was killed a hundred

time. By killing the IRA unit at Loughgall, and particularly people like my brother and Jim Lynagh, they had taken away people who would have potentially been critical of subsequent strategic developments within the movement.' The genesis of this line of thought lies in claims that Gerry Adams was at that time involved in behind-the-scenes negotiations to pave the way for a political settlement. The implication is that the men at Loughgall were specifically targeted to aid Adams's political project. **However such contacts, and lines of communication, have always existed. Certainly, if the intention of the republican leadership was to wind down IRA activity, particularly in east Tyrone, events on the ground do not support the theory. In the years after Loughgall, the IRA in east Tyrone became more active,** and in the early-1990s, east Tyrone was the first area to use 'barrack buster' mortars. Attacks on helicopters were also mounted in the area for the first time. **Loughgall can, instead, be seen as the war being played out in public, with both the British government and republican leadership determined to negotiate from a position of strength. Logically, successful IRA operations were more likely to be a benefit rather than a hindrance to Adams.** Conversely, the British government wanted to demonstrate the futility of armed struggle..." (All emphases mine – MO'R).

This New Year's Eve edition of the *Sunday Independent* carried a strange criticism of the manner in which the *Irish Times* had reported on recently released State Papers regarding Loughgall. On December 29th, one of those reports was headed: "*Sinn Féin denies Gerry Adams 'set up' IRA Loughgall ambush.*" The subheading on the online edition read: "*Sinn Féin president was accused of being behind the killings*" and the IT report began:

"Sinn Féin president Gerry Adams was rumoured to have set up a notorious IRA gang for ambush by the SAS as they tried to blow up a police station in May 1987, previously secret files have revealed. A Sinn Féin spokesman on Friday dismissed the claim as 'utter nonsense'."

The suggestion to *Irish Times* readers was—as I am reminded of the Mandy Rice Davies response in 1963 to British Government Minister John Profumo's denials of sexual dalliances—*well they would say that, wouldn't they?* And the "*paper of record*" was particularly keen to establish the credibility and "*good authority*" of the conveyor of such accusations:

"The rumour about Mr Adams was passed on to the Department of Foreign Affairs by the highly respected Fr Denis Faul about three months after the Lough-

gall operation. The priest, who had been at school in St Patrick's Academy, Dungannon, with Pdraig McKearney, one of the IRA gang, said the theory doing the rounds was that '*the IRA team were set up by Gerry Adams himself*'. Fr Faul said he was 'intrigued' by the theory... Fr Faul, a school teacher and chaplain in Long Kesh prison who died in 2006, said the rumour was that two of the gang—Jim Lynagh, a councillor in Monaghan, and McKearney—'had threatened to execute Adams shortly before the Loughgall event'. It was being claimed that Lynagh and McKearney 'disliked Adams' political policy' and that they were leaning towards Republican Sinn Féin."

And the large type subheading on page 8 of the print edition—with the byline of its one-time security correspondent *Peter Murtagh*—re-emphasised that message to readers: "*Respected priest told officials of 'intriguing' theory on British army killings.*"

Just not good enough from the *Irish Times*, opined *Sunday Independent* columnist Eilis O'Hanlon on December 31st:

"Curiously, the *Irish Times* downplayed the story about Adams, relegating it to the bottom of an inside page, which hardly did justice to the interest which the release of the latest papers was bound to generate."

But, by heavens, was O'Hanlon—with her own very personal agenda against Adams—determined to milk the accusations for all their worth! At the top of that issue's masthead was its announcement: "*Ghosts that still haunt Gerry Adams*—Eilis O'Hanlon, page 8". (Remember that, on that same page 8, O'Hanlon berates the *Irish Times* for its own page 8 being a bridge too far back.)

The main heading established the tone of her column: "*Counting down the days: Sinn Féin will soon be well rid of its sinister controller*". The subheading read: "*Unsubstantiated rumors are dangerous in the North, but questions about Gerry Adams's past will never go away*". O'Hanlon elaborated:

"So the year ends for Sinn Féin... with party spokespersons scuttling about trying to stamp out another bonfire blazing round Gerry Adams. This time the flames were fanned by the traditional New Year release from the National Archives in Dublin of previously confidential State papers under the 30-year rule. Specifically, one startling snippet from 1987—that Fr Denis Faul, who played a crucial role in brokering a deal to end the IRA hunger strikes, told the Department of Foreign Affairs of a rumour that the Sinn Féin President had 'set up' the eight-man IRA team ambushed and killed, along with the innocent driver

of a passing car, by the SAS that year in Loughgall, Co Armagh. Adams's purported reason, according to the rumour, was that two of the men were staunch opponents of his efforts to shift the focus of the republican campaign away from terrorism and towards politics, and had even threatened to have Adams killed. Fr Faul told officials that he found the rumour '*intriguing*', and that would be putting it mildly. The incident was the single biggest loss of life by the IRA during the entire Troubles. Even now, the Loughgall ambush couldn't be more iconic in republican circles... For the leader of the republican movement to be accused of their betrayal, even with a glaring absence of proof, could not be more provocative... Curiously, the *Irish Times* downplayed the story about Adams... Here was a serious allegation against a man who, until recently, still had ambitions to be Tanaiste. Whether right or wrong, the story could scarcely be more indicative of the problems which Adams has posed to successive Irish governments trying to figure him out. Sinn Féin was unequivocal. 'These claims are utter nonsense', went the official line, and there is definitely some cause for Adams's supporters to feel aggrieved at the now official dissemination of such rumours. Men have died for less, some entirely innocent of wrongdoing. The social media reaction illustrated the dangers. The rumour was gleefully accepted as true..."

She continued:

"Gerry Adams has always reacted to allegations that he has blood on his hands in the same manner as Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, who, confronted at a feast in his honour with the ghost of the recently murdered Banquo, declares: '*Thou canst not say I did it. Never shake thy gory locks at me.*' No one can say for certain that Gerry Adams did anything in those dark years either. Only he knows the truth. But the ghosts keep appearing all the same, shaking their gory locks. Now the Loughgall dead have joined the throng. Adams can't say that he isn't used to it by now. He himself has spoken openly in the past about rumours that he was a British spy. In 2014 he was arrested and questioned for four days at Antrim police station over the 1972 murder of Protestant mother of 10 Jean McConville. On his release without charge, Adams wrote that his accusers 'claimed I was turned by the Special Branch during interrogations in Palace Barracks (near Belfast) in 1972 and that I became an MI5 agent'. Some concluded at the time that it was a smart move by Adams to go public with these long-standing rumours, because pointing to the existence of a possible plot to smear his reputation neutralised any attempt by the British authorities to use it against him. Others were baffled as to why he would circulate rumours against himself in such a public fashion. So far Gerry Adams has said nothing about the release of the State

papers, not even to rubbish the rumour about the Loughgall ambush passed on to the Department of Foreign Affairs by Fr Denis Faul. The denials have been left to colleagues, as so often in the past. As 2018 gets under way, they can at least take some comfort from the fact they won't have to do so for much longer."

O'Hanlon's "no one can say for certain" is equivalent to a "mind you, I'm saying nothing" statement as to how one might be expected to view those accusations against Adams. But since Macbeth had actually been responsible for ordering Banquo's murder, could it possibly be the case that she was nonetheless suggesting a balance of probability to her *Sindo* readership, by drawing parallels between Macbeth and Banquo's ghost, on the one hand, and Adams and the ghosts of the Loughgall dead, on the other? In any case, *Independent Newspapers* were determined to ensure that such "unsubstantiated rumours" concerning Adams should continue to remain "dangerous in the North", notwithstanding the fact that "men have died for less". An editorial decision was taken to extract two sentences from the body of O'Hanlon's column and rephrase them in much larger type at the centre of the page:

"Adams has spoken openly in the past about rumours that he was a British spy. Many were baffled as to why he would circulate rumours against himself in such a public fashion..."

A *Sindo* suggestion of no smoke without fire? *Cui bono*? If not sinister, certainly cynical, to say the least. It is now my turn to borrow an "it's the way she tells 'em" phrase from O'Hanlon's column, in saying that I find the *Independent Newspapers* determination to stoke the fires of such accusations quite "intriguing, and that would be putting it mildly".

Neither the *Irish / Sunday Independent* nor the *Irish Times* are newspapers worthy of the name. They are **opinion** papers—indeed, **opinionated** might be the more appropriate adjective. Eilis O'Hanlon and Peter Murtagh were either intent on, or content with, having the mud from such accusations stick to Adams, 'balanced' only by Sinn Fein denials—well, they would say that, wouldn't they?

A paper that was actually concerned with the pursuit of news would have sought out a response from those with more reason than most to care about Loughgall. Yet only the Unionist *Belfast Telegraph* did so. True, its report on December 30th made no secret of its own hatreds, beginning with its headline, "*Brutality of Loughgall gang obscured in row over Adams, says ex-RUC man*", in this case, Special

Branch Intelligence Officer William Matchett. But, half way down, the *Belfast Telegraph* went on to further report:

"Sinn Fein has described the 'set-up' claims as 'utter nonsense', and **yesterday the brother of Padraig McKearney said he did not believe Adams had anything to do with Loughgall as it was an operation planned in Tyrone. Tommy McKearney rubbished claims that the planned attack was sabotaged by the Sinn Fein president over fears that his brother and Lynagh were plotting his execution.** 'It's no secret that I have long-held political differences with Gerry, but I don't give these claims any credence whatsoever and I certainly don't point the finger at Mr Adams', he said. 'Setting aside his denials that he was ever even in the IRA, I don't think he would have any hands-on knowledge of this particular operation.' The former IRA man, who was jailed for his involvement in the killing of a part-time UDR member in 1976, dismissed the claims as 'misinformation' propagated for political purposes. 'This is only evidence of a classic dirty trick by the British intelligence services designed to exacerbate divisions within republicanism at that

time', he said. In November 1986 around 100 members walked out of Sinn Fein's ard fheis in Dublin after a majority voted to end the long-held policy of abstentionism from Dail Eireann in Dublin. Mr McKearney believes the Loughgall rumour was spread to drive a wedge between competing factions within republicanism at that time. 'I'm not saying my brother didn't have differences with the movement, many did in 1987 due to a split the previous year, but to suggest that anyone was contemplating the execution of Gerry Adams is a bizarre piece of misinformation', he added." (My emphases – MOR).

The sheer integrity of Tommy McKearney's judgement on this issue has thoroughly demolished and given the lie to such "intriguing" accusations. But Free State media have displayed absolutely no interest in reporting McKearney's response. Today's Anti-Sinn Fein Society has its own agenda to pursue, no matter how dangerous the possible consequences of the fires being so cynically stoked in the process.

Manus O'Riordan

Special Nature Of Hiroshima-Nagasaki

In the December issue of *Irish Political Review* I had an article "*Between Two Civilisations*" which argued that the West's European civilisation began to end when the Hiroshima-Nagasaki atomic bombings (unlike the Jewish Holocaust) were followed by no apology; so that nuclear massacre became a standard option of Western warfare.

Two readers, Cyril Hannahay of Co. Leitrim and Jack Lane of this *Review*, have objected that Hiroshima-Nagasaki was not so outstanding a crime against European civilisation as to cause the West's turning away from that civilisation which we have witnessed since the 1960s. As comparable or greater Western crimes Mr Hannahay instances the enormous slaughter of the First World War; and Jack writes of the wiping out of the American Indians by European immigrants and the slavery practised overseas by Europeans from the fifteenth century to the nineteenth.

For my part, I am saying that a civilisation ends—and many civilisations have ended—in either of two ways: by destruction from without or by decision of its power centre that it has so strayed from its original (political-intellectual-moral) nature that it must be abandoned and replaced by a more useful structure. In

short, it ends by murder or suicide; in the case of European civilisation by suicide.

As to the question: why did the (American) power centre of European civilisation conclude that its civilisation had strayed fatally from its original nature? In my judgment due to its consciousness of the awful transgressiveness of those unrepented atomic bombings and the message to that effect which came to it from the West.

That awfuteness lay not in the relatively small number killed outright, 250,000—European civilisation could cope with that—but in the nature of that mass killing: on the one hand, the fact that it was directed against civilians going about their daily lives, who were killed instantaneously or, in some cases, transformed into shadows of their bodies on a nearby wall; and on the other, that the massacres were effected by means of a tiny portion of the planet Earth which clever men in white coats in laboratories had made to explode on command; furthermore, that more such bombs and more powerful hydrogen bombs, were on hand or being made in the US. To this add that soon after the bombing in Japan similar industries were under way in two other Western countries and the Soviet Union was soon to join the club for the atomically armed Cold War

(What by-standing Westerners did not know but may well have sensed coming

was that a small new state—North Korea, as it turned out—noting the West's rapid destruction of Iraq and Libya, would decide that the only way of ensuring its survival was to arm itself with nuclear weapons and flaunt them threateningly.)

There is definitive evidence that the last power centre of European civilisation realised that, with Hiroshima-Nagasaki, the game was up for the civilisation it had come to head. It lies in the fact that within a few years after the atomic bombings it was engaged in devising and promulgating a replacement. Excluding Christianity, which had been the core animator of the European system, Official America, with the help of mass media, set about creating a new, non-Euro-American culture which would secularise, feminise, sexualise, and multi-colourise the old one.

The new values and rules, added to some retained European ones, affected

sexual relations, dissemination of pornography, the practice of abortion and some language usage, while furthering the promotion of women and non-white people. Official America, borrowing inappropriately a term from the old civilisation, called this new values and rules system "*liberalism*". Its declared purpose was to establish the freedom and power of all individuals and, except in material terms, their equality. The new system of values-and-rules-to-live-by was exported to America's European satellites.

As to the contention by Mr. Hannahy and Jack that, as a crime of European civilisation, Hiroshima-Nagasaki was not so exceptional as to merit the dissolution of the civilisation. They instance other actions by Westerners which they believe were equally or more grievous. One can only reply that the central power of European civilisation rightly or wrongly decided otherwise.

Desmond Fennell

sensically. Kettle's propaganda opinion, as related by Lynd, was that Connolly was a worthy but narrow-minded class warrior, and that his mind gave way when the Declarations of War in August 1914 were not met with international socialist revolution, and that he acted out of despair as a kind of bomb-throwing anarchist.

It would be closer to the truth to say that the coherence of Kettle's mind gave way under the impact of Connolly's action. He insisted on returning to the trenches, courting death, and before he died he wrote a poem about the War that was an escapist fantasy.

Pilsudski's nationalist Socialism was rejected by the internationalist Socialists of the Marxist 2nd International, the most eminent of whom were Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg.

Luxemburg, a Jew born in what became Poland, repudiated nationalism altogether as reflecting a form of society that was made obsolete by the development of international capitalism.

Lenin did not repudiate nationalism as historically outmoded. He used the Brest Litovsk negotiations with Germany in March 1918 to stir up nationalist feeling in Europe—and he was condemned sharply by Luxemburg for it. He supported nationalist movements against Imperialist states, as he increasingly described Imperialism as Finance Capitalism, which was international in tendency.

He supported, at least by implication, the formation of bourgeois nation states—the nation state being considered to be essentially a bourgeois social form. But I do not recall that he ever said much about what socialist movements should do in the burgeoning nation states implied by his propaganda.. He theorised no more than he had to, but when he had to he theorised with striking effect. (Theorising as a form of pure reason—he left that to Rosa Luxemburg.)

In the Polish state of 1919 there was a national bourgeois party led by Dmowski and a national socialist party led by Pilsudski. Although Pilsudski had acted with the German enemy in 1914, Versailles could not ostracise him. And, for as long as he lived, Pilsudski represented what was substantial in the Polish state.

In March 1918 Lenin felt obliged to make a Treaty with Germany. Elements in the Bolshevik Party, led by Bukharin, saw the making of a Treaty as the cutting off of revolutionary Russia from the revolutionary potential that arose in Central Europe with the war. Germany said it

100th Anniversary Part 3

The Russian Revolution

"Word of the Tsar! and the drowse malign is broken;
The stone is rolled from the tomb, and Poland is free.
This is the strong evangel. The guns have spoken:
And the scribble of flame of the guns is Liberty.

...

Word of the Tsar! And Russia rises to vision.
Poland and Ireland—theirs, my lords, was an augured fate.
The days draw in, and the ways narrow down to decision—
Will they chaffer, and cheapen, and ruin, or yield to be great?"

That was the war-mongering Home Rule intellectual, T.M. Kettle, in the *Irish Independent* on 21st August 1914.

The Tsar made a gesture towards the autonomy of Poland—most of which he ruled—in order to help his British allies spin the yarn about the War being for democracy and the freedom of small nations. Britain lured him away from conflict with itself in Central Asia by giving him Constantinople (Istanbul) if he could take it from the Turks, on the condition that he also took part with Britain and France in war on Germany.

Warsaw was soon liberated. But it was liberated from the Tsar, not by him.

Polish independence was the aim of a small Polish Army raised by Joseph Pilsudski in Austria, which went to war in alliance with Germany.

Pilsudski founded the Polish Socialist Party in the 1890s. This seems to have been the only Continental Socialist Party

with which James Connolly had any real sense of affinity. Pilsudski set his socialist movement within Polish nationalism as Connolly set his within Irish nationalism.

Connolly went to war, for Irish national independence, against the British Imperialist component of the Entente Powers as Pilsudski went to war for Polish independence against the Tsarist component.

Kettle, who sought Imperial Home Rule, was serving in the British Army in France and was home on leave around the time of the Easter Rising. He was consulted about Connolly's motivation by Robert Lynd (a Home Rule propagandist for the British war effort) who was writing an Introduction for a reprint of Connolly's *Labour In Irish History* by the publisher, Maunsel, which held the copyright. Maunsel was fanatically anti-German. The purpose of the reprint was to disparage Connolly as being out of his depth in matters of foreign policy, and as having therefore acted non-

would resume its war with Russia if Russia did not make a Treaty. Bukharin said that, in that case, Russia should declare revolutionary war. If it had done so, and had hung on for eight months, who can tell what might have happened when the German Navy mutinied and German State authority melted away in early November 1918?

Bukharin had majority support in the central institutions of the Party, but he lacked the force of character to act on his convictions against Lenin. And he was not supported by Trotsky. And so "*Socialism in one country*" became a fact in March 1918.

(I suppose Lenin was assuming a German victory and was securing Russia against it. German victory did seem very much the probable outcome until American fighting technique and propaganda were brought to bear on the War during the Summer of 1918.)

In 1920 Lenin tried to break through into chaotic Europe by force. Poland blocked the way. And so the first battle between International Socialism and National Socialism was fought in Poland in 1920. The dispute between Pilsudski and Lenin moved from ideology to war. Pilsudski conducted a long, orderly retreat before the offensive of the Red Army, right up to the gates of Warsaw, and then launched a powerful counter-offensive which drove the Red Army back beyond its starting-point and enlarged the Polish state. And then he wrote an exuberant book about it: *Year 1920*.

(In 1926 Pilsudski established himself as the authority figure in the Polish State. His regime was described as "*fascist*", and rightly so I think. Insofar as I could find definite meaning in the word '*fascist*', it was a combination of nationalism and socialism.

There was considerable rancour in Weimar Germany, "*democratic Germany*", over the Polish settlement. It was not until Hitler took power that Germany accepted the existence of the Polish State. But Hitler told the Germans that they must forget about the "*Polish Corridor*". He made a Treaty with Poland in 1934 accepting the *status quo*, but with one item left for future negotiation: the German city of Danzig, which was close to East Russia. It was not under actual Polish authority, and held an anomalous position similar to that of mediaeval Free Cities. It was notionally under the League of Nations, but the League had no political purchase within it.

When Germany proposed to clear up that anomaly early in 1939, by attaching

Danzig to East Prussia, Pilsudski was dead. His successor, Colonel Beck, was swept off his feet by the offer of a military alliance with the British and French Empires against Germany. He refused to negotiate on Danzig, though it is hard to see what Poland would have lost by its transfer to East Prussia. And, by making Poland part of a powerful military alliance against Germany, he revoked the 1934 German/Polish Treaty in fact, and gave Germany reason to act against it. And, when Germany did act, Colonel Beck got no assistance whatever from Britain or France.

Russia took back what it had lost to Pilsudski.

The Polish Guarantee was obviously a provocation of Germany with a view to getting a 'moral' case for another war on it.)

*

In the War of 1920, National Socialism confined International Socialism within a single country. Lenin was defeated by Pilsudski. But, at the same time, it vindicated his position on nationality against Rosa Luxemburg's rejection of it as a spent force.

But the Single Country within which comprehensive socialism, in the form of a dictatorship of the proletariat, was confined was vast in size, rich in material resources, and had been developing strongly as its own cultural world for about a century.

Lenin, as far as I know, did not reassess the situation after his defeat by Pilsudski. He carried on strengthening the State that he had constructed in Russia, weaving it into the life of Russian society, and devising ways of enabling economic development to go on within the great mass of individual owners of property that he had brought into being.

His socialist state rested on the bourgeois revolution which he had enacted in the main body of Russian society. With his New Economic Policy he enabled the new owners of the land to buy and sell in the market, while using the State to prevent, or delay, the emergence of political awareness from that activity. But he asserted repeatedly that this mass of small-scale commodity transactions would have a tendency to generate capitalism "*daily and hourly*".

He did not repudiate the opinion that Communism could only be achieved through international socialist revolution—meaning socialist revolution in the countries of advanced capitalism in Europe—but neither did he desist from the practice of building it in isolated Russia.

While he was directing affairs, this conflict between theory and practice never became an issue. But, when he was

disabled in 1923 and died early in 1924, it became the great issue.

This series of articles began as an account of the development of BICO from discussion meetings held around 1963 between a group of Trotskyists of IRA background, a group of ex-members of the Communist Party of Great Britain, Pat Murphy, and myself. It was agreed that we should follow through the course of events in Russia in the light of a factual assessment of the situation at each turning point and see where that led us.

I had never been in any socialist organisation, nor had Pat. I had read *Capital* Volume 1 in Slieve Luacra and the later volumes after I went to London, and from those later volumes I got an idea of the immense resourcefulness and adaptability of capital that was quite different from the idea one got from Volume 1. The only Marxist political literature I had read was Trotsky's *Defence Of Terrorism* (directed against the German Social Democrat, Karl Kautsky).

The critical thing in our discussions was what happened after Lenin, in 1923-4. Trotsky at that point made an issue of *Socialism In One Country*, holding it to be an impossibility. This was entirely in accordance with his theory of *Permanent Revolution*, published before 1917. That theory said that a bourgeois revolution would be unsustainable in Russia and would give way to socialist revolution—but also that socialist revolution would be unsustainable in Russia unless it was sustained by socialist revolution in Europe.

Lenin could be quoted in support of that view, but he had not acted on that view when there was no European revolution, and when his attempt to break through to Europe was thwarted by Pilsudski. He carried on as if he thought that Socialism in One Country was a practical possibility, and Trotsky did not dissent.

But now Lenin was gone, and those who had been carried along by the magnetic force of his will had to decide for themselves what to do.

Should the revolution be aborted, and a bourgeoisie found, and an orderly transfer of power to it be arranged? I could not find that Trotsky suggested such a thing.

His view implied that an attempt to build socialism in Russia in isolation must lead to its perversion or degeneration under the irresistible influence of the surrounding capitalist world. But what he published a few years later was not an account of the inevitable degeneration suffered by the revolution when it was persisted with after

isolation made it impossible—it was *Revolution Betrayed*.

I had many discussions with Liam Dalton, trying to get my head around the idea that the revolution was destined to failure by international circumstances, but that it also failed because it was betrayed by those who assumed the leadership of it. To my mind the idea that it was betrayed implied that it might have succeeded.

Would it have succeeded if Trotsky had become party leader after Lenin instead of Stalin? As I recall, Liam would not express a definite opinion one way or the other. But he could not deny that he thought it would have been better if Trotsky had become leader.

So why didn't he? I looked into that a bit and it struck me that he did not try to take over the leadership. He acted as if he did not want to be Party leader. Lenin towards the end did what he could for him. He was the obvious heir. And Lenin tried to cast a posthumous veto against Stalin. But Trotsky refused to act in any way that would have enabled him to become leader of the party made by Lenin.

Going into this, I discovered his pre-Revolution condemnation of the Leninist Party as a dictatorially-controlled bureaucratic structure which was designed to act in place of the working class.

Going through Trotsky's later accounts of why he did not become leader in 1924, I found much of his pre-Revolution dislike of Leninism re-surfacing as criticism of Stalinism, but with the addition of distaste for the uncouth company of the workers who were increasingly encountered in Stalin's circles. The party Stalin made was to act in place of the working class and yet it was thick with workers who were not cultured.

Now Liam Dalton was an intellectual. He was very widely read. He took the *Irish Times* (which I had never seen before I met him) and a French newspaper every day, but it was evident, ardent Trotskyist that he was, that he had never gone into the detail of why Trotsky had not taken over from Lenin. What I was finding out was all news to him—as it was to me. He did not close up against it, despite Trotskyist taunts from Géry Lawless, with whom he had a strange love/hate (or contempt) relationship. Eventually Lawless blew the group apart by becoming police informer, and I had to try to figure the thing out on my own.

Brendan Clifford

TO BE CONTINUED

January Brexit Summary

As 2017 ended, a short-hand summary of the Brexit impasse was: the UK wants Canada plus plus plus while the EU is only prepared to concede Canada dry. At the time of writing in late January, despite much probing of the possibilities, that remains the position. During the month political developments pertinent to Brexit occurred in Germany concerning the formation of a Government, and in Britain—including a visit by Emanuel Macron. We also learned that the UK hopes to agree transition arrangements with Brussels by the end of March and that Michel Barnier wants the transition to end in December 2020, 21 months after the formal exit on 30th March 2019 at 11 pm UK time (midnight on the Continent).

Notable news items and issues from an Irish perspective are the impact of Donald Trump's tax reform on the litigation between the Irish Government, Apple and the EU Commission; the opening of a new ferry service between Cork and Santander in Spain; a practical suggestion regarding retail supply chains; and some thought provoking debates in the Irish media.

HOW MUCH DIVERGENCE?

A common way of explaining the UK's preferred option of Canada plus plus plus is: neither Norway nor Canada but somewhere in between. *'Norway'* means making a financial contribution to the EU and agreeing to be bound by rulings of the European Court of Justice while *'Canada'* means having a Free Trade Agreement in goods and a small number of services but not financial services. Both of these options have been repeatedly ruled out by the UK Government.

According to the London correspondent of the *Irish Times*, Denis Staunton, a blueprint of the relationship that the UK wants with the EU may be contained in a recent report from the Institute for Government, *'Whitehall's favourite think tank'* (IT, 22 Jan). In the report reference is made to a regulatory partnership which would have three levels: a core tier in which the regulations would be fully aligned with current and future rules of the Single Market; a mid-tier where UK regulations diverged from EU rules to achieve the same outcomes; and an outer tier of regulations outside the scope of the Single Market or not relevant to UK/EU trade.

Staunton considers that the proposal

echoes a passage in May's Florence speech last September. He writes that the Institute for Government cites the EU's agreement with Ukraine, which allows that country to participate in parts of the Single Market where it adopts EU rules. EU officials counter that such arrangements are for States in transition to joining the Single Market. And so the debate goes on. If the Institute for Government report is anything to go by, the final trade deal is likely to reflect a closer relationship with the EU than the Brexiteers would like.

POLITICAL EVENTS IN GERMANY AND BRITAIN

Following the collapse of talks between the Christian Democrats, the liberal FDP and the Greens, Angela Merkel's efforts to form a Government switched to the Social Democrats under Martin Schulz. Discussion between these two parties became relevant to Brexit when, following a preliminary agreement to enter coalition negotiations on January 12th, a 28-page document was published in which the first three pages related to EU reform. This was immediately interpreted as a victory for the more pro-EU SPD as against Merkel's more cautious approach, adding to hopes that Macron's ambitious plans for a deeper EU and Eurozone integration will eventually receive German backing. Movement in that direction will militate against the possibility that a change of heart will take place in the UK over Brexit, an outcome that in any case seems unlikely. When the preliminary agreement was reached Schultz stated:

"Together we are determined to use Germany's strength, both economically and politically, to make Europe a great project again."

The agreement won the support of an SPD Conference on January 21st but by a narrower margin than was expected. Coalition talks now start in earnest, following which a vote of the total membership of the SPD will take place. Only then will the formation of a Government become possible, so the uncertainty that has kept Macron's plans in suspension will continue until Easter at the earliest. It should be noted that, throughout these developments, Merkel officials have insisted that regarding the EU *"anything beyond superficial changes will be a lengthy process"* (*Irish Times*, Jan 12th).

In Britain the *European Union (Withdrawal) Bill* passed its third reading on January 17th, at which point the debate moved to the House of Lords; it is expected to encounter strong opposition in that chamber. That an amendment was passed in the Commons allowing the Westminster Parliament a vote on the final Brexit deal has been interpreted to mean that a majority of MPs stand opposed to Brexit. A reshuffle of Theresa May's Cabinet on January 8th was expected to have the effect of re-asserting her authority following the poor election results of last year, but it had the opposite effect. Jeremy Hunt refused to move from the Department of Health and Justine Greening chose to resign from the Government rather than become Secretary of State for Work and Pensions.

Macron met May in Sandhurst on January 18th for a bilateral exchange which, if any other Member State was party to it, would be considered a breach of EU solidarity. Thirteen papers were released following the meeting, covering areas like Security and Defence, cyber and digital; Foreign Policy; and even Sports Events—according to a Guardian correspondent. In an indication that the UK is far from being out-manoeuvred by the Barnier team, Theresa May made the following statement in response to Macron's re-statement of the standard EU position about the UK not being allowed to cherry-pick:

"I think the City of London will continue to be a major global financial centre. That is an advantage not just for the UK, it's actually good for Europe and good for the global financial system" (Guardian, 18 Jan).

Other developments in Britain were that Jacob Rees Mogg, a hard line Brexiteer who has been tipped as a potential future leader, was elected Chair of the European Research Group, a key post in the pro-Brexit camp; and, in the Labour Party, the pro-Corbyn Momentum faction achieved a clean sweep in the membership elections to the Party's National Executive Committee. The latter result means that Blairism has been effectively defeated in British Labour, representing, on top of the dramatic collapse of Carillion, another important nail in the coffin of Thatcherism. The significance of the triumph of Corbynism will not be lost on the Continent.

ECONOMIC MATTERS IN IRELAND

Donald Trump's tax reform, which incentivises US companies to repatriate large cash reserves, at a one-off reduced rate (15.5%) of US Corporation Tax, has major implications for Ireland, immediate-

ly and in the long term. It has caused the company that manufactures the I-Phone and that employs over six thousand staff in Ireland, Apple, to make a once-off payment of \$38 billion to the US Treasury. The consequent re-orientation of the company's tax strategy means that Apple no longer has a financial interest in fighting the European Commission ruling that it must pay 15 billion euro to Ireland in back tax. The Irish Government may still win that case on the grounds that profits made elsewhere should not be taxed in Ireland. In the long term these changes may reduce the attractiveness of Ireland for US foreign direct investment.

Developments in this area will be used by lobbyists who see Ireland's membership of the EU as a purely transactional arrangement. However, most economic commentators consider that the long term threat to inward investment from the US resulting from Trump's reform has been exaggerated.

A new ferry route linking Cork with the Spanish port of Santander will commence in April. Brittany Ferries will provide two sailings per week on the route and divide its business between passengers and freight. Regarding the service Captain Michael McCarthy, Commercial Manager for the Port of Cork, stated:

"The option for freight carriers to bypass the UK land bridge will be seen as very attractive as Brexit uncertainty continues. We have no doubt that both exporters and importers will make this a viable service" (Irish Times, Jan 16).

This might be seen as a first step in re-orientating Irish transport services in response to Brexit.

Staying with the subject of transport logistics post-Brexit, economist John Fitzgerald made a useful suggestion in early January. In an article headed, "*How Brexit will hit you when shopping in Pennys or M&S*", his final two paragraphs read:

"An obvious solution to the potential difficulties in importing goods through the UK would be for Irish retailers to establish a warehouse in Rotterdam where they would collect all their non-UK imports and then ship direct to Ireland. However, such trade normally involves lift-on and lift-off of containers, not lorries, and Irish ports don't have the capacity to handle a big increase in such trade.

Even with the most efficient electronic documentation, the costs of supplying retailers in Ireland will rise significantly. There is the risk that some UK retailers might just give up if this is too troublesome, resulting in a loss of competition

and higher prices. Long-term what is needed is to attract new entry by foreign retailers, such as the French retailers Carrefour or Leclerc, who have a supply chain immune from UK difficulties. They could bring enhanced competition and more efficient distribution. The Department of Business, Enterprise and Innovation needs to actively foster retail competitiveness, including attracting new entrants" (Irish Times, 5 Jan).

DEBATING BREXIT

A point worth airing by way of introduction to this section is that, since at least the foundation of the State, one of the constituent elements of the Irish national community has been pro-British in its cultural leanings. That has been the case and will continue to be so. That sub-category is itself quite diverse and not amenable to either generalisation or stereotyping; it even encompasses many people who hold nationalist views. A problem has emerged in recent times in that a political project which may be called '*Anglicisation*' has sought to identify the Irish-with-British-leanings with a contrived historical narrative. Even before Brexit that political project was running out of steam.

Rather than following that course, it would be far better to allow the various constituencies of the national community—adherents of purely Irish culture, citizens with Continental leanings, citizens with British leanings etc—to retain their identities in the context of a basic national consensus. One part of that consensus, necessarily, would derive from the view that separation from Britain arose from solid historical causes.

These thoughts were induced by watching a TV debate about Brexit broadcast by TV3 on January 17th. The '*Tonight Show*' featured a discussion that included Nigel Farage, Eamon Dunphy, Ray Bassett, and Fine Gael Senator Neale Richmond; the anchors were Matt Cooper and Ivan Yates. What came across in Eamon Dunphy's contribution was raw emotion along the lines that Leo Varadkar's pro-EU speech that day at the European Parliament had been '*anti-British*'. Ray Bassett endorsed Dunphy's point and later in the debate Ivan Yates, who is from a Church of Ireland background, suggested that Ireland should consider joining the Commonwealth.

Strangely enough there was nothing anti-British in Varadkar's speech; in answer to a question Varadkar actually drew on his own family circumstances in demonstrating the close links that exist between Ireland and Britain: his sister lives in England and his nephews are English; his parents had met in London

where his Indian father had worked as a doctor and his Irish mother as a nurse.

Senator Richmond made the political point that, for Ireland to follow the example of Norway by leaving the EU while remaining in the Single Market as Ray Bassett had proposed, was "fantasy". Ireland drew many benefits from, and had a disproportionate influence in, the EU, and giving up all of that would be madness, he said. Yet political arguments seemed to have little effect on the other panellists. Perhaps, from having been led to believe that a pro-British mindset must become dominant in Ireland, Dunphy, Bassett and Yates have each fallen prey to revisionist illusion. Like John Bruton their arguments seem to be driven by emotion rather than political considerations; but their concerns should be assuaged; British cultural influence in Ireland is not going to disappear as a result of Brexit.

"Brexit is a collective English mental breakdown" was the heading of an opinion piece published in the *Irish Times* on January 16th. The author, Nicholas Boyle, is a Professor of German at Cambridge University and a biographer of Goethe. What was interesting about the article was not so much its contents, which are well summarised in the title, but the replies it provoked in the letters page under the heading, "Pathologising Brexit". Here is one of them.

"Is The Irish Times intent on demeaning and even demonising the English?"

Anglophobia is dead, declared Fintan O'Toole in this paper in 2011. Unfortunately not. Anglophobia is alive and well, and Brexit shows it.

The Irish political and commentariat class has revelled in Brexit. A majority of headlines in Irish papers appear not only to oppose Brexit, but to stand in a sneering condescension to it.

Most worrying is the latest piece by Nicholas Boyle ('Brexit is a collective English mental breakdown', Opinion & Analysis, January 16th), who has attempted to pathologise a perfectly legitimate referendum result as a 'collective mental breakdown'.

This is outrageous.

Pride in your history, concern for your borders and cherishing your national sovereignty are perfectly legitimate views. These matters do not make you a dewy-eyed imperialist with a mental health problem.

BRIAN JOHN SPENCER, Belfast."

Mr. Spencer has a point. Fintan O'Toole *et al* would be well advised to ease up on the Anglophobia. Pathologising Brexit is a good description of what they have been up to.

Dave Alvey

Letter sent to *History Today*

Looking Back Through The Iron Curtain

Archie Brown's review (Jan 2018) of Angus Roxburgh's memoir "*Moscow Calling—Memoirs of a Foreign Correspondent*" is a useful antidote to most western commentary on the Soviet Union and Russia these past hundred years.

The figures given for fatalities during the Second World War should explain Russian fears ever since.

The continental United States suffered no civilian fatalities, Britain 67,000 and the Soviet Union 16,000,000.

United States military fatalities are given as 400,000, Britain 380,000 and the Soviet Union 10,000,000.

Might I add that Indian civilians living under the protection King George VI of Britain, their Emperor, died in their millions from famine arising from British policy in 1942-43, dwarfing Britain's total fatalities, civil and military combined, in both world wars?

Donal Kennedy
5.1.18

Courts Set The Tone For Gardaí

The treatment meted out to Joanne Hayes by some investigating officers of An Garda Síochána during the Kerry Babies debacle was heinous.

The Hayes family were exposed to appalling conduct by an aggressive Garda questioning regime, the roots of which could be traced back to the establishment of the 'Heavy Gang' in 1976. This 'Heavy Gang' were gardaí who specialised in the extraction of confessions amid claims of ill-treatment while in custody. Members of the then government were made aware of these allegations yet decided to ignore them.

Speaking in 1998, Dr Conor Cruise O'Brien, a former government minister, revealed that he had in 1974 supported police brutality by a group of gardaí that went on to beat confessions out of, and obtain convictions against, innocent people.

Dr O'Brien and the government, by their inaction, set a standard of behaviour among gardaí that was damaging not only to civil liberties, but to the reputation of the force.

Despite trial by jury being a bulwark of our Constitution, the government sanctioned the use of special legislation by the non-jury Special Criminal Court which was repugnant to the basic principles of justice and liberty.

As the behaviour and attitudes of courts are a determining factor in the behaviour of the Garda, it was perceived that if the courts were taking short cuts to get convictions, then gardaí could do the same.

And they did.

Tom Cooper
Irish Independent, 25.1.2018

Troubled History: A 10th Anniversary Critique Of *The IRA & Its Enemies* by Brian Murphy osb and Niall Meehan. Introduction Ruan O'Donnell. 48pp. **€10, £8**
(Postfree in Ireland and Britain)

The Embers of Revisionism, Critiquing Creationist Irish History, a contribution to the First West Cork History Festival, by *Niall Meehan, Brian Murphy OSB*. 40ppA3, **€12, £8**
(Postfree in Ireland and Britain)

VARADKAR continued

in not participating in the so-called war on Fascism. If all the anti-fascists had acted like de Valera in their own countries, there would be no need for the Armageddon that was WWII. There is more than one way to skin a cat.

Varadkar could have a lesson to tell the worried delegates at Davos based on this period of Irish history. But how could he do it unless he could rise above his party and its history? That he just cannot do.

Jack Lane

Does It Up

Stack ?

BITCOIN BUBBLE

The recent Bitcoin Bubble is a new manifestation of the South Sea Company Bubble and the Dutch Tulip Bubble. It does not stack up at all upon reasoned examination but, even so, the most intelligent people fall for it just as much as the most foolish people. Over the years, there have been big fluctuations in the prices of commodities such as wheat, gold, copper, oil, etc., usually based on scarcity or rumours of scarcity or exceptionally good harvests or exceptionally bad harvests. Last year, due to difficult farming weather in New Zealand, the price of butter soared at the same time as medical science found that butter was healthier than vegetable oil substitutes. Well, we all know that wheat and gold and butter are intrinsically useful commodities. Even if their price collapses—they will be useful.

But Bitcoin in itself is useless. And so of course is paper money intrinsically. Paper money is useful because it is accepted by everyone as a store of value, and a measure of exchange value. It is accepted because State Governments guarantee the value of the Euro, UK pound, the US dollar and so on. Everybody does their buying and selling in their own chosen money. For example, if you want to sell something and you are offered Swedish Kronar, you will not conclude the deal until you find out what the Swedish Kronar is worth in your own chosen currency. This is because you do not want Swedish money unless you are about to go to Sweden. You may completely trust the Swedish money but the first thing you will do with it is to convert it into your own chosen currency.

I do not know anyone who is likely to offer me Bitcoin nor do I know what I could do with it if I got it. Would a Bank take it in exchange for Euros? I don't know of any bank dealing in Bitcoin and so I would not accept it in payment for any valuable goods I might wish to sell. Bitcoin is no use to me as money. I do not trust it, yet.

Money is a peculiar thing. In these

times, money takes the form of paper notes and coins issued by Governments or by Central Banks under Government control and it also consists of credit cards and cheque books based on bank accounts. People do know they are skating on thin ice and this is evidenced by how fast people will rush to banks holding their 'money' if there is the slightest rumour of a Bank failing. And those people will want to get their money back in 'hard cash', which these days mean Central Bank or Bank of England notes.

Paper money was issued by the Sung Empire in China but was only acceptable in certain areas and for certain periods of time and in 1260 the Mongols created in China a paper money which was by Law to be acceptable throughout the Empire and for an unlimited time. However the Mongols started to take away the precious silver currency, leaving only the paper money. Vast quantities of silver and gold were taken out of China and the currency became less and less acceptable in a short time. The notes were replaced by a new paper currency in 1287 which remained stable as long as the dynasty lasted. We have reports on it from Marco Polo in his book *'The Travels'*. He was in Peking, now Beijing, in 1275 and met Kublai Khan. Ibn Battuta (1304-1377) who was a Moslem born in Tangier, also reported in 1349 on the paper money of China.

(Incidentally the Franciscan priest Giovanni di Monte Corvino went to China in 1291 and as a result of his missionary work—Pope Clement V appointed him Archbishop of Peking. He died in Peking in 1328. So there was evidence of traffic to and fro by sea and also across the oases of the deserts by land. There was at that time a sizeable community of Chinese in Moscow.)

In Ireland, a silver coinage was introduced about 1000 A.D. by Danes in Dublin and some of these coins are in the National Museum of Ireland. They are not very well minted and on some of the coins is evidence that they were copied from coins issued by the Danes in London. The Dublin coins continued to be minted up to about 1150 A.D. These were the only coins found to be minted in Ireland before 1169, after which the Normans introduced their own coins for limited use among themselves.

It is interesting that the Irish people seemed to have had no use for coins as a medium of exchange. I have come across no reason for this. The ancient Egyptians also did not use coins.

What was it about these economies that money was not needed? It could be that tribute or ransom was paid in herds of cattle or measures of wheat. Or in slaves? Or days of work as in the Irish *meitheal*? Barter of gold and silver ornaments was undoubtedly engaged in. Your guess is as good as anyone's. They did not need Bitcoin obviously and they did not need computers either. The Great Khan was ruling the greatest Empire the World has ever known. And that was eight hundred years ago. However did he manage it without computers? It Khan be done!

GENDER BALANCE

The great up-swell of complaints of harassment and sexual abuse against men has risen to unreasonable levels. The 'herd instinct' can clearly be seen in the *#MeToo* hash-tag but it is a remarkable feature of the movement that no poor men are being attacked and so there seems to be a strong element of greed for money—and money can be got only from men who are rich and powerful. Also, the accusations are many but the evidence is scarce and so there seems to be a lot of blackmailing going on—like, pay me the money and I'll shut up maybe.

All of the publicity is good for the media in the short term; increasing the demand for the latest news and so the media can sell more advertisements which is what the media lives on. But in the longer term people will become disgusted by their own salaciousness and they will turn away from it eventually. All of this is not good for women in general because it is turning decent men off.

It has now got to the stage that even entertaining and harmless flirting in good humour between men and women is dangerous for the men if even the odd woman decided to take offence from innocent remarks. No longer can a woman be complimented on her hairstyle or on her beautiful dress by a man, in case his praise is termed inappropriate! "*Dragons Be Here*" is what some men end up thinking and who can blame them? When French-woman and great actress Catherine Deneuve, with 100 other women who joined her, protested against this "*gender harassment*" movement, she was shouted down by a fascistic mob of women, along with some men on the Internet, and she ended up apologising—literally afraid for her life and that of her family.

It should be pointed out that this is mainly an Anglo/American movement. Europe has yet to be enticed into this type

of mad immaturity and gross behaviour by women.

All of this anti-men stuff is having a serious effect on Society and in the world of work. For example, in the teaching profession, a great majority of all Primary level teachers are now women in Ireland and throughout Europe. The ratio at Primary level is about 87% women to 13% men. Children need role models as they grow up and the majority of role models now for all children—girls and boys—are women. And so is it any wonder that boys as well as girls want to be women when they grow up?

At Secondary level the women teachers are a smaller proportion but at about 65% they are still a substantial majority. This is not good for our children. Teacher quality is a most important factor in determining the academic performance of students and this requirement is being satisfied by the present arrangement but, apart from academic excellence, there are other factors to be considered as important in producing a well balanced adult person and it would appear that these other factors are not being given the attention which they deserve.

Young men will not take up a teaching career if they see that it is too dangerous. Society must find some way to protect male teachers and indeed men in every occupation from the sort of blackmailing attacks which a small minority of women and indeed men are getting away with. And that it is caused by women more than men is evident. We all know of a case in France where a young boy of 14 years was groomed and seduced by his woman teacher in her mid-thirties and the outcry against this wrongdoing was muted if not silenced. If it had been a young girl of 14 years old who had been seduced by a male teacher in his mid-thirties—there would have been an international outcry of horror and fake revulsion. But France's First Lady Brigitte Macron got away with it and indeed many women's magazines felt it was time that such things happened.

Cougars (i.e. that is women of a certain age who go after young men successfully)—the magazine *women* writers chorused are here to stay. How is that for double standards? It does not stack up and society needs to do something about it—otherwise things are slipping into a very large abyss.

Michael Stack ©

Child Varadkar at Davos

At the Davos get-together Taoiseach Leo Varadkar gave an insight into his view of European history, the EU, and the USA that was enlightening about himself but showed a simpleton's view of these issues. He said that: *"I am also cautious about the Europe of the historical past... where large states went to war on occasion and very often over-ran smaller states"* (Irish Times, 26.1.18). If that's the history of Europe why has he anything to do with it? It must be a crazy, dangerous place.

It is of course the essential English view of that history—one in which England itself is absent, despite the fact that it has the longest and most outrageous history of doing exactly what he accuses Europe of doing. At the last count:

"A new study has found that at various times the British have invaded almost 90 per cent of the countries around the globe. The analysis of the histories of the almost 200 countries in the world found only 22 which have never experienced an invasion by the British" (The Telegraph, 4.11.2012).

And that number has increased since. No European country comes within an ass's roar of such numbers. Varadkar has a very squinted view of history.

The Taoiseach added: *"We don't want to see meetings in Paris and Berlin that only countries with more than 40 million people are invited to attend, and the smaller countries being told afterwards what's good for Europe..."*

With the UK set to exit the EU, smaller *"free trader countries"* that believe in *"low taxation generally... will need to work together and build new relationships and help shape the future of Europe..."* (Irish Times, 26.1.18).

Again, the states that have made the EU functional, Germany and France, are targeted as the focus for others to ally against on the basis of low taxation and free trade, along with a caricature of how the EU works. Varadkar is in effect taking up the British position and seems to think that this is a sensible approach in a post-Brexit EU.

But why should the sort of Europe he wants, rationally market-oriented, take any interest in Ireland's problems, post-Brexit. Surely the low taxation and free trade orientation will take care of everything!!!

And at some point the Taoiseach will no doubt complain and wonder why he may not have the full confidence of the EU when the UK has gone its own sweet

way. He is adopting a reckless position. It is beyond comprehension that the Irish leader is alienating the two major Powers in Europe at a point when he needs allies to force Britain to keep its apparent promises over a Hard Border in Ireland.

He told the meeting that:

"America made itself great by trading and accepting migrants from all over the world... It's a country... that saved the world from fascism and then from communism. When America disengages from the world, it doesn't live up to those very American values and the world becomes a more dangerous place—and a lesser place" (ibid).

America made itself great by applying Protectionism for over a century and a half, based on Listian principles as any rudimentary knowledge of history shows. It is also still protectionist, and becoming more so. And it takes even less knowledge to know that it was the Communist Soviet Union that defeated Fascism not America which entered the war to destroy Japan, and entered the war in Europe to prevent those who defeated Fascism from getting the fruits of their victory.

And the American victory over Communism has ensured the very opposite of what Varadkar claims, as anybody can see that, when America engages with the world, *"the world becomes a more dangerous place—and a lesser place"* by every passing day. That's the result of American foreign policy!

Speaking of Fascism, Varadkar should know something about Fascism, as his party was formed as the Irish fascist party in the 1930s. But did America or anybody else help defeat it for us?

There is a great lesson to be learned from that defeat of Irish Fascism that is very apposite for today's Europe. It was done without war or terror or bringing the house down politically—speaking. We are told that Fascism, under the title of populism, is growing everywhere as a result of the consequences of globalisation, i.e., Free Trade in its purest sense. De Valera had to deal with similar consequences of an earlier version of 'globalisation' in the form of the British Empire as then espoused by Varadkar's party.

How did he and Fianna Fail do it? They developed and implemented economic and industrial policies that satisfied the country's needs in a protectionist framework. And, more important, they satisfied the soul of the nation by getting rid of the humiliating so-called *'Treaty'*. As a result Fascism declined and its adherents joined de Valera

continued on page 27, column 3

FAKE NEWS continued

Examiner, 26.3.2015)

PRINT DEPENDS ON SOCIAL MEDIA

The "threat from fake news" has been here since the beginning of time. It reached a pinnacle with the onset of the print media—it didn't have to wait for social media.

There's somewhat of an irony here in that if you go into any major newsroom today, it is doubtful that you could produce a publication for the following morning if you did not have social media and its ancillary components at hand.

The problem for the print moguls is that they have been left behind, if they controlled social media, it would be the greatest advance since colour print. It's a little like Bitcoin—the bankers and speculators are aghast—this can't work. It can't work because the established banking system is not in control of the system. Indeed, it may fail. But it has set the pace and it will prevail in some other form.

DEPUTY MARTIN'S BAILIWICK

There is little doubt that the leader of the opposition has something to fret about. We can credit him with some knowledge on this subject. On December 5, 2017, the *Irish Times* took control of Landmark Publications, publishers of the *Irish Examiner* and *Evening Echo* in Cork city. At a stage in the early 1980s, the circulation of the then Cork Examiner was on the verge of outselling the venerable *Irish Times*, both were tottering around 70,000 copies a day. Today, the *Irish Examiner* is selling below 30,000 copies and the direction seems downwards.

The *Examiner* and the *Echo* are the very oxygen of political survival in Cork. Tip O'Neill once stated: "...all politics is local". No, No—in Cork "All politics is parochial." As one wag whispered in my ear, *Arraah, boy, do you think they'd still be printing, if we didn't have the Tainiste and the Leader of the Opposition and a state controlled bank.*

News is now so immediate through the TV and internet that this function of newspapers is disappearing. Commentary, editorials, adverts, sport and death notices are the remaining reason for reading newspapers. The present writer used believe that the only truth contained in a newspaper was the death notices but this function too, is now being gradually taken

over by the internet.

MEDIA NEGATIVITY

Week after week we get a dose of unremitting negativity on the airwaves and newspapers that supposedly serve Irish society.

Sub-editors compete with each other to concoct the most damaging and alarming headlines possible in the pursuit of circulation figures. It is a corrosive and unbalanced agenda that should be changed at every turn.

The point here is not to present a rose-tinted prism through which to view modern Ireland. Hugely difficult economic and social challenges face us but we tackle them equipped with resources and skills that never existed in the past.

We are one generation away from Irish men and women who had no electricity in their homes and walked to school without shoes. We are one generation away from a large slice of Irish society that emigrated on ships with no easy means of returning or even communicating with those left behind, distraught.

We have not seen much of this contextualised in the shouting match that now dresses up as journalism in Ireland. Anyone in their 20s must think they live in some form of hell hole which will forever destroy their futures and condemn them to endless misery.

Education standards in this country, at national and secondary levels, remain high; healthcare and survival rates are at a standard as good as any other EU state, yes, a lot done and more to do; we live longer than ever before.

Things like this are not, apparently, legitimate issues for the front page of newspapers or radio and TV discussions. The Irish print media after a century of dominance is being bypassed by new technology. Proprietors and media columnists should cut out the histrionics and get on with the job of overhauling the size and structure of that industry fast.

By all means, Micheál, curry favour with the Press Barons but not with taxpayers money!

=====

IRISH TIMES: Past and Present, a record of the journal since 1859 by John Martin. 264 p.p. Belfast Historical & Educational Society. 2008. £20, £15.

=====

FIANNA FAIL: The Irish Press and The Decline of the Free State by Brendan Clifford. 172 p.p. Aubane Historical Society-2007. £12, £9.

=====

Dark Days Ahead For Our Infrastructure

Infrastructure cuts - *Belfast Telegraph* letters

Despite the heroic efforts of hundreds of staff from the Department of Infrastructure (DfI), working around the clock, in atrocious conditions, to grit and plough our roads network, there has still been significant disruption. Schools have been forced to close, business and commerce have been adversely affected and there have been road accidents and cars abandoned.

Shockingly, until as late as October 2017, the Department did not have the capacity to make financial provision for such winter service in the current financial year. Thankfully for our community, in-year monitoring of departmental budgets and 'underspends' elsewhere, allowed the reallocation that is funding the activity we are witnessing.

The ongoing problems faced by DfI, are outlined in the **Briefing on the Northern Ireland Budgetary Outlook 2018-20** issued by the Department of Finance. This sets out various scenarios by which the NI budget might be balanced, (as it has to be). This follows cuts to the Block Grant by the Westminster Government, which match the extreme austerity imposed on public expenditure in GB.

Unfortunately because of severe cuts made in 2014/15 to its predecessor, the Department for Regional Development, DfI has never achieved a reasonable baseline in its budget. Given that there is no activity that the public would want the Department to abandon, it has simply been forced, among other things, to underfund Translink, leaving them to exhaust their financial reserves, pay less to NI Water than the Regulator has determined reasonable and to reduce routine maintenance of roads.

But perhaps the most telling example of this man made crisis, lies in the budget scenarios outlined that require the abandonment of funding for public street lighting by the Department. Notwithstanding the obvious problems that will arise in community safety, with an annual energy bill of just over £12 million, street lighting is simply not affordable within the DfI's likely budget allocation. The Westminster Government, without a vote to its name in Northern Ireland, has truly cast us into the shadows.

Michael Robinson
19 Jan 2018

**Labour Party Northern Ireland
Constituency Council
Michael Robinson is Chair of NICC**

FAKE NEWS continued

the computer:

"The origins of disinformation stretch back centuries before Christ. But it has become uniquely part of the late twentieth century, practised on a hitherto undreamed-of scale by the Soviet bloc and to a lesser extent by the West" (Richard Deacon, *The Truth Twisters*, Futura, 1986).

Substitute 'fake news' for 'disinformation' and that's where we stand today.

THE NORTHERN WAR

Surely, the leader of the Opposition has some little recollection of the fake and utterly dishonest record of both the British and Irish media in covering up Britain's responsibility for the 28 year war in the Six Counties.

If he hasn't, then he will surely remember the notorious Section 31 of the Republic's Broadcasting Act introduced by Fianna Fail Minister for Posts and Telegraphs Gerry Collins in 1971 and further strengthened in 1977 by Labour Minister Conor Cruise O'Brien.

THE 'NATIONAL' DAILIES

"Earlier this year, [2017] it emerged that Landmark Media had outstanding borrowings of €16.3 million from AIB and the acquisition required the *Irish Times* to take on some of Landmark's debt. In a message to staff last week, the *Irish Times* said that AIB had supported a "significant debt restructuring". Sources close to the matter said the debt write-off was in excess of €11 million." (*Sunday Business Post*, 10.12.2017).

There were many times when the *Irish Times* had no visible means of support. Did it survive the way it has acquired the *Examiner* - the banks write off its debts when necessary? Nice way to do business, very hard to fail.

The interesting thing is that the *Irish Times* has been here before. It was never a real commercial success but its survival was ensured for more important reasons than mere profit. Politically, the life of the *Irish Times* centres on London.

In 2009, AIB received the biggest bailout of all the Irish banks still trading, with the government injecting €21 billion into the bank during the financial crisis. In June, 2017, the state sold approximately 28.75% of its shares in AIB for €3.4 billion. This is the government-owned bank, is now set to face sanctions from the

Central Bank for overcharging thousands of customers on tracker mortgages.

Resistance to change and an inability to innovate were cited by 36% of respondents in an industry survey by the Reuters Institute.—(*Irish Times*, 13.1.2018).

"Mr Martin has said his party is developing legislation to provide State funding to newspapers." Why? The *Irish Independent*: "If you look at the cash they have right now, it's €90 million... It will be more than €100 million by the end of the year, and probably €120 million by the end of 2018." (*The Sunday Business Post*, 27.8.2017).

And *The Irish Times*: what justification is there for State funding here: they have just acquired *The Irish Examiner* titles, with a little help from their friends in Allied Irish Bank. They're sitting pretty, surely!

The taxpayer already contributes million to these dailies in the form of massive state advertising: Government Notices; Compulsory Purchase notices etc.

PROPERTY BOOM

"Academics suggest media had a 'significant' role in property bubble"—Newspapers and other media outlets were unable to fully forewarn of the economic crash before 2008 because State and international agencies were insistent there was nothing wrong. (*Irish Examiner*, 26.3.2015).

"*Irish Examiner* editor Tim Vaughan outlined the difficult situation which faced the industry during the Celtic Tiger at the latest meeting of the Oireachtas banking inquiry.

"Despite claims from Julien Mercille, lecturer in UCD's geography department, that property advertisement income prevented journalists from examining the economy, Mr Vaughan said the academic was talking about "a planet I neither recognise nor inhabit".

"A journalist was offered "retail" in exchange for positive property market coverage during the economic boom, the banking inquiry has heard.

"DIT academic and former *Irish Times* journalist Harry Browne made the claim during the latest meeting of the cross-party body.

"Responding to questions about whether the media failed to scrutinise the Celtic Tiger, Mr Browne insisted

this was the intention of the industry.

"However, he said it is self-evident media outlets also came under intense pressure from the PR and property worlds, with one reporter offered "bricks and mortar" for "light touch journalism".

"Mr Browne said during this era there was a "property porn" tendency, with some reports explaining "how to decorate your apartment in Bulgaria".

"He said this attitude inadvertently sidelined contrarian views and was in part due to media companies' advertisement revenue needs—an issue which should have been prevented by the "myth" of a "Chinese wall" between editorial and advertising.

"Mr Browne said this situation played into the fact the media had an "immeasurable but almost certainly significant" role in developing a property bubble.

"The expert hit out at RTE's focus on shows like *I'm An Adult Get Me Out of Here*, and the *Irish Times* and *Irish Independent's* multi-million euro property website investments.

"He said the media's coverage of the property sector has "essentially not changed" since the economic crash, meaning the same problems could be repeated again.

"In particular, Dr Mercille said the industry's support from advertisement revenue - specifically from the property sector - has created a situation where it is still at risk of being a "cheerleader" for developers.

"I mean that the trends in media coverage point roughly in the same direction as pre-2008. In general, it is still the interests of elites that are mostly reflected in editorials and news stories, while those of ordinary people are often left out." (*Irish Examiner*, 26.3.2015)

"Referencing his "cheerleaders" remark, Dr Mercille said during the pre-2008 boom many reporters "had even persisted in rejecting the view the market had been in a bubble months after it started collapsing".

"He said some newspapers and media outlets were too focussed on establishment views and information, and criticised the initial coverage of the bank guarantee.

"After the crash, the media also presented the government's crisis resolution policies in a largely favourable manner, again in line with Irish and global elites' views," he said. (*Irish*

continued on page 30



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 36 No. 2

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

Fake News And Micheál Martin

"The newspaper industry should be supported with taxpayers' money to challenge fake news, Fianna Fáil leader Micheál Martin has said" (*Irish Examiner*, 29.12.2017).

"Mr Martin has said his party is developing legislation to provide State funding to newspapers. It could be allocated by a merit-based system, by way of standard, base-line funding, or a mixture of both.

"Currently, RTÉ is the only taxpayer-funded media outlet (through the TV licence fee), but it also relies on advertising revenue.

"Arguing that State support should be widened to include newspapers, Mr Martin said: "In a world where democracy is under threat from fake news, exploitation of online media platforms by all sorts of forces and states, there is a need to keep an independent, mainstream, factual, objective-based media"... (*Irish Exam*, 29.12.2017).

COMMUNICATIONS MINISTER

"The public have respected institutions, like our national newspapers, like our national broadcasters. I think it is important that trust remains there, and I think it does need to be supported and that broader debate now needs to take place..." (Communications Minister, Denis Naughten. *Irish Examiner*, 29.12.2017).

"Provide state support to protect journalism—The essential work of the print media is no less important than decades ago. But for that work to continue, newspapers must be given a chance to survive", writes *TP O' Mahony*. (*Irish Examiner*. 20.10.2017)

IRISH INDEPENDENT

"Do we want to hand the democratic duty of holding the powerful to account to social media giants who fail to act

responsibly?

"Defamation will change when the social media giants get sued. Their influence is akin to the church of old" (Fionnán Sheahan [Editor], *Irish Independent*, 11.11.2017).

"Adams accused of 'setting up' IRA men for an SAS ambush"—*Irish Independent*, Front Page, 29.12.2017.

"Gerry Adams was **rumoured** to have set up a notorious IRA gang for ambush by the SAS as it tried to blow up a police station in May 1987, previously secret files reveal.

"Eight members of the Provisionals' East Tyrone Brigade were shot dead after they loaded a 200lb bomb onto a stolen digger and smashed through the gates of the RUC barracks in Loughgall, Co Armagh.

"British army special forces were lying in wait and killed them all, along with innocent bystander Anthony Hughes.

"Declassified documents, released through the National Archives in

Dublin, showed ballistic tests found that weapons discovered on the dead had been used in 40 to 50 murders, including every republican killing in Fermanagh and Tyrone in 1987.

"The **rumour** about Mr Adams was passed on to Ireland's Department of Foreign Affairs by respected cleric Fr. Denis Faul about three months after the Loughgall operation.

"The priest, who had been at school in St Patrick's Academy, Dungannon, with Pádraig McKearney, one of the IRA gang, said the theory doing the rounds was that "the IRA team were set up by Gerry Adams himself".

"Fr. Faul said he was "intrigued" by the **theory**.

"Mr Adams declined to comment on the contents of the file when contacted in recent days.

"Fr. Faul, a school teacher and chaplain in Long Kesh prison, said the **rumour** was that two of the gang - Jim Lynagh, a councillor in Monaghan, and McKearney - "had threatened to execute Adams shortly before the Loughgall event". (29.12.17)

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>

This is not social media! This, in its own words is "Ireland's truly national newspaper" (*Irish Independent*, 18.8.2017). Of course, the Editor will argue that his publication was merely quoting from Declassified documents, released through the National Archives in Dublin for the year 1987.

It could be argued that he was publishing Gerry Adams death warrant! And Micheál Martin is advocating that the taxpayer subsidises this type of libel.

"In a world where democracy is under threat from fake news" states Micheál Martin—One would think that "Fake News" only appeared with the advent of

continued on page 31