

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

January 2018

Vol.33, No.1 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.32, No.1 ISSN 954-5891

Britain Back To Playing Balance Of Power In Europe!

The central institutions of the European Union are trying to impose themselves as a State on the states that make up the Union, and Britain—while still in the process of exiting the Union—is seeking to take advantage of the problems it is causing for itself.

The Prime Minister has visited Poland to give moral encouragement to the Polish Government in its defiance of the EU authorities who are trying to lay down the law to it about internal Polish affairs.

Britain is leaving the EU because it does not intend to reduce itself to the status of a mere European nation. The English nation is not European in culture and sentiment. It decided not to be five hundred years ago and it has never changed its mind.

When the groundwork of the EU was being laid, its attention was distracted by the unexpected crumbling of its Empire as a consequence of its war with Japan. A group of six defeated European states got themselves together while Britain was fighting its dirty wars—racist wars—in Malaya and Kenya and elsewhere: rearguard actions first to try to prevent independence and then to impose neo-colonial structures on its former colonies.

The European project, whose purpose was to prevent Britain from ever again playing balance-of-power games with Europe, took off. When Britain noticed what had happened it asked to join, but the EU (then in its EEC phase) was still being led by its founders and the British application was rejected.

It was admitted by a later generation of European leaders who lacked the experience and wisdom of its founders, and it spent its forty years of membership diverting Europe from its original purpose.

continued on page 2

Boomtime Bob: *caught in his own rat trap*

Bob Geldof, a former rock star whose band was called the *Boomtown Rats*, has for some time used the cult of celebrity to give himself a political platform. He has regularly described Ireland as a *banana republic* and, before and during the centenary year, he persistently denigrated the legacy of the 1916 Rising. Geldof is currently in the news because Dublin City Council under Sinn Fein Lord Mayor Mícheál Mac Donncha has refused to reinstate his Freedom of the City award after he handed it back. He handed it back with much fanfare as a way of demanding that Aung San Suu Kyi should be removed as a recipient because of her alleged complicity in the violent expulsion of Rohingya from Myanmar.

In its Irish aspect the controversy cries out for satire and the prize for best satirical response so far must surely go to the following letter which reproduces the punch line from Geldof's most famous hit song, 'Rat Trap':

"It's ironic to hear Bob Geldof isn't happy that Dublin City Council removed

continued on page 7

Central Bank undermining IFSC Brexit efforts ?

"nice little financial services centre you've got here, pity if anything were to happen to it..."

Those were not exactly the words used by the outgoing British Ambassador to Ireland in 2016, Dominick Chilcott, when he warned the IDA's head of strategy Kieran O'Donoghue against poaching business from the City of London post-Brexit.

What he actually said as reported in the *Daily Telegraph* was:

"You have a job to do, so our working assumption is that you will do your job, but it's the way you do your job", recalled Mr Donoghue in an interview with The Telegraph.

"He said, 'if there is any aggressive or public marketing of Ireland in London, or it was seen to be an opportunistic grab for a piece of the industry, you can

imagine how that will play out in Downing Street or the Treasury in London'."

But it seems that the Ambassador need not have worried. According to the *Irish Independent* ('Minister queries Central Bank attitude', 7 Dec. 2017), the Central Bank of Ireland has stepped up to the plate to protect British interests from Irish encroachment. So much so, that the Minister with responsibility for promoting the financial services industry, Michael

continued on page 11

Britain Back To Playing Balance Of Power In Europe!. Editorial	1
Boomtime Bob: caught in his own rat trap. Dave Alvey	1
Central Bank undermining IFSC Brexit efforts ? Seán Owens	1
Readers' Letters: Russians Under The Bed? Donal Kennedy	3
Ukraine's economy shrinks by 20% without access to Russian market. David Morrison	
Pop Goes The Weasel! Wilson John Haire (Poem)	3
The O'Connor Column (JUSTICE DEPT—DEEP STATE; Justice and Security; An unusual Minister for Justice; Catalonia on my mind; The bleating of a West Briton; What Austrian school children know about Brexit; Varadkar's history lessons; Gorbachev and Brexit)	4
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (Bishop Paul Colton and a very strange Award)	8
Remembering McKee, Clancy And Clune. Mícheál Mac Donncha, Mayor of Dublin (Oration)	11
Assessing Dev. Jack Lane (Review of David McCullagh biography)	13
Centenaries And Other Citations In The Irish Times. Manus O'Riordan	14
In Memoriam Thomas Ashe. Manus O'Riordan, Sean O'Casey	16
Ó Corráin And His Key To Irish Writing. John Minahane	16
Thoughts on the Viewing of the Casement Diaries in 1916. Tim O'Sullivan	18
Desmond Fennell—Hamlet without the Prince. Jack Lane	19
December Brexit Summary. Dave Alvey	20
Linking Ireland To Europe After Brexit. (Report)	22
Samuel Neilson: Rebel And Unionist. (Review of Dawson biography)	
A Diplomat's Take On The North! (Review of Noel Dorr book) Brendan Clifford	22
Keeping up the pretence of a viable 'peace process'. David Morrison	28
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Save the Constitution; Bankers and Others)	29
Biteback: Would Fianna Fail Take Its Seats. EugeneMcEldowney (Report)	30

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

Asquith on Ulster: 1913 (back page)

John Redmond's Violent Politics

Who were the Ballybricken Pig Buyers?

Nicholas Whittle's Witness Statement

Pat Muldowney (page 33)

Then, in 2016, Britain judged that it had misdirected Europe from the inside as much as it could and decided to leave. It has not quite left but it has already begun to play balance-of-power.

The EU, encouraged by Britain, engaged in random expansion when the Soviet system broke up, re-imagined itself as a World Power, and began pressing on Russia, engineered an anti-Russian *coup* in the Ukraine—overthrowing a Government which had made a trade deal with Russia and collaborating with Fascist elements for the purpose, while at the same time invoking the memory of the war against Fascism—a war to which the European contribution was negligible, if Russia is no longer to be seen as European.

The Six states that made Central Europe modestly functional in the immediate aftermath of the War have now become 28. The coherent collaboration of the Six is not sustainable in the 28, which Britain will reduce to 27 with a view to playing on

the divisions that will necessarily arise amongst them.

Napoleon described the English as *a nation of shopkeepers*. He was greatly mistaken. While England may have pioneered shopkeeping as a major economic activity and developed shopping into a mode of Sabbath observance, it is by origin a nation of conquerors, buccaneers and gamblers. The revelation of the 2016 Referendum was that it still remains what it always has been.

It boasted in connection with its last two World Wars that Europeans tried to figure it out, to understand it, so that they could take prudent account of it in their own actions, but they always failed because England had within it the capacity to act in a way that defied calculation. It would never allow itself to be tamed through being understood.

Edmund Burke used the phrase "*truckling nations*" to describe nations that cannot live in their own history and

act out of the impulse which made that history. England would never be such a nation. It would not be part of the European herd—a herd of losers who were seeking comfort by keeping each other company.

"Between the Individual and Humanity stands, and must continue to stand, a great fact—the Nation. It was Arthur Griffith who said that. It was the insight on which Sinn Fein was founded. 21st century Ireland seems to have forgotten it, and to have adopted what Griffith rejected—the illusion of a cosmopolis.

But what has cosmopolitanism ever been in Ireland except West Britishism?

Its nature was camouflaged by Ireland's entry into the EU following Britain. It could be European in the company of Britain. It could be internationalist as an attachment to Britain in Europe. But now Britain has shocked it by being what it always was—a Cavalier nation acting out of its impulse of national wilfulness.

And how can Ireland be European without Britain!!

If Ireland had the will to be itself in Europe—as it never was except in the brief Haughey era—there would no doubt be some difficulties of economic adaptation. But, if its actions are determined by those economic problems, rather than by a revival of the national will that made it a state, what will it be?

The rise of Provisional Sinn Fein during the last twenty years slowed down the West British development of Southern politics. But Sinn Fein is a Northern Ireland party. What drove it was resistance to the undemocratic and Protestant sectarian system of British government in Northern Ireland.

The Protestant sectarianism of the system has been remedied to a considerable extent by the 1998 reform which established something close to authentic apartheid—an authentic system of separate development. This reform has made life in the British state tolerable to the minority community—Catholic and Nationalist—which is now close to equality with the other community which is Protestant and Unionist. It is possible that under present circumstances there could be a rift between the Catholic and Nationalist aspects of what has hitherto been a seamless unity.

The Southern Establishment used to be strongly Catholic—of its own volition because of centuries of English Protestant oppression, and not because of some imposed power of priestcraft—and anti-Partitionist, in superficial form at least. It

has for a generation been discarding its Catholicism and trampling on it, doing this allegedly in the groundless expectation that this would encourage the Ulster Unionists into a United Ireland—while simultaneously downplaying the Anti-Partition ideal. It never came to terms with the facts that the Ulster Unionist community was something in its own right, and was positively British and not just put off by Catholicism, and that the internal change in the North was brought about by the IRA fighting a real war against the British State on behalf of the Catholic community.

When Sinn Fein developed into an effective all-Ireland party the official Republic—particularly the Fianna Fail part of it under Micheál Martin—treated it as a criminal Mafia.

The prospect of Brexit transformed the Dublin Establishment into concerned Anti-Partitionists because it cannot contemplate life for the 26 Counties in the EU without Britain and has refused to make preparations for it.

Just now it feels that it has played a blinder against Britain, and has it over a barrel. It has held a self-congratulatory gathering (see *Sunday Independent*, 24.12.17, *Because The Night Belongs To Leo*). It looks forward to holding some very special place between Britain and the EU.

The real choices that will have to be made, however, have only been postponed for a year.

There is an Anglophile body called the *Irish Sovereignty Movement* which holds that the force tending to erode Irish national sovereignty is not Britain but the EU. It was founded by Professor Raymond Crotty who wrote an article for the *London Times* saying that nationalist Ireland is intellectually barren and pleading for Britain to take it in hand. Currently its best-known activist is Anthony Coughlan. It now advocates Irexit along with Brexit—in practice, a restoration of the full United Kingdom.

At the same time the EU authorities, the Council and the Commission, have begun to act in a way that must stir up national divisions within the Union. It denies the Polish Government the right to appoint judges in the Polish state and proposes to deny it voting rights in EU affairs. It has already aggravated Hungary to such a degree that it threatens to veto the proposal. The Commission imposes on all EU states an obligation to take set

Russians Under The Bed?

Hearing Theresa May alleging Russian meddling in an American election against a candidate named Clinton was interesting.

In 1992 when another candidate named Clinton was running for the White House, the British Home Office under Kenneth Clarke went through their files to find out if Bill Clinton, as a student at Oxford, had ever applied for British nationality to avoid the draft in America.

The Foreign Secretary at the time was Douglas Hurd and the Prime Minister was John Major.

Bill Clinton was elected, to the chagrin of the British.

If the Russians were instrumental in Hilary Clinton's defeat is Mrs. May's complaint a case of sour grapes?

Donal Kennedy

Ukraine's economy shrinks by 20% without access to Russian market

It seems that the Ukrainian economy has taken a terrible battering since the 2014 "revolution", with GDP declining by nearly 50% from \$183 million to \$93 million. (These figures appear on *Russia Today*, 30 November 2017 at <https://www.rt.com/business/411434-ukraine-russia-crisis-economy/> and are confirmed on Google at: <https://tradingeconomics.com/ukraine/gdp/>.)

I can believe, as statistics show, that exports to Russia have declined substantially and exports to the EU have not increased to compensate.

The EU can be proud of its success in bringing misery to Ukrainians.

David Morrison

quantities of non-EU migrants regardless of circumstances. (And surely the right thing here is for the Imperial States who created the current refugee crisis to take those disrupted by their adventures, instead of expecting others to pick up the pieces?) And, on the Catalan issue, it has said clearly that the right of national self-

determination does not apply within the EU.

All this is fertile grounds for Britain to resume playing Balance Of Power in Europe, including using the Irish division to disrupt the European polity.

We live in interesting times.

POP GOES THE WEASEL

With a fortune of 35 million
 he once cried: 'Give us yer fuckin' money!'
 And the busy wee bees give him honey
 as he rode with world poverty pillion.
 But was enough left to stop the dying
 when show business dipped into the bucket.
 and he kept crying money, just chuck it.
 Soon there came the baubles and the vying.
 It was for Germany that Quisling wept.
 The unseen murder of a nation's ego,
 condemned a people's struggle inept.
 with his blasting language of the argot.
 Without shame his Fifth Column intercepts,
 places national pride on an embargo.

Wilson John Haire
 20 December, 2017

The O'Connor Column

JUSTICE DEPT—DEEP STATE JUSTICE AND SECURITY

The Frances Fitzgerald resignation might have led to a useful political conflict had it not been superceded by the Brexit drama. Perhaps the investigation into the Department of Justice due to get underway this month might yet lead to something . . . or not.

That Department is a very peculiar one, and has been since the foundation of the Treaty State in the course of the 1922 counter-revolution. At that time it secured for itself the central role of guardian angel of the state and has jealously this ever since. In this Ireland is fairly unique in Europe.

Eunan O'Halpin of Trinity College wrote a book a decade ago called *"Defending Ireland"*. Its starting point was 1922, three years after the electoral contest that established the First Dáil. The *"enemies"* that O'Halpin identifies as those against which the state has had to defend itself ever since have all been internal ones. Irish defence in the O'Halpin narrative is simply a story of an ongoing police operation.

Of course in actual history there were two moments when the Irish state had to defend itself against existential military threats. The first was when the Dáil organised to prevent its dissolution and extermination by the British police terror of 1919-21, and the second was when De Valera organised Irish Neutrality in the Second World War in such a way as to defend the state against Churchill's threatened invasion of 1939-41. In both cases, a credible Irish defence was pieced together and the state successfully withstood the challenges to its existence in a reasonably proficient joint political-military manner.

But for O'Halpin neither of these events occurred at all. The TCD Professor dismisses the first act of Irish military defence as an outbreak of *"violence"*, in a form understandable only in socio-pathological terms. He was given a JCB by a television company to dig up County Cork in search of evidence of the pathology, but alas came away empty-handed. Trinity College has been at this for a long time. In the 1980s, under Professors Horne and Fitzpatrick, it established a Special Unit to investigate and diagnose the Irish socio-pathological lapse. The unit was called the *"Trinity History Workshop"* and eventually produced the dead-end of

Professor Peter Hart, following which the unit was disbanded.

O'Halpin also expended considerable energy deconstructing Ireland's second significant instance of military defence. He wrote a book about it which essentially portrayed it as a false flag operation to fool German Intelligence while Ireland dissolved itself into a branch of Britain's MI5 to assist in prosecuting England's second world war. This writer has written before of the nonsense of this particular theory of the Professor's.

What remains for O'Halpin in *"Defending Ireland"*, having removed the two actual defence events of significance, is a catalogue of the doings of the Department of Justice/Gardaí in heroically thwarting various minor acts of "subversion" over the decades.

It must be admitted, however, that O'Halpin is on to something. In many ways the Department of Justice was the post-"Treaty" Free State, and the base from which it consolidated itself. Known as *"Home Affairs"* when it was set up, it became the central Department of the Treaty State, headed by the most significant and defining personality of the regime, Kevin O'Higgins. While Mulcahy's unruly and scraped-together paid "army" marauded the country suppressing the majority wing of the actual army that had fought the War of Independence, O'Higgins' Department, and its G-men at Oriel House, made short work of any Shinner politicians they could get their hands on.

Under the terms of the "Treaty" actual Irish defence was deemed to be unnecessary apart from its subordinate aspect as an Imperial operation, and was entrusted to the Royal Navy. The Free State construct, an illegal entity in the strict sense of not yet having been constitutionally established, was temporarily allowed an army for counter-insurgency purposes, and was forbidden from taking on any serious military role in external defence. Once the Republicans had been routed in the field, Mulcahy's grenadiers were largely demobilised on London's orders. What remained was an interminable police operation whose task remained maintaining a vigilant watch against the threat of a Republican resurgence.

The Establishment will have a problem sorting out the Department of Justice. It is

a law unto itself. Its self-understanding in its security role was most brazenly exposed during the *arms conspiracy crisis* of 1970. At that time it sabotaged the operations of the Cabinet and saw itself entitled to bring about the overthrow of half the Government. During the 1970s it produced the *"Heavy Gang"* as a type of extra muscle for the Special Branch. Those such as Fintan O'Toole, Pat Rabbitte and others who have called for a *"root and branch"* review of the Department are the very same people who have applauded the extra-constitutional actions of the same Department in 1970 and the State's police operations of the 1970s as *"unfortunate necessities"* in *"defending the state"* a la O'Halpin. We can expect them all to rapidly dismount from their high horses when the mandarins whisper some home truths in their ears.

The Gardaí had a shaky start but rapidly established a degree of credibility and acceptance for themselves with Irish society. Irish people are notoriously *"slightly constitutional"* and regard both law and policing as a necessary evil, mostly to regulate personal and property disputes. Unlike most countries, the 'law' is not regarded as a system of credible justice, but as a kind of game in which it is necessary to be very cute, and well resourced. You get the law you can buy, and being *"agin the law"* is still something of a badge of honour in popular culture. This would strike most people in most countries, for whom law is the evolution of a system of fair and just treatment, as highly peculiar.

But the common law came to Ireland as an imposition which overthrew pre-existing and organically evolved legal arrangements such as the Brehon legal system. The new 'Law' was widely understood as a kind of extravagantly staged hypocrisy whose purpose was the usurpation of Irish property and rights. Its functional form for a century were the Penal Laws. In the nineteenth century the outcomes of this "Law" were handed down by a particularly pompous and supercilious element of the Reformationist colonial caste, and enforced by a foreign-officered and locally recruited mercenary paramilitary "police", the RIC.

The census in Ireland was a state security operation, carried out by armed police rather than civilian enumerators.

One of the casualties of the "Civil War" was the alternative Irish jurisprudence being developed under the First and Second Dáils. Under the "Treaty" the British ordered the restoration of the rule of hypocrisy, along with its former personnel, and this was rapidly implemented. The RIC, however, who had irredeemably disgraced themselves as enforcers of the anarchic terror, were replaced by a native force, the Gardaí, who thereupon commenced their role as upholders of the state against the large proportion of the population it labelled subversives.

Ireland does not have a "ruling class" in the sense that Britain does. At best there are rich Irish who conspire with each other to be richer. That is not the same thing. In the absence of a ruling caste such as Britain's, what Ireland and many other countries have is a State that it expects to rule in the interests of the wealth-advancing elements. In such a context, dismantling the Department of Justice is not what is required, or any witch-hunt which can only result in its demoralisation. Some suitable minor reforms would be sufficient.

But the dual role of the Gardaí as both unarmed village bobbies and simultaneously and primarily a heavily-armed State security force, was bound to produce contradictions. Every state needs a security arm, but the Irish state has long lived the pretence of not needing one, and therefore denied the existence of its very own deep security State. This is nothing unusual: until very recent times the very existence of MI6 in Britain was officially denied. The arms conspiracy revealed for anyone who wanted to know just what the Department of Justice thinks itself to be.

The Gardaí are servants of the State, not of the Government, much like the Revenue, and must remain so. But when they, unlike our extraordinarily efficient Revenue, become dysfunctional because of their lived lie, and a population used to the comforts of affluent living can no longer live with a police service partially out of control, it's time to sort things out.

Hopefully the Fitzgerald scandal will shine some light where light never shines, and allow a modernisation of Irish security. Village-green-policing should be civilianised, credibly subject to Police Boards of County Councillors and such like and to a credible civilian Police Authority.

Rabbitte's typical Stickie proposal that a Commissioner from the colonies be appointed, to show us the way, should be stoutly resisted however. Given the nature of policing in Ireland, this position must be occupied by a local.

The "security" task which has distorted the Gardaí and infected its culture should be hived off to an openly admitted security service, which might be subjected to some mild scrutiny by a Dáil Committee as happens elsewhere. While keeping wraps on spooks is a necessarily uncertain business, some orderly method for ensuring they don't spin totally out of control is essential, and this might be the proper solution.

To date, the State has dealt with the police when it got out of control, as under Eoin O'Duffy, by sacking the Commissioner. It is a blunt instrument when what is needed is a whole restructuring. Given Irish traditional attitudes to both policing and the law, sorting out the Department and the Gardaí will have to be handled carefully.

What is needed—yet again!—is a good Irish solution to this particular Irish problem!

AN UNUSUAL MINISTER FOR JUSTICE

Speaking of *nests of vipers*, it is interesting to note that, when Haughey was Minister for Justice in the early 1960s, he was required to implement the suppression of the IRA, which by all accounts he did with efficiency. However, how enthusiastically he did so is unknown, but it is certain he agreed with the proposition of the primacy of the interests of the state. It is interesting to note that, while in that Department, he otherwise tended to avoid security issues and focused instead on social reforms in the considerable areas over which it exercised power (e.g. rights of separated wives, prison reform, unwinding the censorship system, even investigating Industrial Schools). In Opposition in the 1970s, he opposed the Extradition agenda and the Heavy Gang thuggery of Justice Secretary Peter Berry's Department and of the Guards. Later as Taoiseach he kept Justice well at arm's length, and well away from Northern policy. Now there was a man who knew something about "Irish solutions"!

CATALONIA ON MY MIND

I believe I am entitled, following my comments in the October *Irish Political Review*, to say "I told you so!" National questions, in whatever form they manifest themselves, cannot be wished away and most certainly not policed away. The Spanish Deep State, a necessary inheritance from the pre-parliamentary days, showed its uglier face, with paramilitary police, after inflicting their beatings marching from hotels in Barcelona, singing "Viva Espana!"

Catalan nationalism is not a very serious

phenomenon, but a real phenomenon it is nevertheless, and needs to be taken into account. The Spanish Constitution must be reformed in such a way as to accommodate local difference more and diminish the power of centrally appointed satraps.

When the EU was on its march to federal integration in the glorious years of Jacques Delors—a process derailed by Britain—it used to promote regional diversity and regional identities. Indeed it became the champion of the regions and regional expressions, and this was a rational and popular policy in the context of an integrating Europe. But the EU has had to revert to an alliance of sovereign states, and so it can no longer promote regional divergence and is only entitled to express its loyalty to its contracting partner, in this case the Madrid State. Whether Macron's promised "reform agenda" will include regional democracies in its integrating Eurozone architecture remains to be seen, but it should.

THE BLEATING OF A WEST BRITON

It was amusing to read a recent opinion piece by a real *Irish Times* West Briton. This was Dennis Kennedy's *crie de couer* at the fissure opened by Brexit between Britain and Ireland. It was the type of thing that used to be commonplace in the paper, but has been something of a rarity in recent times. In passing, Kennedy took a swipe at 1916 Rising in the Brutonesque fashion favoured by columnists of that paper in those long-off pre-Brexit, pre-Commemoration days. The current writer submitted the following letter in response:

"In an opinion piece in your newspaper today, former *Irish Times* deputy editor, Dennis Kennedy, claims that 'in 1966 and 2016, official Ireland trumpeted the message that the violent ideologues of the Easter Rising were the true founders of the nation.' This is untrue. Whatever about the amorphous and ever changing 'Irish Nation', what the government celebrated in both 1966 and 2016, with the enthusiastic approval and participation of the great majority of the people, was the 1916 Rising as indisputably the founding moment of the modern independent Irish State.

"As to the 'violent ideologues', the very modest violence of 1916, compared to the cataclysmic violence in which the British state was enthusiastically engaging in elsewhere at the time, is viewed by most people as the regrettable but worthwhile price that had to be paid."

The letter has not appeared at time of writing.

WHAT AUSTRIAN SCHOOL CHILDREN KNOW ABOUT BREXIT

Austrian Chancellor Christian Kern issued a piece of common sense on Brexit

recently, which is worth quoting as the Irish Government shows signs of dissolving its hitherto clear position into a welter of "maybe's" in response to Britain's clever re-interpretation of the "gentlemen's agreement" reached in December:

"Even a primary school student could see that the 'first phase' deal on the Irish Border would come back to haunt the talks because it was impossible for Britain to leave the bloc's single market while avoiding a hard Border on the island of Ireland. 'There cannot be any border controls between Northern and southern Ireland, there cannot be border controls between Northern Ireland and the UK, but there can between UK and the EU,' he said. 'So our primary school students can see that there is a riddle to be solved.'"

Meanwhile the UK is busy digging away at potential allies, particularly among the *arriviste* Europeans of the former Eastern Block. Poland, which is having difficulties with the European Commission, has come into its sights, with Britain proposing all kinds of *bespoke* deals with it. Let's hope the Poles remember the last great unfulfilled British promise that provoked them into a war over Danzig and undid them as a State in September 1939.

VARADKAR'S HISTORY LESSONS

Taoiseach Vlad's unusual statements on history, including some very un-Blueshirt ones on De Valera, Irish Neutrality, and the crimes of the Free State Army in 1922-3, have caused many eyebrows to be raised. It is said these are the work of an advisor he recently appointed as a "speech-writer" to his "Communications Unit", Patrick Geoghegan, a historian in TCD with a popular history programme on Newstalk radio. With these statements, and the stance he has adopted on Brexit, Vlad is off-siding Micheál Martin, the FF leader.

On historical matters, Martin is something of a disgrace. He published a book a number of years ago on politics in Cork, referencing for the War of Independence period the tangled violent fantasies of the late Professor Peter Hart. Martin has been disabled in commenting on matters historical ever since. Recently, in defending the Fianna Fáil record on the North from Varadkar's statements of fact regarding the Republic having thrown Northern nationalists to the wolves, Martin waxed indignant. In his catalogue of Fianna Fáil "achievements" he left out the one FF leader who actually did achieve something. Airbrushing Haughey out of history, he dated the start of the "enormous political commitment different Irish governments

had made to Northern Ireland" to Fitzgerald's hugely flawed *Anglo-Irish Agreement!*

It is whispered that Martin is taking direction on these matters from the Sven-gali of the *Sindo*, Eoghan Harris. Which is all grist to the mill of the theory that FF and FG, who in alliance form the current anti-Sinn Féin Government, are merging ever more in the fight to the last stand against the encircling Shinners.

Varadkar/Geoghegan's historical line should be treated with caution, however. In responding to Martin in the Dáil the Taoiseach stated: "It was governments and the Oireachtas that put up the customs posts on the Border in the first place and engaged in an economic war that further divided the Republic from Northern Ireland and Britain." Revisionism on De Valera's Economic War is the last thing needed in the current Brexit conflict.

GORBACHEV AND BREXIT

There has been comment recently following the publication of documents from the 1990-92 period when Gorbachev helpfully dismantled the USSR to the applause of his "friends" in the West. Whatever about the depths of misery into which former Soviet Russia sank in the great pillaging of its economy that followed, he always stood on his honour on the "assurances" he had been given that NATO would not extend eastwards if Russia withdrew from Eastern Europe. The fact is that none of those promises were at all binding, and in retrospect it seems amazing that he failed to realise this. The latest disclosures show that the assurances fervently given to him were nothing but verbal promises, "gentlemen's agreements" if you like

Brussels and Dublin beware!

Bob Geldof

continued

him from the city's roll of honour, after he handed back his Freedom of the City award. His big statement of protest against Myanmar's Aung San Suu Kyi's honour has backfired on him. What does he expect in a banana republic?

Put simply, you can't have it both ways. It's a rat trap... and you've been caught. **Brian Cullen** (Irish Times, 16 December)

A more pedestrian letter, which has not been published, which I submitted to the *Irish Independent* on December 18th, fills out some relevant political context behind the controversy. It reads:

"Since Bob Geldof was awarded the Freedom of Dublin he has used his standing as an international figure to insult the memory of the rebels of Easter Week, 1916. In an interview for *Event Magazine* that accompanied the *Mail* on Sunday of April 3rd 2016 he compared the actions of the Irish rebels to those of the jihadi suicide bombers who caused the deaths of 75 people in Lahore, India.

Asked in the course of a 2016 documentary on the Rising commissioned by RTE whether he considered the GPO to be a sacred place he said it 'represents the birth of a pious, bitter and narrow-minded version of Ireland I couldn't wait to escape'.

Mr Geldof is entitled to his opinions but in making those statements he would have known that the Rising has special significance for many Dubliners and indeed for many people, Irish and non-Irish, across the world.

Mr Geldof chose to return the honorary scroll that granted him Freedom of the City as part of a publicity stunt that was unnecessary in the sense that members of Dublin City Council were already taking steps to remove the accolade from Aung San Suu Kyi. Now that he has by his own actions opened the question of his suitability for the honour, I hope that the Council will note that Mr Geldof no longer enjoys anything like the unanimous support of Dubliners. His name should not be re-instated on the city's role of honour. Yours etc., **D. Alvey**".

A SPURIOUS COMPARISON

Republicans and citizens sympathetic to the politics of the Irish national tradition will readily recognise Geldof's grandstanding for what it is. but it is still instructive to spell out the spurious nature of the comparison he made between the 1916 rebels and the perpetrators of the Lahore bombing of March 2016.

It is well known that James Connolly was taken aback when the British army used heavy artillery to bomb rebel positions in 1916. His surprise on that point shows that he and the other leaders had considered the danger to civilians in planning the Rising. They assumed that the welfare of civilians in what was then viewed as a British city would be considered by the military, that the risk to the lives of non-participants was relatively low.

Likewise when Pearse declared the surrender his order met with resistance from some of the other rebel garrisons. The insurrection could have been sustained for a further period but, as commander-in-chief, Pearse considered that without a chance of overall victory the risk to life occasioned by continuing the conflict was unjustifiable.

It is also relevant that the peaceful democratic avenue to political change was closed off in 1916. A change in Government with-

out an Election had occurred in 1915 in which a number of the most inveterate opponents of Irish Home Rule, including Edward Carson and F.E. Smith, were granted official positions. John Redmond's party failed to demand an Election at that time, even though the lifetime of Parliament had expired, opting to comply with all actions deemed necessary to the war effort. Meanwhile violence on an industrial scale was being perpetrated in the trench warfare in Flanders and Northern France, and Irish males who had enlisted in the British forces under Redmond's influence continued to suffer disproportionate losses—while the possibility of Home Rule faded as a realistic proposition.

CASEMENT'S INFLUENCE

One aspect of the Rising that is rarely commented on is the background influence of Roger Casement's writings. From his inside knowledge of British Foreign Office diplomacy, Casement became an informed opponent of British Imperialism. As Brendan Clifford states in the introduction to the Athol Books edition of Casement's book, *The Crime Against Europe*, it was Casement's reading of international affairs that placed him in sympathy with Germany, not the opportunist view that England's difficulty was Ireland's opportunity.

Referring to *The Crime Against Europe* Clifford states "It is a book about British foreign policy and, because of what followed from its publication, it is a book of Irish foreign policy". He continues:

"Casement... gave a pro-German orientation to the Volunteer minority which rejected Redmond's leadership. He had a presence in world affairs as the diplomat who had exposed the Belgian atrocities in the Congo and the atrocities of international capital in South America. So his identification of himself with both the German cause and Irish separatism gave the Irish cause an immediate German orientation in the sphere of international opinion, *de facto*. This orientation was confirmed *de jure* when it was given Fenian backing" (*The Crime Against Europe*, Athol Books 2003, p5).

It is strange that some of Casement's political writings are only now being published, that his influence is only beginning to be understood a hundred years after his death. This new thinking about Casement is not confined to writers and researchers in the Athol Books camp. Angus Mitchell of the University of Limerick and Margaret O'Callaghan of Queen's University Belfast are also making important contributions. For the purposes of the present discussion the point that needs to be made is that an important legacy of the 1916 Rising is the conviction, expressed through the diplomacy of Eamon de Valera in the League of Nations during the 1930s, that an alternative to the militarism of the

Great Powers is possible in the realm of international affairs.

THE LAHORE BOMBING

The Lahore bombing of March 2016 referred to by Bob Geldof was carried out by an affiliate of the Pakistani Taliban known as Jamaat-ul-Ahrar. The target of the bombing was a group of Pakistani Christians who had gathered in a public park as part of their Easter celebrations. Christians make up 2 per cent of the population of Pakistan and are a frequent target of Islamist attacks. 75 people died in the blast and 340 were injured; the casualties included many Muslims.

How the force of Islamic radicalism was won over to violent nihilism is a complex subject but one of the factors known to have caused it is US Intelligence stimulation of Islamic radicalism in Pakistan and American collusion with and aiding of the Afghan Mujahideen during their war against the Kabul Government and its Soviet ally (1979-1989). In other words, the modern scourge of violent Islamic extremism had its origin, in great part, in the US tactic of weaponising Muslim radicals. As an act of Islamic terrorism, the Lahore bombing had the additional characteristic that, in targeting Christians, it had the purpose of inflaming inter-religious hatred.

Geldof's comparison between the Dublin Rising of Easter 1916 and the Lahore bombing of Easter 2016 is a calculated affront to anyone who holds the Rising as important. It fails to stand up on any count. The two events are the products of radically different sets of circumstances and reflect opposite attitudes to the preservation of human life and the fomentation of sectarian hatred.

The 1916 Rising had a global significance as a revolt against the senseless militarism in which the major Powers were then engaged and its legacy favours collective security as a foil against the might of militarily powerful nations. These points are beyond Geldof's ken for the simple reason that he is on the other side. It was no surprise to learn that, when discussing Irish politics, he quarrelled with Nelson Mandela. Nor can there be any doubt that the knighthood he holds from the Queen of England was richly deserved.

HIGH STAKES

In the course of the controversy the argument has been made that the City Council was wrong to remove Aung San Suu Kyi's name from the Dublin's Roll of Honour and that the line should therefore be, as between Geldof and the Council, '*a plague on both your houses*'. This viewpoint ignores the high stakes that are now being played for. As this is being written, news has come through that Fianna Fail Leader Micheál Martin is demanding that

Geldof's name be re-instated on the Roll of Honour. Geldof himself has announced that he is donating the documentation associated with Band Aid to the National Library. Pressure, clearly, is being brought to bear on Dublin City Council.

So, should Lord Mayor Mícheál Mac Donncha be supported in the stance he is taking against Sir Bob? I say yes. Re-granting Geldof the Freedom of Dublin would represent an endorsement of the views that he has expressed on the Rising. In truth he has done more than express an opinion. In 2015 he participated in the making of a special centenary DVD that had to be withdrawn, such was the outcry against it for ignoring the actual history of 1916.

In April 2016 he gave the interview to the *Mail on Sunday*, discussed above, and later in the year the documentary on Yeats was released in which he again moralised on the baleful influence of the event that led to the founding of this State. Geldof has strong views about 1916 and chose to weigh in as a combatant in a culture war that the centenary heightened. He has effectively disqualified himself from receiving an honour that is supposed to have near unanimous support from the citizens of the city.

Before and during the 1916 centenary a tug of war was waged between the elite and the general public over how the Rising should be regarded. It may be worth attending the January meeting of the Council (Monday Jan 8th, 6.30 pm, Council Chambers, City Hall, Dame Street, Dublin 2—you will need an invite from your local Councillor) to provide moral support to the Lord Mayor and in that way to make sure that the public wins this one.

Dave Alvey

Editorial Note: Ireland seems to have picked up the British habit of laying down the moral law to other nations as to how they should conduct their affairs. In this instance, it did so both in conferring an honour on Aung San Suu Kyi and then in withdrawing it. Recent events in many countries—notably Iraq, Libya and Syria—show the damage that can be done by ill-considered foreign interference. The countries ruled by dictatorships all have been damaged by Imperial population manipulation, interference and exploitation over the centuries: now they have to be allowed to find their own way forward. They certainly don't need to be given simplistic lessons in 'democracy' by those who have only the haziest understanding of their history and make-up. There is also the consideration that Power Politics play a role in minority insurgencies. Myanmar (formerly Burma) is in the Chinese sphere of influence and is therefore subject to destabilisation by the West: a typical ploy in such instances is to work up antagonism between minority populations and the mainstream. ■

"Thomas Carlyle, who was passionately interested in biography—and whose own *Life*, by his friend the historian J.A. Froude, would be the biggest scandal of the century—used Croker's edition of Boswell's *Life* to air his own biographical convictions. The writing of a life, Carlyle said, should above all be an act of sympathy. 'To have an open loving heart' was the primary qualification for a biographer. With that comes the feeling for detail, the evocation of personality, and the commitment to truth-telling, which Carlyle (like Johnson and Boswell before him) thought were the marks of the best kind of life-writing."

Introduction. *Body Parts: Essays in Life-Writing* by Hermione Lee. Chatto & Windus. London. 2005.

BISHOP PAUL COLTON AND A VERY STRANGE AWARD

It is well known in Cork and its wider environs that the "Right Rev. Dr. Paul Colton, Bishop of Cork, Cloyne and Ross" is a great self-publicist and apparently has a well-established presence on social media. His full and rather grandiose title here is from a post, '*Latest News from the Church of Ireland Diocese of Cork, Cloyne and Ross*'. He does a lot of such posting and selfies. But the one that is most widely known here locally and caused great hilarity was when the *bould bishop* arranged with the quiet, unassuming, and shy Catholic Bishop John Buckley (who was going to Rome for a Synod of Bishops meeting with Pope Francis) to organise a quick audience with His Holiness and then got himself photographed with the Pope, going on to post it immediately—cropping out the poor Catholic bishop and then seemingly heaping coal over the latter by writing the caption: '*Bishop Colton of Cork with Pope Francis*', leaving no doubt as to who was the *real* bishop—*capiche*? And sure enough all the national papers carried the photo with the caption, which they would *never* do if the picture was of even the highest-ranking Catholic Archbishop—much less a *mere* bishop.

In the Evening Echo, 2nd December 2017, under another beaming picture of Bishop Colton, we were informed in the heading: "*Spirit of Cork honour for Bishop Paul Colton*". I had never heard of such an award and was informed that:

"The Board of Cork Civic Trust made the award saying, Bishop Colton was being honoured for his 18 years that he has served in Cork and for" (sic) "and to recognise his inclusiveness for all in our society" (My emphasis—JH).

I had to do a lot of researching to find out about this "*honour*" and who is behind it. *Cork Civic Trust* is basically along the *social* lines of the *Georgian Society of Dublin* (without doing the work) of upwardly mobile people who want to be seen as having the *right attitudes* and thereby hopefully scooping up the resultant social *cachet*.

The panel of Judges told me all I needed to know about who these people are. The Chair is Robin O'Sullivan, a former President of Cork Chamber of Commerce, and the Council members (of the Civic Trust) are James O'Sullivan, John X. Miller, Amanda Neri and Michael Mulcahy. Those who are known would be Robin O'Sullivan, John X. Miller and Michael Mulcahy, who would all have backgrounds in PR Consultancy/Marketing. Mulcahy is as far as I know—the publisher of the local free-sheet, '*The Cork Independent*'. According to the website of '*Spirit of Cork*', it is a—

"honours and recognition programme for Cork that was founded by Michael Mulcahy the Honorary Consul of Poland in Cork, Managing Director of Hi Media Group and Director of Cork Civic Trust. In every walk of life, recognition and honouring our finest is important and now more than ever. Cork has the opportunity to honour and recognise people who have made a real difference to our great city and county. In association with Cork's oldest hotel, the Imperial Hotel, Cork will host a spectacular annual dinner to celebrate and recognise one who has made an outstanding contribution to Cork. This event will bestow the **Spirit of Cork** honour and recognition to a person who has been an example to others and who Cork and her people wish to say thank you to. **Spirit of Cork** is an honour and recognition for people that we are proud to be part of our Cork family. Be they in Cork or in any part of the world where Cork is recognised, we wish to acknowledge them and their exceptional contribution to Cork" (Emphasis by web-site).

On the web-site one is encouraged to become "*A Corporate Patron*". There is a long list of these amongst whom are the following:

Cork County Council, Cork Civic Trust, Cork City Council

These are "*Patrons*" and therefore it can be seen that they are all funded out of tax-payers' money without *any* consult-

ation with said tax-payers! Really what we are talking about—despite all the PR window dressing—is an exercise in self-promotion as long as we—the ordinary everyday tax-payers—are kept out of things.

The Associate Patrons—I counted 24 in all—amongst who are Barry & Fitzwilliam, a Premier Drinks Company (I could only read the fine print here with a very handy 'Handheld Magnifier Light Craft which himself gifted to me some time ago—who thought it would come in so handy?), Barry Group, BigWhiteRabbit.Com, Cork Vision Centre, Corona, Cuddy, O'Leary & Foley Accountants, **DIPLOMAT**, Sherry Fitzgerald, Auctioneers, Keary's, The Imperial Hotel, Voxpro, Consulate of the Republic of Poland in Cork and some others whose names were almost impossible to decipher but whose presence in this article I realised would mean nothing to many readers including many people of Cork city itself!

The dinner was held at the Clayton Hotel, Cork and the black-tie awards ceremony was presided over by P.J. Coogan (96FM) and Bibi Baskin. The presentation of the award was made by An Tánaiste and Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade, Simon Coveney, Fine Gael, TD, "*who spoke about Bishop Colton's contribution to the life of Cork*". Greetings and messages of appreciation were read from Michael D. Higgins, President of Ireland, An Taoiseach, Leo Varadkar, Fine Gael, TD, and from David and Victoria Beckham at whose wedding the Bishop officiated in 1999. (All of this information has been obtained from <https://churchofirelandcork.com/2017/spirit-of-cork-award>.)

The Colton family, Paul, wife Susan (a Vice Principal of a local Protestant school), and their two sons Andrew and Adam (both at university), we were told were joined by family, friends and colleagues as well as members of the Church of Ireland community and many members, past and present, of the Cork Civic Trust.

Grace before dinner was said by the Bishop's Chaplain, the Reverend Elaine Murray. Archdeacon Adrian Wilkinson spoke on behalf of the clergy and people of the Diocese. A *second presentation* was made by the Lord Mayor, Tony Fitzgerald, Fianna Fail *on behalf of the citizens of Cork* later in the evening, and further tributes were paid by Senator Jerry Buttimer, Fine Gael, Michael McGrath, Fianna Fail TD—and Opposition Spokesman on Finance, former Senator John

Minihan (from the defunct Progressive Democrats). I am adding all their political affiliations because for some reason there seems to have been an attempt to draw a veil over this very pertinent information.

Bishop Paul and Mrs. Susan Colton, were presented with a print of an original painting called '*Spirit of Inclusiveness*' by 14 year old Malika Benhaffaf, sister of Hassan and Hussein—as was every guest. Mrs. Susan Colton was presented with flowers and with a gift on behalf of everyone present by Bibi Baskin.

Amongst the distinguished guests present, beside those already mentioned, were: Elected Members of Cork City Council and Cork County Council; Professor Patrick O'Shea, President of University College, Cork; Bill O'Connell, President of Cork Chamber of Commerce; Commodore Hugh Tully, Flag Officer Commanding the Naval Service; Col. Michael O'Connor; The Defence Forces; Chief Supt. Barry McPolin, An Garda Síochána; Bill Holohan, Chairman of The Chartered Institute of Arbitrators in Ireland; Dominic Daly, Hon. Consul of Belgium; Sir Freddie Pedersen, Hon. Consul of Denmark; John Miller, Hon. Consul of Hungary; Michael Barry, Hon. Consul of Mexico; Frances Lynch, Hon. Consul Emeritus of Brazil; former Fianna Fail TD Noel O'Flynn; David O'Brien, Chief Executive of St. Luke's Charity, Cork; and Trevor Dunne, President of the Incorporated Church of Ireland Cork Young Men's Association, Garryduff Sports Centre.

Disgracefully not mentioned in this category or indeed any other one was the Catholic Bishop John Buckley of Cork—so much for the spirit of *inclusiveness*.

In addition to the current Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoresses, also present were former Lords Mayor and Lady Mayoresses who served in Office over the past 19 years that Bishop Colton had been Bishop of Cork, Cloyne and Ross.

What I found odd was that every one of those former Lord Mayors and their spouses were named but the present Lord Mayor, who was not named once in the written up web-site notes. And the only reason I have for this is that Tony Fitzgerald is from Knocknaheeny, regarded as a most insalubrious north-side enclave by those dinner attendees. He started life as a road sweeper for the Corporation as it was then, and worked his way up through Fianna Fáil by unstinting hard work and I notice now when he is on local Radio that he has elocuted his voice—and fairs play to him.

I know he has ambitions to run as a second candidate for the party at the next General Election but Michael Martín is having none of it, as he is busy promoting Seán Óg Ó hAlpín who was invited by Fianna Fáil Headquarters (MM i.e.) to give the *Sean Moylan 60th Commemoration Oration* in Kiskeam on Sunday 12th November 2017. From some of those whom I met who attended—they were all—to a man—very impressed by the likeable (and I know this from personable experience) young man and I too would like to see him representing Fianna Fáil, with fellow candidate Billy Kelleher TD (who obviously doesn't want this development) as the party vote in Cork Centre North has dropped catastrophically as it has elsewhere.

But the great Cork, North Monastery hurling legend that is Seán Óg has lots to commend him in this new era of "*clean*" politics—he is a non smoker, non drinker, charmingly self-effacing and bi-racial—Mam Philippino, Dad Irish—what more could anyone want? Especially if that "*anyone*" is Michael Martín who has one final throw of the dice and then the fat lady will certainly sing if it all goes pear-shaped for him, which is looking more and more likely the case.

I notice in passing that poor old Mattie McGrath, Independent TD—formerly of Fianna Fáil who used this old fashion operatic phrase was rounded on by that appalling woman Senator Noone, Fine Gael, who kicked Mattie for such "*sexist language*" when she herself was being a "*fattist*", that is one who is guilty of fat-shaming women—in other words she thought that being "*fat*" was a negative attribute. I came from the country where to be a farmer's wife and be called "*stout*" was seen as a positive asset!

But to go back to the Bishop's bash—a musical tribute after the meal was performed by Ireland's *Bella Voce*, Amanda Neri. Music during the drinks reception beforehand was performed by *Tr3ble Clef* [sic] and during the meal the guests were entertained by Bob Seward and the Clubmen. Throughout the evening photographs were taken by award-winning photographer Erich Stack. Responding to the presentation of the Spirit of Cork Award, Bishop Colton came over all humble . . . (yeah me too!), saying "... *Michael Mulcahy will attest to the fact that I was a reluctant recipient, and had to be persuaded ...*"

Bishop Colton shared memories of growing up in Cork in the 1960s and

1970s and then referred to the changed religious outlook since then:

"I grew up with a version of Christianity that, by and large, looked in on itself, or rather, when it looked out, it sought the company of people like ourselves, or who were prepared to become like us, to marry us and to perpetuate our way. *We were taught to lie low and to get on with it in our own minority way. There were reasons for that, not all of them without foundation. Protestants were not alone in their insularity. When it came to religion, the Cork I grew up in was more fort than frontier. Everything outside was risky. I soon discovered, and still believe, that life is more exciting when you take down walls rather than build them. Instead of pulling up bridges over moats to leave them down and to go out and start coming and going. Our children, rightly, have no truck with now with the world of circled wagons, nor do the majority of people... The wounds and injuries of history run deep; it falls to us to heal and reconcile.*

But Colton was born and brought up in Derry, or Londonderry as I saw him refer to it elsewhere. He also was in Northern Ireland during the War, in ministry, and I never heard of any of his healing of divisions work there. He came to Cork with his family at the age of 6 (again this age can vary) and seems entirely ignorant of the big hold of Protestant businesses on the large majority of Cork people, or *so it seems!* From Banking, Accountancy, Insurance, Solicitors *et cetera*—Protestants also had huge businesses from Johnson's & Perriot Car Dealers to Woodford, Bourne Wine Merchants, and Shipping to everything else in between. So who "*taught them to lie low*"? For which of these very privileged people was Cork "*a fort*"? How dare Bishop Colton—in being so honoured—lecture the very people who really had to lie low but who now want to forget that fractured past and rightly so—but not then have one's nose rubbed in it.

If there are still some people out there who really don't know about Bishop Colton and, for example his Hard Gospel Project, then they can access '*An Affair with the Bishop of Cork*' by Jack Lane and other authors. It was brought out in 2009 by the Aubane Historical Society and can be got through the www.atholstreet.com site.

But back to one of the Associate Patrons of the **Spirit of Cork**, and one of the few to be in (blocked capitals) **DIPLOMAT**, I did a search for this and found a very odd site. When the former UK Ambassador Sir Dominic Chilcott was ensconced in the Dublin Embassy, he did a lot of

travelling and turned up at the most unexpected events. But without doubt, he was in Cork most often and who was always extending him the invitations but the Cork Civic Trust, which I have since learnt is also publicly funded by the taxpayers of Cork.

Trust Chief Executive John X. Miller gave the British Ambassador "a farewell lunch" that was attended by all the luminaries who attended the Bishop's dinner. And the Chairman of Cork Civic Trust commented:

"Cork Civic Trust is pleased that Ambassador Chilcott has accepted our invitation so that various sectors he has engaged with here in Cork during his term as Ambassador, can show our collective appreciation for his *commitment to Cork*."

And John X. Miller stated:

"The Ambassador's willingness to attend this event to bid farewell to Cork, in the midst of not only a frenetic departure schedule but in the aftermath of the recent UK Referendum result, I believe, reflects the position Cork holds in his heart."

DIPLOMAT is a monthly magazine and seems to be an add-on to the ordinary diplomatic efforts of the Irish State. It has a presence in Belfast, Dublin and Cork and has as its purpose putting out there the activities of the Consular Corps/Association of Northern Ireland.

Its recent AGM took place in Baronscourt, Newtown Stewart, Co. Tyrone—the home of the Duke and Duchess of Abercorn. Amongst the guests were Co-operation Ireland's Chief Executive Peter Sheridan OBE, who after thirty two years service with the RUC/PSNI and was the first Catholic Assistant Chief Constable stepped down in 2008 to become Chief Executive of the charity Co-operation Ireland.

The Duchess of Abercorn has been appointed the new President of Consular Corps Association of Northern Ireland effective in 2018. She is also the Hon. Consul of the Russian Federation.

Strange doings indeed! But then these are strange times—yes?

Julianne Herlihy ©

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

Central Bank

continued

D'Arcy, felt obliged to put his concerns in writing. As reported in the *Indo*:

"The Central Bank has been accused of adopting an *'unhelpful attitude'* when it comes to processing Brexit-driven inward investment and relocation queries and of *'unclear processes'* that often result in *'lengthy delays'* for financial services firms considering relocating or expanding their businesses in Ireland."

"While the minister is careful not to criticise the Central Bank, he details a list of frustrations relayed to him by corporations and questioned whether a formal *'mechanism'* should be established to *'enable companies to articulate their concerns'*."

"Mr D'Arcy said the proposal follows his conversations with a *'significant number of financial services companies who are... considering Ireland as an EU 27 location'*."

The Central Bank for its part has rejected the criticism and stresses that its approach is in line with European regulatory norms. According to the *Irish Times*, at the launch of the Bank's latest macro-financial review, Sharon Donnery, Deputy Governor, stated that *"debates about the Bank's role in promoting and attracting industry are not appropriate in light of what happened during the crisis"* (IT 12 Dec 2017).

The reference here to the 'crisis' harks back to the allegation that the Central Bank did not regulate the activities of the IFSC properly in the years preceding the crisis, that it was too involved with the IDA in the promotion of the IFSC as an offshore banking centre (a formal part of its remit), and that this contributed to Ireland's reputation of being the 'Wild West' of finance at the time.

But the 'light touch' regulatory approach of the Irish Central Bank before the crisis was completely in tune with the accepted regulatory approach adopted at least within the Anglo-Saxon financial world of the time. Continental countries nominally also subscribed to this approach, but in practice had historically maintained more intrusive regulatory regimes which stood them in better stead when the whole edifice crumbled in 2008-9.

This 'light touch' approach facilitated the growth of the IFSC, but, combined with EU Single Market rules, also left the Central Bank incapable of defending the domestic banking sector (were it able or inclined to do so) from the assault of foreign, particularly British, banks. The

British banks led an aggressive race to the bottom in lending standards within the retail banking sector in Ireland during the boom years and their introduction of innovative *'products'*. such as tracker mortgages was emulated by local banks with consequences which continue to reverberate today.

The Honohan Report on the banking sector and the others which followed it, up to and including the Oireachtas Banking Inquiry, ignored this factor or dealt with it only in passing, preferring to focus on the car crash that was Anglo Irish Bank, a boutique lender uninvolved in the retail mortgage market, rather than financial behemoths like HBOS and RBS (Ulster Bank) whose deep-pocketed drive for market share in Ireland produced the train wreck that the wider banking sector became.

Both banks eventually had to be bailed out by the British taxpayer with their Irish losses alone running into the tens of billions, but like elephants in the room, their presence and influence in the Irish banking landscape during the boom and bust years has been all but eliminated from Irish public consciousness. The reasons for this would require a separate study by themselves, but they are probably not unrelated to the mindset that set in after the Peace Process and Good Friday Agreement whereby a healthy critical scepticism with regard to Britain's designs in the world was subsumed under a tide of ahistorical historical revisionism emanating in large measure from TCD with the British Embassy's moral and financial support.

The UK's Brexit vote and the ensuing discussions have removed some of the scales from Irish eyes in regard to our neighbour and opened up opportunities for development as well as challenges for the domestic Irish economy. The decision of the British Government to interpret the vote as a vote to exit the Single Market means that the highly regulated financial services sector will be closed to British entities unless they establish subsidiaries within the Single Market which are subject to its rules. This welcome development looks set to severely curtail, if not remove completely, the more pernicious influences of English (and Scottish) finance capitalism in Irish and European affairs in the future and enables both Ireland and Europe to, as the Brexiters say, take back control.

However there will be an ongoing need for the location/relocation of activities, currently carried out in the City of London, within the single market and the IFSC is a natural candidate. It should be remember-

ed (above all by Deputy Governors of the Central Bank) that the activities of the IFSC had minimal impact on the collapse of the banking sector in Ireland, as the companies which operate there have little organic connection with financing the wider Irish economy.

It seems as though the Central Bank is currently interpreting its regulatory role as defensively as possible with respect to the IFSC. If, as it says, it is merely following 'European norms', then institu-

tions aiming to relocate within the EU should not find Paris or Frankfurt to be any more convenient as operating locations from a regulatory point of view than Dublin, and Dublin's advantages in terms of language, legal system etc, should still win out. If, on the other hand, firms are choosing to relocate elsewhere within the EU because the regulatory constraints are too onerous in Ireland, then something is very clearly amiss.

Seán Owens

Oration of Mícheál Mac Donncha , Mayor of Dublin, 1st December 2017

Remembering McKee, Clancy And Clune

Gabhaim buíochas le Cumann 1916-1921 as an chuireadh chun labhairt anseo inniú. Molaim an obair atá á dhéanamh le fada ag an Cumann, ní hamháin chun na fir agus na mná a throid idir 1916 agus 1921 ar son saoirse na hÉireann a chomóradh ach chun a gcuspóirí a chur chun cinn.

I am honoured as the first *Ardmhéara*, certainly in recent times, to give the main oration at the Annual Dick McKee, Peadar Clancy and Conor Clune commemoration. I thank the 1916-21 Club for the invitation and for the work you have been doing over many years not only to commemorate our fallen patriots but also to promote their ideals and aspirations.

In commemorating McKee, Clancy and Clune we must try to imagine Dublin as it was in the Winter of 1920. It was in the grip of terror. Not, as the revisionists would have it, the '*terror*' of a people's Army, the IRA, which was leading the resistance against British rule. No, the reign of terror was initiated and sustained by the British regime in Ireland, with its headquarters in this very building, Dublin Castle, outside of which we are assembled.

People in Dublin must have had a great sense of helplessness as they waited and watched while Kevin Barry lived out his last days behind the high walls of Mountjoy Jail before he was led to his death on November 1st. A week before that they had seen the slow death on hunger strike of the Lord Mayor of Cork Terence MacSwiney in Brixton Prison.

But, while Republicans could not save these men, they were far from helpless. The Flying Columns were beginning to inflict heavy casualties on the enemy,

most notably at Kilmichael. And here in Dublin the IRA struck at the heart of the British Intelligence and Counter-Insurgency system when they executed British officers and agents on what became known as Bloody Sunday when the British carried out their revenge attack on civilians in Croke Park.

The same day McKee, Clancy and Clune, prisoners in Dublin Castle, were murdered, with the usual excuse of '*shot while trying to escape*'. These men represented the best of what has been described as *a golden generation*. Dick McKee, a brave commander of the Dublin Brigade; Peadar Clancy, a 1916 veteran, former hunger striker, a natural leader; and Conor Clune, a typical man of the rank and file, dedicated to the Irish language and culture, and to building a new Ireland.

It was an act of revenge. Just as the execution of the Manchester Martyrs Allen, Larkin and O'Brien was an act of revenge and their 150th anniversary occurred last week.

The so-called revisionists would have us believe that there was no need to resort to arms to achieve Irish independence. This is the constant chorus of the likes of John Bruton. Of course what they ignore is the fact that every resort to armed struggle came about after so-called constitutional methods had met with intransigence, contempt and betrayal by the British Government.

So it was in 1914 when Home Rule was shelved and Irishmen were induced in their tens of thousands to sacrifice themselves in the armies of the British Empire in return for what Roger Casement

called "*a promissary note payable only after death*". While Pearse is castigated for his supposed notions of blood sacrifice, the real man of blood, John Redmond, who sent tens of thousands of Irishmen to their deaths, is rehabilitated and elevated to sainthood by the so-called revisionists.

This was done even to the point of the Department of Taoiseach having Redmond's portrait on a giant banner in College Green during the 1916 Centenary—a banner thankfully removed early due to protests from Dublin City Councillors.

As we approach the centenary of the 1918 election and the First Dáil Éireann, let us remember that it was England's armed suppression of the Dáil, the expressed will of the Irish people, that led to the intense conflict.

While all have a right to remember their dead, no matter on what side they fought, we cannot equate the cause of Irish freedom with the cause of British imperialism.

I wish to say here, for the first time in public, that many relatives of those who died for Irish freedom have spoken to me about their upset and anger at the Glasnevin Wall where the names of the fallen Irish patriots of the 1916 Rising have been listed indiscriminately together with the members of the British crown forces they fought.

How many realise that it is intended for this to continue to 1923—and that the names of McKee, Clancy and Clune are to be listed together with Black and Tans, Auxiliaries and other British murderers and spies? This should not be allowed to proceed.

I want to conclude by again commending the work of the 1916-21 Club. I commend in particular your participation in the campaign to save Moore Street, the 1916 Battlefield Site.

Finally in honouring these men and all their comrades we say—Their dream is our dream and their Republic will be our Republic. *An Phoblacht abú!*

On-line sales of books, pamphlets and magazines:

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

Northern Ireland And The EU: *The Case For Special Status*

Listed to appear:

Martina Anderson, MEP, Sinn Fein for North of Ireland.

Chris Hazzard, MP, Sinn Fein, MP for South Down.

Chair: Michelle Gildernew MP, Sinn Fein for Fermanagh/South Tyrone.

A very cold night and buskers with microphones and guitars blasting out near the Westminster Tube and Portcullis House, which is just around the corner from the Tube. No tourists to be seen. Only office workers on staggered hours, I would guess, walking briskly against the cold.

Much different when I was at Portcullis House on 7th September 2016, on a very hot evening with blinding sun, for a discussion by SF on the Loughinisland Massacre, County Down on the 18th of June, 1994.

And then again on the 24th of January, 2017 to hear SF's explanation for its withdrawal from Stormont.

A thorough airport-type security check in the foyer—overcoats off, belts off, for both sexes, through the X-Ray, then patted-down for good measure. Heavy security guard and police presence. For obvious reason there could be no objections from the long queue waiting for over 15 minutes to get to the Grimond Room.

The Chair announces that Martina Anderson can't be here as she had to make an urgent flight to Brussels. Discerning disappointment from a full room. We were all anxious to hear the Brexit case but also anxious to set eyes on Martina Anderson, former member of Provisional IRA, former POW for 13 years.

Her niece, Elisha McCallion, once SF mayor of Derry took her place.

The meeting was around the statement of SF, issued earlier:

"There is now growing support in Europe for the North of Ireland to secure a special status within the EU. Sinn Féin has regularly called on the British government to recognise this and work with the EU to achieve it."

Martina Anderson was quoted in her absence:

"The latest paper which the European Commission sent to the British government is welcome as it builds on the October resolution. It acknowledges the need to protect the Common Travel area

, north-south cooperation and the institutions created by the Good Friday Agreement. It also calls on the British government to ensure there is no imposition of an EU frontier on the island of Ireland, and no emergence of regulatory divergence from the rules of the internal market and customs union. When the Council meets in December it must build further on this to ensure no regression in rights and that the Good Friday Agreement is protected. And the Taoiseach needs to signal his intention to oppose the Brexit negotiations progressing to trade talks unless the issues relating to Ireland are fully addressed. The paper is further evidence that the EU acknowledges and supports the need for the north to secure special status within the EU. Successive papers coming from the EU supports that position and now it is time for the British government to recognise that and work with the EU to secure special status for the north within the EU.'

A bright and optimistic statement and it should be pointed out that the Good Friday Agreement in her statement tops all other issues.

The Left, formerly from the Republic, sounded a bit Connolly Association, and might have been or still are members. Long ramblings on Palestine, good maybe, but this wasn't the place or the evening for that.

Kindly acknowledged from the platform, as if humouring an overexcited dog, gentle applause from the audience. Then a rep from the CPGB (Marxist Leninist): It seems workers could solve the Irish question. I thought: *'If so then why the fuck didn't they!'*

You couldn't tag SF as anything political at this meeting. It was once again the struggle of the Nationalist people of the North for survival, And that struggle looks like it's about to be upon us again. The Irish or English Left could make no inroads into that situation on that evening. It looked like they just couldn't understand what was happening and could maybe happen if a hard border was introduced. That would be a border that was slogan-proof and kindly-regarding-leftist proof.

Tired of sentimental slush, I decided to bring up Britain's balance-of-power centuries-old procedures. That stopped the financial issues, the travel issues, the human rights issues and the Palestine issue from the platform. Britain would be now

using the Irish issue for its own ends. The Good Friday Agreement became the chief topic from the platform. The two MPs there represented border areas and that sent alarm bells ringing..

A hard border could see the mustering and expansion of the Dissidents, playing right into British hands in their battle against Sinn Fein. Chris Hazzard, the 33 year old who defeated the SDLP in South Down, pointed out the Conservative Government's coolness on the Good Friday Agreement. He explained that those who spoke of the Belfast Agreement instead of using the term The Good Friday Agreement were not wholly in favour of it. It was a sort of codification.

Theresa May had spoken of the *Belfast Agreement* on many occasions. He also pointed out that the Good Friday Agreement was a fragile thing that could unravel very quickly. I thought: War brought Sinn Fein to the fore and now peace could advance it even more. Does Britain want that to happen? What a silly question. Of course not.

There was concern from the platform about some of the religious zealots of the DUP.

I can quite understand that having tussled with a few of them back in Belfast during my time. Old Testament cut-outs advocating a nuclear attack on an independent China back in the early 1950s. Or seeing the Catholic population crawl south across the border as bloodied cockroaches. Or in local parlance: *'Wi' the blood flyin' out of them.'*

But I would hope those religious zealots in the DUP would be thinking of more gentle methods.

A psychiatrist, once part of my extended family said there were two groups of people he couldn't get through to—communists and religious zealots.

The platform, including a former political advisor to Martin McGuinness, were also concerned that the emerging once-out-of-sight colonial mindset of the British political and media elements had upped their bitterness towards those who they saw as their enemies in the Irish nation and in its people.

The queue to enter Portcullis House had been discussing excitedly among ourselves the present situation on Brexit. The Irish must be the most political of all people in Europe. But we left Portcullis House silently and in gloom.

Wilson John Haire
29 November 2017

Assessing Dev

Biographies of de Valera seem to be a publishing fashion at the moment and this is the latest. There is a theme to all of them along the lines that that he was a great politician and statesman but had serious flaws that account for his rejection so-called 'Treaty' and thereby was the cause of the so-called 'Civil War'.

The distinguishing feature of de Valera was that he was both single-minded in his basic aim, Irish independence, but infinitely flexible on how that was to be achieved and he was the latter because he was the former. The two attributes are complementary but can easily be portrayed as opportunistic, deceitful, egotistical, malicious, etc. and this is very easy to do by not appreciating the particular context in each case.

Taoiseach Leo Varadkar launched the book and is reported as saying that—

"...he has no problem acknowledging the greatness of Éamon de Valera even if his predecessor was not always right. Mr Varadkar described De Valera's achievement in keeping Ireland neutral in the Second World War as 'probably his finest hour' but said the same stubbornness behind this diplomatic policy was apparent in 1921 and 1922 in events which led to the Civil War" (Irish Times, 3.11.17).

So his virtue becomes his vice. Varadkar seems unaware of the consistency in this 'stubbornness' as in both cases de Valera sought to defend the independence of the state he was the leader of. Varadkar shows the endemic failure of a Fine Gaeler to see this obvious point. If it was not for de Valera's stubbornness in both situations, he would not have had an independent state to become leader of.

Ronan Fanning, in his recent biography, put de Valera's "petulance" as the cause of the 'Civil War' in place of Varadkar's "stubbornness".

McCullagh seems to have foreseen both Varadkar's and Fanning's critiques when he says: "*But those who ascribe de Valera's position solely to wounded vanity and stubbornness miss the essential point: he was desperately trying to find a compromise that would preserve unity. That doing so would preserve his own leadership he chose to regard as a happy accident*".(p.249).

McCullagh deals in some detail with what turned out to be the crucial event in the negotiations with Westminster—the Cabinet meeting of 3rd December 1921 to discuss Lloyd George 'final offer' of Dominion status.

The basis for all subsequent events on the Irish side was laid at this meeting. Modern historians have tended to avert their eyes from it and concentrate on later dramas but this was the moment of truth.

McCullagh treats it as such. Griffith initially argued for acceptance of the draft and accepting the King as head of state. He suggested that they should sign it and leave it to the Dail to accept or reject it. Brugha argued that this would "split Ireland from top to bottom". Griffith then agreed and said "I'll not sign the document but I'll bring it back and submit it to the Dail and, if necessary, the people" (238). On that assurance de Valera decided not to go to London and attend the negotiations himself..

The Cabinet accepted that any Oath should be based on the concept of external association, acceptance of the King as head of the "Association of States" i.e., the Commonwealth, which included Ireland. But there was to be no acceptance of him as King of Ireland.

But the important event at the meeting was the dog that did not bark—Michael Collins. McCullagh puts it as delicately as possible: "*Collin's view was more confused*". On the oath, "*he was ambivalent, pointing out that it wouldn't come into force for 12 months, and it might be worth taking that time*"(237). He seems to be the only confused person at the 7 hour meeting which provided plenty time to clear up minds. Confused thinking is not the usual attribute associated with Collins.

And McCullagh gives the real reason for Collins' prevarication two pages later:

"Unknown to de Valera, the Cabinet was not the only body considering the draft Treaty. Collins had given a copy of the British draft to Seán Ó Muirthuile, secretary of the IRB, to put before 'the lads'—the Supreme Council. According to Ó Muirthuile, the oath proposed by the British was unacceptable, but a new version was drafted that expressed allegiance to the 'Irish Free State', with fidelity to the British Monarch in a subsequent clause. At best this was an appalling breach of confidentiality by

Collins; at worst, it suggests he regarded the views of the Supreme Council as being of greater value than those of the Cabinet; the oath contained in the final treaty was in the IRB's form rather than de Valera's" (p239).

The 'worst' was the reality. Collins had no regard for the Cabinet—"the lads" were more important.

This was in contrast to de Valera for whom the consummate issue was Cabinet unity and Cabinet responsibility.

Yet this disregard for democratic norms is never laid against Collins. Even though this attitude was to form the essence of later problems. The IRB considered itself the real Government of Ireland as it had held itself to be since 1867: it had not taken on board the consequences of its own success in organising 1916, democratically legitimised in the 1918 Election.

That Election changed completely the paradigm of Irish politics. Irish independence was now based on democracy not conspiracy. The IRB was naturally slow to disown its very successful methods of the past. And the IRB was Collins at this stage.

As has been pointed out previously in these pages, Collins went on to ignore the next meeting with the British negotiators, made his own agreement with Lloyd George, and went on to help coerce the full negotiating team to accept the 'Treaty'. Thereby he defied and totally ignored the agreed Cabinet decisions. It was all of a piece and based on a total misjudgement of what had happened and was happening in Ireland at the time.

The IRB and its methods were past their sell-by date but they ensured that the 'Treaty' was passed and so made a conflict inevitable.

The greatest irony in Irish history is that the IRB, which did more than any other body to create an Irish Republic, was also primarily responsible for destroying the Republic that it helped to create and turned it into a Dominion under the Crown.

That misjudgement was the cause of the 'civil war' that de Valera bent over backwards to prevent.

McCullagh's book makes this case without acknowledging it—but such an acknowledgment is still too much to expect even when the facts make it obvious.

Dev's biography has still to be written.

Jack Lane

Centenaries And Other Citations In *The Irish Times*

It is interesting to compare what first appears online in the *Irish Times* and what the Editor chooses to publish, or not publish, in the subsequent print edition. The issue of November 14th is an interesting case in point, both in respect of what was published, albeit re-edited, or not published at all. I will come back presently to what was completely excluded from that print edition. What was printed, under the category of "*Literature*", was the following story concerning that paper's own Literary and Assistant Editor: "*O'Toole commissioned to write Heaney's official biography*". The happy news was delivered as follows by reporter Martin Doyle:

"Fintan O'Toole has been commissioned to write the official biography of Seamus Heaney, Ireland's Nobel Prize-winning poet, who died in August 2013 after a career spanning seven decades. O'Toole, an *Irish Times* columnist for nearly 30 years, has written almost 20 books, including studies of playwrights Richard Brinsley Sheridan and Tom Murphy, and most recently *Judging Shaw*, a biography of George Bernard Shaw. This year, he has won the Orwell Prize for Journalism, the European Press Prize Commentator Award and Broadsheet Columnist of the Year at the Newsbrands Ireland Journalism Awards. Heaney's family and his publisher, Faber & Faber, welcomed the news. O'Toole will engage in years of original research, interlacing archive, oral and literary work, and correspondence to create a portrait of, in his words, 'the personal, the political and the poetic'... The poet's son Michael said: 'The family of Seamus Heaney wholeheartedly welcome the announcement of Fintan O'Toole as his biographer.'"

And so read the final sentence, as published in the print edition, from which I have quoted only the half of that report. But an editorial decision had been made to excise the final sentences from the report as originally filed, where O'Toole's fellow *Irish Times* columnist, its radio reviewer Michael Heaney, had let the cat out of the bag. For, online, we could ascertain how that report's final paragraph originally read:

"The poet's son Michael said: 'The family of Seamus Heaney wholeheartedly welcome the announcement of Fintan O'Toole as his biographer. We have long been great admirers of Fintan's astute and wide-ranging work—as was my

father—whether as a critic, a biographer or an observer of Irish society, so when he approached us with his proposal for a biography, we felt he was uniquely qualified to chronicle the life and work in a new light. We look forward to helping Fintan in working on this new biography, which enjoys the approval and co-operation of the Heaney family.'"

Perhaps a more informative heading might have been: "*O'Toole successfully canvasses to write Heaney's official biography*". Nothing particularly wrong with seeking out work which one would thoroughly enjoy doing. We have all had to earn our bread. I myself was fortunate to find lifetime employment in doing work from which I also derived immense intellectual satisfaction—in my case, in the service of the Trade Union movement. But, in this latest chapter of O'Toole's career, *Irish Times* re-editing had masked the sequence of events—that his canvassing had preceded his successful commission.

It is of further interest to note how editorial decisions are taken, particularly during this Decade of Centenaries, as to who or what should be mentioned, and who should not be. This past September saw the Centenary of the death of Thomas Ashe, at whose Glasnevin funeral Michael Collins had given the funeral oration. This was mentioned during the 95th anniversary commemoration of Collins's own death, on which, under the heading of "*Irish Times Self-censorship*", I reported in the September *Irish Political Review*: The former Political Editor of the *Irish Times*, Stephen Collins, gave an Address at a commemoration of Michael Collins hosted by the Collins/Griffith Commemoration Society at Glasnevin on 20th August. An *Irish Times* report of this event 'neglected to record' that its columnist pointedly criticised President Michael D. Higgins, by name, for "*simplistic analyses*", and that he also denounced what he called the "*extreme left*" leadership of the British Labour Party.

No self-censorship was, however, involved when the *Irish Times* joined in celebrations marking the centenary of Conor Cruise O'Brien, who had been born on 3rd November 1917. "*O'Brien's stance*

on nationalism took courage" was the heading of the extensive encomium by Stephen Collins published this November 2nd, while "*Conor Cruise O'Brien caused cultural transformation*" was the *Irish Times* heading of its November 4th report on the two day celebration of O'Brien's centenary in Trinity College, at which Collins himself also performed.

The *Irish Times* is, of course, a commercial operation, and a centenary mention of anybody else can be purchased by way of a classified advertisement. I don't have any problems with that, as I annually insert *memoriam* notices in respect of my deceased wife, mother and father. So, this November 11th, the following notice was paid for and appeared:

O'RIORDAN, Micheál— (Centenary Family Remembrance)

—Son of Julia and Micheál, West Cork Gaeltacht of Béal Átha'n Ghaorthaidh. Born Cork city, November 12, 1917, first week of the Russian Socialist Revolution. General Secretary, Communist Party of Ireland, 1970-83. International Brigade volunteer, Spanish Anti-Fascist War. Wounded-in-action, Gandesa, Lughnasa 1938. Author of "Connolly Column". Honorary citizen of Spain, 1996. RIP 2006. Beloved comrade and husband of Kay (RIP 1991). Loving father of Mary (RIP 1948), Manus and Brenda. Father-in-law of Annette (RIP 2013) and Tony. Much loved Grandad of Jess, Neil, Dara, Caitriona and Luke. Micheál also lives on through his great-grandchildren—Amaia, Rory, Caleb, Cian, Eli and Jacob. Always remembered with pride and love.

*"Si me quieres escribir,
ya sabes mi paradero:
en el frente de Gandesa,
primera línea de fuego."*

("If you wish to write to me, you already know my address: on the Gandesa front, in the first line of fire.")

Now, I am not one to engage in uncritical hagiography. Following my father's passing in May 2006, I penned a tribute to both my deceased parents entitled "*In Remembrance of Two 'Fools'*"—**The Fool** being the title, alike, of a poem by Patrick Pearse and a song by the Cuban Silvio Rodríguez, and a designation proudly worn as a badge of revolutionary honour. This remembrance was first published in the July 2006 of *Irish Political Review*—see http://free-magazines.atholbooks.org/ipr/2006/IPR_July_2006.pdf to download—and it was reprinted, with due acknow-

ledgement, in the October 2006 issue of *Unity*, published by the Communist Party of Ireland. My tribute did not avoid the issue of our sharp political differences, while, of course, it primarily focussed on our unity of purpose in terms of shared political convictions.

I also referred to disagreements as well as agreements in the two centenary biographical lectures delivered this past year in my father's native Cork: the first, entitled "A Neighbour's Child", on August 4th, as part of the Spirit of Mother Jones Festival; and the second, entitled "Born to be a Revolutionary", on November 9th, in Cork City Library. This was attended by the *Irish Times* Cork correspondent, Barry Roche, who thought it sufficiently newsworthy to post a report online on November 13th. Yet not a single word of that report was published in the print edition of the *Irish Times* on November 14th, the same issue that announced, with a fanfare, Fintan O'Toole's happy news. Nor, indeed, on November 15th.

Why? Was there some objection to me pointing out that the Spanish Republic had been defeated, not only due the superior military intervention of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, but also due to the so-called "non-intervention" strangulation of that Republic by Britain and France? In any case, hereunder is now the only place to find that Barry Roche report in print:

"Communist O'Riordan thought war already lost before he fought in Spain. Manus O'Riordan says father 'honour-bound' to defend Spanish republic against Franco.

Irish communist leader Michael O'Riordan went to fight with the International Brigades in the Spanish Civil War even though he believed the fight for the Spanish republic was already lost, his son Manus has revealed. Speaking at a lecture to mark the 100th anniversary of his father's birth last weekend, Mr O'Riordan said his father believed the Spanish republic would fall to Franco's fascist forces when he went to Spain in March 1938. But his sympathies had been with the democratically-elected republican government from the outset of the war in July 1936. "He was due to go in 1937, but he got appendicitis, so he went the following year, but before he went he actually said 'I already knew the war was lost because of the amount of aid that Hitler and Mussolini were giving Franco and the lack of support for the republic from Britain and France'," Mr O'Riordan said. "But he still felt honour-bound having volunteered to go, so he

went out without any expectation of the war being won by any action he took—he thought perhaps the republic could hold out a little bit longer and there might be some change if something dramatic happened elsewhere in Europe." Mr O'Riordan said his father thought, perhaps, Britain and France as democracies might come in and support the republic, which should have happened when Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia in 1938, but "they just stood by and the Spanish republic finally fell in July 1939".

Speaking at a lecture at Cork City Library to mark his father's birth on November 12th, 1917, just days after the Russian Revolution, Mr O'Riordan said his father joked that the guns of the cruiser, *Aurora*, firing on the Winter Palace in St Petersburg brought on his premature birth in Cork. First joining Fianna Éireann as a teenager in Cork, Michael O'Riordan later joined the IRA. He was in the IRA when he became a communist, under the influence of Sean Nolan whom he met at a WolfeTone commemoration in Bodenstown, said Mr O'Riordan. He was only 20 years old and lied about his age when he travelled to Paris to join the International Brigades. There he was vetted by future Yugoslav leader, Tito, before he travelled over the Pyrenees with smugglers and joined the British Battalion of the 15th International Brigade, after training at Figueras.

"His commander in the British Battalion was a man from Manchester called Sam Wild and when the Republican forces mounted one last offensive to regain ground lost to the Fascists on the Aragon Front, Sam Wild gave each company a Spanish flag and a Catalan flag as they crossed the Ebro", Mr O'Riordan said. "Sam said to my father it was important an Irishman carry the Catalan flag as they crossed the Ebro into Catalonia, which sounds very romantic, but when I asked my father what he did with the flag, he said he gave it to the first liberated Catalan he found as it made him a sitting duck for snipers." Wounded by shrapnel while defending Hill 481 during the Battle of the Ebro, Michael O'Riordan was invalided back to Barcelona. There he witnessed La Pasionaria, Dolores Ibarruri, make her famous 'You are history, You are Legend' speech to the departing international Brigades, in November 1938.

Although the Republicans lost the civil war, Michael O'Riordan was deeply honoured when the Spanish Parliament voted in 1996 to offer Spanish citizenship to all surviving International Brigadiers who had come to Spain to help defend the Spanish Republic, said Mr O'Riordan. "Spain was a huge part of my father's life and he was very moved by that and he was delighted when Christy Moore wrote

Viva La Quince Brigada, which was inspired by his book about the Irish involvement in the International Brigades, *Connolly Column*, which he wrote in 1979.

"When he died in 2006, we scattered some of his ashes in Carlingford Lough where we had scattered my mother, Kay's ashes in 1991, but we brought another part of his ashes back to Spain and scattered them at the very spot where he had crossed the Ebro with the Catalan flag in 1938". (End of Roche's report).

Now, it might be argued that any newspaper editor has so many competing reports for his/her limited space in a print edition, that many good newsworthy reports, for that reason alone, must invariably fail to make it beyond online posting. But limited space does not explain how my father's name was regarded as one great unmentionable when it came to owning up to "*corrections and clarifications*". It was under this heading, for example, that the print issue of November 1st acknowledged: "*A book review last Saturday referred in error to Philip Larkin when it meant to refer to Jim Larkin and his statue in Dublin's O'Connell Street*".

I have no doubt that a genuine error had also been made in the *Irish Times* of October 30th, when its "*Irishman's Diary on Catalonia and Ireland in the 1930s*" quoted from an unsuccessful solidarity appeal to de Valera from a Catalan Youth Party, but gave as its source "Manus O'Riordan's book *Connolly Column*." No credit was, of course, due to me, but rather to my father, and his research for his own book. This is why, that same day, I requested that, just like the Larkin correction, the following should be published under that paper's "corrections and qualifications":

"*An Irishman's Diary*, October 30, inaccurately referred to "Manus O'Riordan's book *Connolly Column*".

The author of this 1979 book was Michael O'Riordan."

No such correction was ever acknowledged and published, but, on once again checking the online version, I discovered that "Manus" had now been surreptitiously altered to read "Michael", without, however, any indication that there had ever been a Larkin-type error to be corrected in the first place. What a shabby "*paper of record*"!

Manus O'Riordan

In Memoriam Thomas Ashe

In memoriam Thomas Ashe, Irish Volunteers Commandant; victorious commander in the Battle of Ashbourne during the 1916 Rising; President of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, 1917; fatally wounded at the hands of the British authorities by forcible feeding in Mountjoy Gaol; died 25th September 1917.

LET ME CARRY YOUR CROSS FOR IRELAND, LORD

by

Thomas Ashe,

Lewes Gaol, England, 1917.

Let me carry your Cross for Ireland, Lord
The hour of her trial draws near,
And the pangs and the pains of the sacrifice
May be borne by comrades dear.

But, Lord, take me from the offering throng,
There are many far less prepared,
Through anxious and all as they are to die
That Ireland may be spared.

Let me carry your Cross for Ireland, Lord
My cares in this world are few.
And few are the tears will for me fall
When I go on my way to You.

Spare. Oh! Spare to their loved ones dear
The brother and son and sire.
That the cause we love may never die
In the land of our Heart's desire!

Let me carry your Cross for Ireland, Lord!
Let me suffer the pain and shame
I bow my head to their rage and hate,
And I take on myself the blame.

Let them do with my body whate'er they will,
My spirit I offer to You.
That the faithful few who heard her call
May be spared to Roisin Dubh.

Let me carry your Cross for Ireland, Lord!
For Ireland weak with tears,
For the aged man of the clouded brow,
And the child of tender years;

For the empty homes of her golden plains;
For the hopes of her future, too!
Let me carry your Cross for Ireland, Lord!
For the cause of Roisin Dubh.

LAMENT FOR THOMAS ASHE

by Ashe's close friend,

Sean O'Casey, 1918

The breasts of the mountains with anger are
heaving,
Swift rivers of tears down their rugged cheeks
flow;
Their mantle of heather the wild wind is
reaving,
And their proud heads are capp'd with a
storm cloud of woe,
Why gathers the gloom in a manner
appalling—
What causes the sunshine in terror to flee?
The mountains of Erin are plaintively
calling—

Thomas Ashe, Thomas Ashe, we are
mourning for thee!

The wild mountain glens are now silent and
lonely,
And Grief on their bosom has laid her poor
head,

Here thoughts of new life have no place, for
now only

The green woods are wrapped in dear thought
of the dead!

The leaves from the trees, sadly sighing, are
falling

And form a bronze pall for the once flower'd
lea,

The winds rustling thro' them, are plaintively
calling—

Thomas Ashe, Thomas Ashe, we are
mourning for thee!

In the ears of the coast Erin's grey waves are
beating

A curse on the Power that his life would not
spare,

And mingle a prayer in their gloomy
retreating,

With a caïone for the soul that had courage
to dare!

The grey restless waves are all rising and
falling—

Oh! a sorrowful breast is the breast of the
sea—

And her waters, uneasy, are plaintively
calling—

Thomas Ashe, Thomas Ashe, we are
mourning for thee.

Shall we then to Nature's sad, heart-broken
grieving

Our own Gaelic Nature in apathy close?
Ah! No! To our hearts this dear sorrow
receiving

We'll send in a shout to our circle of foes!
Your thoughts, Thomas Ashe, now, shall
shortly be ours—

As you fought the good fight so we'll fight to
be free.

'Gainst all the vain pomp of the princes and
powers,

Made strong by the thought of dear
vengeance for thee.

(First published by Sean O'Casey in
Songs of the Wren, 1918, as his contribution
to the Anti-Conscription Campaign).

The funeral of Thomas Ashe on 30th
September 1917, was the first great Republic-
an funeral since that of O'Donovan
Rossa in 1915, at which Pearse had given
his famous oration. Being Ashe's successor
as President of the Irish Republican
Brotherhood, Michael Collins was chosen
to give his funeral oration. At Ashe's grave-
side, a guard of honour of Irish Volunteers
fired a volley of shots in tribute, and
Collins then stepped forward to give the
following oration:

*"Nothing additional remains to be said.
That volley which we have just heard is
the only speech which it is proper to make
above the grave of a dead Fenian."*

And that was that!

Manus O'Riordan

Ó Corráin And His Key To Irish Writing

Donnchadh Ó Corráin, who died recently, was one of the more notable Irish intellectuals of recent times. He was a historian who always insisted that the past must be made to serve the present, and that the historians of ancient Ireland did this admirably.

Ó Corráin wrote about ancient and not-so-ancient Ireland for a half-century or more. His two most interesting publications appeared in the year of his death. A few months ago I reviewed one of them, *The Irish Church, its Reform, and the English Invasion for Irish Political Review*. This is a refutation of the idea that the 12th century Gaelic Irish were decadent, pagan, barbaric or whatever, and needed to be taken in hand by foreign monks and English armies. Ó Corráin shows that this is the propaganda of a variety of interested parties, who were using double standards and whose intervention did not at all improve Irish Christianity, rather the reverse. His short book is the best that has

appeared on this subject for a long time.

Besides that, there's his long book, *Clavis Litterarum Hibernensium* ("The Key to What the Irish Wrote"—it's more polite to translate it as "a key", but Ó Corráin didn't mean "a key", he meant "the key"), issued by the academic publisher Brepols, comes in three volumes and over 1900 pages. It's a bibliography. That is to say, it's a gigantic series of lists of editions and academic commentaries, ranging over Irish writings from the 4th or 5th century oghams to the annals and histories of the early 17th century, or thereabouts. Built into the bibliography is a view of the culture of the Gaelic Irish. There are carefully calculated sentences or short paragraphs of commentary, intended to make sure that an academic who is moving about in any part of the great firmament of Irish literature will have certain perspectives and not others.

In my opinion, there's a bugbear which

haunts this entire huge book. It's the stereotype of the backward, uncivilised Irish. One can sum it up in a statement made by John Bury, a late-Victorian historian of the Roman Empire and biographer of St. Patrick, to the effect that those who studied the development of the human mind could be glad that Ireland lay undisturbed at the end of the world.

When Ó Corráin began his academic career there were still professors who went on like that: Watkins of Harvard, say, or Binchy of Dublin. Early Ireland was a laboratory specimen, a fascinating (for Watkins) or rather irritating (for Binchy) example of arrested development, lagging behind progressive Romanised Europe. Ó Corráin detested all this but seems to have suffered it silently for a long time. Only in the last few years of his life did he begin to say plainly, in print, what he thought of Professor Binchy's wisdom.

In the *Clavis* he certainly gives a sense of how much Ireland contributed to early Christian Europe (including three of its very brightest stars: Columbanus, Sedulius Scotus, and the philosopher and poet John Scotus Eriugena). But at the same time he deliberately loses sight of the dynamic vernacular culture which is generating all this. The vernacular culture is shifted right back to the second half of the book, implying that it is something secondary and dominated. Ó Corráin takes over 1100 pages to get to the poets. But this is outrageous: quite definitely they ought to be in at the beginning, threaded through the stories of Patrick, Brigit, Columcille and Columcille.

We find this isolated sweeping sentence in the introduction: "*In the sixth century, perhaps earlier, the church elites absorbed what indigenous oral learning that had survived and in law, poetry, grammar and narrative literature, created and developed a unique synthesis between it and Christian Latin culture*" (p. ix). But why this way round rather than the other way round? Why should we think in terms of Church elites absorbing indigenous learning, rather than (as Irish tradition and literary evidence suggests) indigenous learned elites absorbing the culture of the Church?

THE HISTORIC COMPROMISE

Ó Corráin omits to point out that according to Irish tradition there was an original dynamic compromise, overseen by St. Patrick, between the pre-Christian Irish culture, most of which was reaffirmed as valid, and the new Christianity. A crucial figure in this compromise was the poet Dubhthach maccu Lugair—"who, it is said, was the first to acknowledge St.

Patrick", we are told parenthetically on page 1606, as if this were a small matter! In Irish tradition it was not by any means a small matter.

The most extensive account of Ireland's Christian/pre-Christian compromise, as devised by Patrick, Dubhthach and others, is in a prologue to the *Senchas Már*, the great collection of ancient laws. This prologue is bone-headedly referred to by some modern scholars as "the pseudo-historical prologue to the *Senchas Már*". What they do not realise is that this is more authentic history than they themselves will ever write: to be sure, the details of the story (St. Patrick causing an earthquake at Tara, etc.) may be somewhat allegorical or colourful or poetic, but substantially the story expresses a great truth of Irish cultural history.

There is one tremendous ancient poem, embedded in that prologue to the *Senchas Már*, which is attributed to Dubhthach in the role of judge, and which no one has any good reason not to consider authentic. It is a death sentence passed on a certain Nuada, with elaborate legal argument. This Nuada has committed some sort of crime which involves a commitment to paganism, and which is capital. Modern scholars are unable to figure it out, but that doesn't mean it isn't important for the history of Irish culture. Ó Corráin commits the major omission of making no specific mention of this poem at all.

When, finally, deep into his second volume, he comes to the vernacular laws, the ghost of Professor Binchy haunts him and there's one thing he has to say at the expense of all else: "*Such has been the mistaken emphasis on the archaism of the laws that many scholars have quite missed their advanced jurisprudence*" (p. 863). On the *Audacht Moraind*, the earliest of the "*How to be a good king*" tracts, Ó Corráin says sweepingly: "*Its ideal king is a christian one, though clothed in the language of apparently inherited and timeless wisdom*" (p. 1188).

Well, yes, of course, the ideal king in *Audacht Moraind* is a christian king, but only according to the terms of the Dubhthach/Patrick compromise! His "*natural soundness*" (*fír aicnid*) is reaffirmed as Christian. But it's another matter to suggest that there's learned Christianity in *Audacht Moraind*. Its editor Fergus Kelly couldn't find any, nor can I, and Ó Corráin doesn't give details of anyone who has done better.

THE QUESTION OF PAGANISM

Finally, nearly two-thirds of the way through, Ó Corráin brings Colmán Mac

Léinín, the outstanding 6th century master poet and saint, into the story of Irish Christianity (needless to say, he should have been considered alongside the other two contemporary 'Colms' (doves), Columcille and Columbanus). Another outstanding 6th century poet and ultimately saint, Dallán Forgaill, is not even mentioned by name. Ó Corráin is wary of the poets, and with reason: give them too much scope and they'll ruin his carefully drawn picture of a clericalised Christian Ireland!

Nonetheless, from this point onwards, the grim ghost of Binchy seems to fade away. Ó Corráin relaxes a bit and, especially when he discusses the great poetic stories, permits himself more complication.

In *Immram Brain* (in which Bran makes a voyage to the Land of Women, where there is no sin or death), "*Christian and pagan themes are mingled with great artistry*" (p. 1398). *Echtrae Chonnlaí* (a similar story of Connla's journey to the Otherworld) is "*a subtle commentary on the relationship between Irish pagan beliefs and Christianity, on mortality and immortality*" (p. 1364). And then there's Eithne, the foster-child of Oengus of the Boyne and the most beautiful god-woman of the Tuatha Dé Danaan, who enquires (in *Altram Tige Dá Meder*) about the possible existence of other gods. She is told by the god Manannán that there is a creator-god more powerful than their own gods. Subsequently she meets St. Patrick and is converted.

"This tale of gods and Tuatha Dé brings paganism... and Christianity... into living contact... This remarkable syncretist tale of conversion draws equally on pagan lore and on the motifs of hagiography" (p. 1303).

I would say that the whole concept of paganism has to be questioned in Irish circumstances. "*Paganism*" is an idea that comes loaded with negativity and often with positive hatred, but the mainstream of Irish Christianity did not have that feeling about the pre-Christian culture.

Modern ideas of paganism, of course, were something else again. Some pagan themes might be stimulating for people who had difficulties with Christianity, but the fact remained that the great ideologies of progress—Hegelian, Marxist, Macaulayan, or whatever—tended to incorporate Christianity in the story of Progress and to see "*pagan survivals*" as backwardness. Ó Corráin, of course, had a horror of precisely that. Which is why he has taken

so much pains to show the academics of the western world how Christian and "un-pagan" the Irish were, and what a very great deal of Latin they managed to write.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LAS CASAS

An interesting question is whether this is a specifically *Fine Gael* way of treating early Ireland. Ó Corráin's shirt was blue. That much is made clear in his Preface to a volume commemorating James Hogan, one of the outstanding intellectuals of the Irish Free State and early Republic. In Hogan's last year as Professor of History at UCC (the last year of his life), Ó Corrain was his undergraduate student. I quote here the most interesting part of his account.

"I had done history elsewhere, but nothing had prepared me for the intellectual roller-coaster that was Hogan's course... We learned much about colonialism and the relationships between European and non-European peoples, and especially the life and works of Bartolomé de Las Casas... (Hogan's) youthful Irish nationalism made him the enemy of colonialism and of the racism that so often accompanies it (and that was Ireland's experience too), and here is the source of his passionate interest in Latin American colonialism; in the great debate at Salamanca between Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda and Bartolomé de las Casas, and in the proclamation of the remarkable Laws of Burgos in 1512, we students knew well where Hogan stood.

... For him, history without values was no history at all—merely a self-evident contradiction, a self-deception. Neither had he any sympathy with the impoverished and epistemologically naive positivism that T.W. Moody and R. Dudley Edwards had acquired at the Institute of Historical Research in London and were seeking to establish in Ireland in the mistaken belief that it was something new (in fact, nearly everybody else knew it was very old and tired)..." (*James Hogan: Revolutionary, Historian and Political Scientist*, ed. Donnchadh Ó Corrain, 2001, pp. ix-x).

On this, one can only comment that Hogan's teaching doesn't seem to have sunk in properly. European colonialism, pioneered and established by official Christians who were mostly real believers, has shaped the modern world and has also poisoned the modern world. Europe's violence towards non-European peoples, sometimes going as far as genocide, and contempt for their cultures, continues to work itself out ominously. From within the high culture of Christian Europe, Bartolomé de Las Casas tried heroically but unsuccessfully to establish another model of contact between Christians and non-Christians. Christianity would

acknowledge and draw out the best in the pre-Christian culture, and there would be a dynamic and essentially peaceful fusion of the two.

What Las Casas hoped for in the non-European lands was what actually had happened in Ireland. It might be a service to thinking people in Europe and beyond, to let them know that. Ó Corráin has done something much less ambitious: he has made early Ireland merely conventionally European, as opposed to what it really was, European and unique.

John Minahane

Editorial Note: John Minahane's series on the polemic of Las Casas with colonialists is ongoing in *Church & State*.

Thoughts on the viewing of the Casement Diaries in 1916

In his article *Précis of a Proof* (*Irish Political Review* December 2016) Paul Hyde makes the interesting claim that the actual bound volumes we know today as the *Casement Diaries* or the *Black Diaries* were not shown to anybody outside of government service prior to Casement's execution. He supports this by way of an absence of archival references to such a showing. It is a striking point which predisposes the reader to ask himself/herself fundamental questions.

The idea that the bound volumes were not displayed is nothing new as such.

"On the advice of Sir Earnley Blackwell (the legal adviser to the Home Office) officially typed copies and photostatic extracts were circulated behind the scenes of the trial, through London clubs, among Members of Parliament and others, who might be thought to influence public opinion." (*The Accusing Ghost or Justice for Casement*, p. 11, 1957, Alfred Noyes).

There is no mention here of an original bound volume being displayed.

PHOTOSTATIC EXTRACTS

Instead there is reference to "typed copies and photostatic extracts". A "photostatic extract" is the equivalent of a modern photocopy of a handwritten original. The copying process a century ago was very much slower. Around two minutes was required for the reproduction of a single page.

Whether the original bound volumes themselves had ever been displayed during the campaign to discredit Casement is a matter that has occasionally been discussed

among those interested in the question of the Diaries. This writer can recall, over a decade ago, an individual who had undertaken a creditable amount of research on the case express the view that the volumes had been displayed to a handful of people. But this view was expressed as an assumption which did not carry the weight of assured conviction.

As mentioned before; *absence of evidence is not evidence of absence*. It is not good practice to base an argument upon a negative. However, we can safely say, given the failure of evidence to appear over the span of a century, that it is likely the bound volumes were not displayed at the period in question.

Such a lacuna is suspicious. Could it be, as Paul Hyde suggests, that the volumes did not exist at this time?

Another explanation is that there was physical evidence on the volumes themselves which marked them out as dubious. Thus they had to be guarded from close scrutiny. Evidence of erasure and interpolation comes to mind. A number of researchers have referred to this. Dr. Herbert O. Mackey, in his 1966 book *The Truth about the Forged Diaries* made a number of references to instances of erasure and over-writing, which he claimed to have perceived on the surface of certain pages. This would explain the volumes being shielded from inspection in 1916.

It is interesting that the National Archives at Kew, London currently provide the Diaries for viewing in the form of monochrome microfilm negatives whereas between 1959 and 1966 Mackey had been allowed to inspect the originals. The authorities at Kew are becoming more rather than less guarded.

A black and white photocopy or its equivalent will not show up the level of detail provided by close scrutiny with the naked eye, especially when accompanied by use of a magnifying glass. Details such as the faint physical indentation left by erased writing on the page can be conveniently hidden.

SECRET TELEGRAM

A secret telegram to the British naval attaché in Washington, Captain Guy Gaunt, of 29th June 1916 said: "Photographic facsimile & transcript of Casement's diary of which you have, no doubt, already heard is being sent to America by today's mail. Person receiving it will communicate with you when it arrives" (Foreign Office Archive - TNA FO 395/43).

The telegram made a distinction between the transcript and the *facsimile*.

The facsimile can only be a photographic reproduction of original diary pages. Anybody who doubts this should explore the meaning of the term *facsimile* by means of a dictionary.

Understood precisely, the telegram implies the transcript and the photographic reproduction corresponded one with the other. The date is important. It was over a month before Casement was executed. So, we can say that here is impressive evidence that the Diaries existed prior to Casement's death.

I also wish to again draw attention to a letter to the *Times Literary Supplement* of 18th April 1936 by Shane Leslie, who was on the staff of the British Embassy at Washington at the relevant time. It stated: *Photographs* (of pages of the Diary) *were sent to the late Ambassador, Sir Cecil Spring Rice, in Washington, and he, in duty bound, showed them to American journalists*". This reinforces the evidence from the June 1916 telegram mentioned above.

QUINN PAPERS

The details from the Quinn Papers held at New York Public Library, referred to both by me and Paul Hyde in his recent letter (*Irish Political Review*, Dec. 2017) bear out that Photostats of what purported to be Casement's handwritten diary were sent to the US and displayed to various persons including Quinn himself.

My statement "*Enough said*" (*Irish Political Review*, 2017 May) was merely to express the view that the archival evidence I had revealed did not require elaboration and spoke for itself. It showed that the *photographic facsimile* referred to a reproduction of handwritten matter as opposed to a typescript as Hyde had alleged.

PHOTOGRAPHS MADE & SHOWN

In his letter of April last Hyde states in relation to UK 1950s official document HO 144/23481 that it implied; "*The same document also confirms that the photographs made & shown were also of typescript materials*" (*Irish Political Review*, April 2017). But, this means that the same materials (i.e. sources or raw material) went into both the typescripts and the photographic reproductions. It does not imply the typescripts were merely photographed.

If that were the case the word *materials* would be redundant in the sentence.

Rather, it implies that the typescripts and photographic images were related to the same original material. The typescripts naturally provided the text. The photographic reproductions provided views of corresponding handwritten pages.

CONFUSION

Just in passing, in relation to Hyde's letter (*Irish Political Review* 1 December 2017), I should mention that the confusion over a letter from Naval Attaché Captain Gaunt can be explained by Gaunt having assigned an incorrect date to his letter alleged to have been sent 22nd August 1916. It was a mistake easily made in the era before digital technology.

A careful reading of my contributions will indicate that I never claimed John Quinn was convinced in August 1916 by the reproductions of handwritten pages he was shown.

Hopefully, the above will go some way towards bringing clarity.

Tim O'Sullivan

Desmond Fennell— *Hamlet without the Prince*

In the last *Irish Political Review* (December 2017), Desmond Fennell outlined, in "*Between two civilisations*", his view of how and why Western Civilisation is dead and argues that we are in a period of transition to a new civilisation as yet to be created and defined. He takes the American atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as the moral turning point for Western civilisation because it has accepted that destruction and has not repented for it. He then traces the further destruction of Western civilisation to the dominant influence of American culture, a trend which accelerated after the Hiroshima / Nagasaki bombing and US dominance of Europe. But this analysis is only half the story.

Where did America and its morality come from? As everybody knows, it was from England. America was and remains essentially a WASP country, whatever the colour, religious beliefs or ethnic origin of its leaders.

An essential part, an integral part of its identity, its act of creation, was the wiping out of the indigenous people of America. That took centuries and the process was fully democratic in that all, except the victims, actually participated in the massacre—coldly and calculatingly carried out over that period. That was how the English colony was created and was simply given a more extensive dimension by American independence. (For the moment, we will ignore the centuries of slavery, its morality, and its origin as the basis for England's industrial development facilitated by the '*Glorious Revolution*').

By comparison, the nuclear obliteration

of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was only a more dramatic version of the same genocidal approach—and one involving a relatively minute number of victims. A few seconds of '*shock and awe*', not centuries of the same thing. That centuries-long massacre has not been repented: it does not occur to any American—and many others—that there is something to repent. By comparison, the Japanese bombing was almost a crime of passion!

Nuclear Bombing Japan was part of the American plan, its *manifest destiny*, of expansion into Asia—copying the English expansion into India, Africa and elsewhere. This bombing is not therefore some great turning point in American and Anglo Saxon morality—it was more of the same, but in more dramatic form. Churchill, and Bertrand Russell—the peacenik—, wanted to attack Russia with atomic bombs at the same time but they had not the technical capacity to build and drop nuclear bombs at the time, and that was all that stopped them doing so. And in these matters of morality is there a qualitative difference between wishes and deeds? Churchill articulated the American case for expansion into Europe with his '*Iron curtain*' speech, a concept borrowed directly from Goebbels.

And how was it that America that wanted no more entanglement with the "*old world*" and its wars, yet got itself participating in the '*old world*' wars, i.e., European wars? It was persuaded by England to do so, to help it 'win' the two world wars it initiated in 1914 and 1939. It was these wars that resulted in the destruction of Europe, quite literally, and what can be called Western Civilisation.

After the Second World War, America filled the vacuum created by this wanton destruction of Europe initiated by England in an exuberant fling of its balance of power strategy towards Europe. If America had not filled the power vacuum in Europe, Russia would have done so because, as we all know, nature abhors a vacuum.

Desmond sees their commonality in being an alternative to European civilisation but who is to blame for this situation? The State that initiated both world wars—England—is the obvious answer but Desmond, while describing quite well the consequences of this destruction, does not explain the real cause. England's role does not enter his vision. It is a blank for him but his way of describing the situation is like *Hamlet* without the Prince. Civilisations do not simply decline of their own accord—they are destroyed.

Ireland was given a front row seat in

that destruction through the career of Roger Casement who pointed out that European civilisation would be destroyed if England 'won' WWI. He was proved right.

Casement pointed it out as it happened—in fact before it happened—he predicted it. That is why he remains the most profound thinker, and actor, regarding WW I and why there was an attempt to

destroy him, *body and soul*, by the people he knew were responsible.

He was one of them for a while. See the forthcoming publication by Athol books, "*England's care for the truth—by one who knows both*" a quotation from Casement himself.

Jack Lane

December Brexit Summary

My coverage of the negotiations in the December *Irish Political Review* concluded on the point that the Government would have been ill advised to follow Alan Shatter's advice by giving way to the British so as to allow the talks to progress to Phase 2. In the event, the Government held to its position that there should be no '*regulatory divergence*' between the two parts of Ireland as a result of Brexit. As the date for a critical meeting between Theresa May and Jean Claude Juncker scheduled for Monday December 4th came close, UK negotiators formulated '*regulatory alignment*' as a position they could live with. This met the approval of the Irish Government and the Barnier Task Force and the scene was set for a historic breakthrough. Then, sometime in the late morning of the Monday, DUP leader Arlene Foster phoned Mrs. May in Brussels to state that her party could not agree to a deal that would place a customs barrier between Northern Ireland and Britain.

It is difficult to disagree with the following verdict on the Government's handling of the matter delivered by Stephen Collins writing in the *Irish Times* of 7th December:

"The way Tánaiste Simon Coveney jumped the gun with a premature radio interview on Monday morning and the subsequent mood music suggesting that the Irish side had got what it wanted, even before Theresa May met Jean Claude Juncker, was tempting fate" (Stephen Collins, IT 7 Dec. '17).

DEAL FINALLY AGREED

Whatever about that, a new formula of words was agreed during the night of 7th/8th December and announced the following morning. In the document arising from the deal Unionist concerns were addressed in the following paragraph:

"The United Kingdom continues to respect and support fully Northern Ireland's position as an integral part of the United Kingdom, consistent with the principle of consent ... The United Kingdom also recalls its commitment to

preserving the integrity of its internal market and Northern Ireland's place within it, as the United Kingdom leaves the European Union's Internal Market and Customs Union."

On the Irish Border the key paragraph reads:

"In the absence of agreed solutions, the United Kingdom will maintain full alignment with those rules of the Internal Market and the Customs Union which, now or in the future, support North-South co-operation, the all-island economy and the protection of the 1998 Agreement."

Apart from the Irish issues, the other important terms of the agreement are described in the following summary:

"EU citizens

- EU citizens in the UK and UK citizens in the rest of the EU have the right to stay. Rights of their children and those of partners in existing 'durable relationships' are also guaranteed.
- UK courts will preside over enforcing rights over EU citizens in Britain but can refer unclear cases to the European court of justice for eight years after withdrawal.

Money

- There is no figure on how much the UK is expected to pay, but the document sets out how the bill will be calculated—expected to be about £50 billion.
- The UK agrees to continue to pay into the EU budget as normal in 2019 and 2020.
- It also agrees to pay its liabilities such as pension contributions."

(*Irish Times*, 8 Dec)

The deal had the merit of being all things to all men and having a text that all the diverse parties—the Irish Government, the Barnier Task Force, the various Tory factions and the DUP—could sign up to. However it contained no proposals as to how the Border is to be kept invisible. In any case the atmosphere of harmony created by the deal lasted all of two days. Brexit Secretary David Davis stated on the *Andrew Marr Show* on BBC television on the Sunday after the deal was agreed

that it was "*more a statement of intent than it was a legally enforceable thing*". This statement which undoubtedly reflected the actual strategy of the British Government—get to Phase 2 where a trade deal can be negotiated and use the divorce payment and the other previously agreed matters as bargaining chips—nonetheless constituted a blunder on the British side.

RESPONSE TO DAVIS INTERVIEW

Davis attempted to minimise the damage that his remarks had created by stating on LBC radio the following day that his words had been "*misinterpreted and twisted*", but it was too late. His *faux pas* was reported as causing consternation in Dublin and anger in Brussels. On the Tuesday (12 Dec) Davis's original claim was said by European Parliament Brexit Coordinator Guy Verhofstadt to have damaged trust and caused a hardening of the EU position. Michel Barnier addressing the European Parliament on the Wednesday stated:

"We will not accept any going back on this joint report. This progress has been agreed and will be rapidly translated into a withdrawal accord that is legally binding in all three areas and on some others that remain to be negotiated."

Davis stated in response that that deal should be swiftly translated into a legal accord. At a meeting of the General Affairs Council, the Foreign Ministers of the member states, in advance of the Summit of 14 and 15 December, Simon Coveney's view that there could be no backsliding by the UK was unanimously supported.

On the Friday (15 December) the European Council formally agreed that the process can move to the second phase. The negotiating guidelines for the second phase that were also agreed, state that the negotiations will continue, "*as long as all commitments undertaken in the first phase are respected in full and translated faithfully into legal terms*".

DEVELOPMENTS AT WESTMINSTER

Two developments have occurred regarding the passage of the *EU Withdrawal Bill* through Westminster. The Government was defeated on the question of whether Parliament will be able to vote on the final withdrawal agreement. This means that a separate Statute will be debated and possibly amended at Westminster when a withdrawal agreement is concluded with Brussels. The second development is that a compromise amendment regarding the date of Brexit has been agreed. The amendment allows for the date to be written into the Bill while "*exit day*" can be changed with the approval of Parliament.

Both amendments testify to the weak position of the May Government.

Three changes in personnel have been implemented in the UK Government. Michael Fallon resigned as a result of sexual harassment issues and was replaced by the relatively inexperienced Gavin Williamson, a close advisor of Mrs May. Priti Patel was forced to resign for failing to fully report dealings she had with the Israeli Government. She was replaced by Penny Mordaunt, like Ms Patel a pro-Brexit MP. At the time of writing it is unclear who will replace Damien Green who also resigned because of sexual harassment accusations. Green is described as having been a close ally of Prime Minister May. The pattern of the changes is that they maintain the balance inside the Cabinet between hard and soft Brexiteers but the loss of Damien Green may further weaken the UK Government.

ENGLISH CRITICISM OF IRISH INTERFERENCE

During the high drama of the December developments there were many commentaries, some of them interesting. Two *Irish Times* articles from English commentators touching on the same aspect of the Anglo-Irish relationship are worth noting. The first was by Paul Goodman, editor of *Conservative Home*, the second by Brendan O'Neill editor of the Left libertarian publication, *Spiked*. Goodman lamented the deterioration in the Anglo-Irish relationship and admitted a failure of interest in Irish affairs on the British side. But he also accused the Irish side of a failure of imagination which he described as follows:

"I suspect that a significant slice of opinion in Ireland doesn't really believe that Britain will actually leave at all. May's government is weak. There is a lively pro-Remain media in Britain, which is well read in Ireland. Britain wants a transition in any event. Put the three together, and it is easy to convince oneself that Brexit won't happen. If Ireland pushes hard enough at this moment of maximum vantage, some might think, perhaps Britain will at least give up on leaving the customs union" (*Irish Times*, 2 Dec).

Goodman's case was that both major British parties supported Brexit, that if the talks were blocked from moving to Phase 2, the Tories will opt for the No Deal option, and in those circumstances Brexit would lead to an extremely hard Border and a disastrous outcome for Irish trade.

Brendan O'Neill's is a voice from a very different quarter of British political life. The opening of his article runs:

"I spent much of my youth asking the

British government to butt out of Irish affairs. 'Hands off Ireland!', the placards said on our long, lonely marches round Westminster.

Now I find myself in the weird position of pleading with Ireland to stop meddling in British affairs.

'Hands off Brexit!', I want to say to the Dublin political set that has let itself be used as leverage by the EU in its war against the British vote for Leave." (*Irish Times*, 8 Dec).

In a previous article I described a tendency in the Irish political class to interfere in the internal British debate on Brexit as "*fishing in troubled waters*". Clearly British observers can spot that game a mile away and they don't like it. Irish Anglophiles who feel betrayed by the Brexiteers and who are using their influence to thwart Brexit any way they can, pose a threat to the possibility of a healthy relationship between Ireland and Britain based on the mutual respect of neighbouring sovereign States.

MATTER FOR A HISTORICAL SYMPOSIUM

An important side story of the final Brussels deal was that Taoiseach Leo Varadkar chose to directly address Northern nationalists in a speech he made on Friday December 8th. He said, "*No Irish Government will ever again leave Northern nationalists and Northern Ireland behind*". It was decidedly strange, given the anti-nationalist narrative that has prevailed in the South over recent decades, to hear a Taoiseach, the leader of a contemporary Dublin Government, speak in such terms. In response, a letter was published in the *Irish News* on December 11th signed by nearly 200 influential figures in the Northern nationalist community representing a wide range of sectors including the arts, business, education, health, law, media, sport and academia. The full letter is reproduced below as it is not readily available on line:

"OPEN LETTER TO TAOISEACH LEO VARADKAR

A Thaoisigh, a chara,

We are writing this letter to you as Irish citizens living in the north of Ireland to express our frustration and growing concern over the deepening nature of the ongoing political crises in the north.

We are committed to human rights and cherish our Irish cultural traditions and our Irish national identity, as do hundreds of thousands of others living in this part of our country.

We value equality for all citizens yet continue to be denied rights afforded to all others living on these islands.

We fully endorse the recent call from human rights groups and others on this island for no regression on rights and

equality and respect for the principle of equivalence.

In 1998 the overwhelming population of the country voted in favour of the Good Friday Agreement.

In recent years we have observed a concerted undermining of the political institutions established under the Good Friday Agreement and a laissez-faire approach being adopted by the two governments as co-guarantors of the Good Friday Agreement.

We believe that the current crisis has come about fundamentally due to a failure to both implement & defend the Good Friday and St Andrew's Agreements.

The result has been a denial and refusal of equality, rights and respect towards the section of the community to which we belong, as well as everyone living here.

The impending reality of Brexit now threatens to reinforce partition on this island and revisit a sense of abandonment as experienced by our parents and grandparents.

The fact that a majority of voters in the north of Ireland voted to remain within the EU must not be ignored.

Against the stated will of a majority of voters in the north, and notwithstanding recent announcements, Brexit pushes us all into uncharted territory, with huge uncertainty for business and the economy, and continuing doubts about what this will mean in reality for Irish and European citizens living in this region.

We, our children and grandchildren should not be forced out of the EU against our democratic will.

All of this is offensive and unacceptable to us and many others.

Despite the British government's equal and internationally binding responsibility for overseeing the Peace Process with the Irish government, we have no confidence in its commitment to do so with impartiality or objectivity.

This is most recently instanced in the British Government's refusal to move on legacy inquest rights. The Conservative Party's political pact with the DUP has now become a grave threat to political progress.

We appeal urgently to you taoiseach, and to the Irish government, to reassure us of your commitment to stand for equality and a human rights based society and your determination to secure and protect the rights of all citizens in the north of Ireland."

Varadkar's response was somewhat underwhelming. A spokesman for the Taoiseach stated that Varadkar "*hopes to soon see the restoration of the Northern Ireland Executive and the North South Ministerial Council, as the institutions will be a vital voice as we move forward into phase two of the Brexit talks*". The spokesman emphasised the importance of the Good Friday Agreement and quoted

an extract from the original speech as follows:

"I want to assure you that we have protected your interests throughout these negotiations. Your birth right as Irish citizens, and therefore as EU citizens, will be protected. There will be no hard border on our island."

The organisation of the letter reflected a major effort on the part of those who signed it. At the least the exchange with the Taoiseach underlined the need for Dublin to be more proactive regarding the North. But the story didn't end there. It was brought to the floor of the Dail when Fianna Fail Leader Micheal Martin informed Varadkar that he found the reference to Irish Governments leaving Northern nationalists behind in the past "*offensive*". A report stated:

"The Fianna Fáil leader said he did not believe anyone could look at the enormous political commitment different Irish governments had made to Northern Ireland from the Anglo-Irish Agreement to the Belfast Agreement and say that they were leaving anybody behind" (IT, 12 Dec).

Varadkar replied to the effect that it was a misunderstanding, that he had been making a historical point referring to the fact that Ireland was forced to accept partition in the 1920s. As the Fianna Fail Leader continued to accuse his opposite number of partisanship, the Taoiseach replied that the subject was "*matter for a historical symposium*". The entire Dail exchange provided another indication of how Brexit is having a disconcerting effect on the revisionist mindset in Dublin. While Leo Varadkar is at least attempting to grapple with the challenge of Brexit, Micheal Martin is emerging as the arch-defender of pre-Brexit revisionist thinking.

In conclusion, much has happened during December under the Brexit heading, so much that it is not easy to summarise. At the end of a hectic month it must be conceded that the uncertainty is as great as ever; the possibility of a *No Deal* collapse remains, and the aspirations of the two negotiating sides seem as incompatible as ever.

What can be said is that the Barnier Task Force continues to have the upper hand but that could change if the will emanating from the EU-27 should weaken. From an Irish perspective the Government position of reiterating that there can be no hard Border seems like promising a definite outcome from an uncertain process.

Dave Alvey

Book Reviews: *The Belfast Jacobin Samuel Neilson And The United Irishmen* by **Kenneth L. Dawson** (Irish Academic Press, Paperback €22.99 pbk)

Sunningdale: The Search For Peace In Northern Ireland by **Noel Dorr** (Royal Irish Academy, €30)

Samuel Neilson: Rebel And Unionist

The 1790s Belfast newspaper, *The Northern Star*, was the life-work of Samuel Neilson. I read it in Belfast during the 1970s and it was through reading it that I got my bearings on the United Irish movement. If Kenneth Dawson's book had been published then, I would have found it very useful indeed.

It would have told me who was who and what was what. But nothing like that existed then, so I had to get my bearings from within, reading the paper day by day—or twice weekly, its publication dates—for news and opinion, as one read a contemporary newspaper in the days before wireless and the Internet, and letting a picture of its world build up in your head.

I imagine that this way of acquiring knowledge is basically different from a process of study, in which one is taught, or from academic research, in which one finds what one is told to look for. I am not certain, because I have never studied and have never engaged in academic research, but I do know that in Professor Fitzpatrick's world one found what he told you to look for . . . or else!

But I do not, in retrospect, regret not having had a guide to Neilson's world. Through reading the *Northern Star* as a newspaper, and also the *Belfast News Letter*, which began as its companion and became its enemy, I know what Belfast was in that generation.

And I also know something about the French Revolution, because Belfast lived every phase of that Revolution almost as if it was a town in France. When I published a book on the bicentenary of the French

Revolution, it consisted largely of extracts from the *Northern Star*.

Neilson's generation in Belfast should be described as bourgeois rather than middle class. It did not hold a middle position in a class hierarchy between an aristocracy and the mass of the people. There was an aristocrat, Chichester. The nominal borough of Belfast was created for his family in the 17th century so that it might send two members to an aristocratic Irish Parliament. The Parliament was not only aristocratic but was also Protestant. And it was not only Protestant, but belonged to the State Protestantism, the Church of England.

The Borough of Belfast was not the municipal institution of the town of Belfast. There was no town of Belfast at the time and, when a town developed, it did not get official municipal status until the 19th century.

Dawson's book is not very much about the *Star*. It is after all a biography of the man, and the man was a revolutionary conspirator as well as a publisher. And yet Neilson was nowhere near as successful a military conspirator as he was a publisher.

The military conspiracy failed. It was heavily shredded by the time the moment for action arrived—and in that moment it can hardly be said that it really tried to act.

It was shredded by spies. Spies are thick on the pages of Dawson's book. It would have been useful if he had listed them in an Appendix with a note on the circumstances of each.

Why were there so many spies? And

Report

Linking Ireland To Europe after Brexit

A European Investment Bank official has called for increased infrastructure spending to counter the effect of Brexit.

Ireland must urgently invest in capital infrastructure to deal with changes to trade flows after Brexit or there will be "*unavoidable long-term consequences*" for growth, said Andrew McDowell, the Vice-President of the European Investment Bank and a former senior economic adviser to Taoiseach Enda Kenny. He told a conference

on investing in the future of Europe on 29th November that the "*big risk*" in relation to Brexit was that it would "*change Ireland's trade routes*", adding—"*New ports and airports and other infrastructure connections will be needed to accommodate this...*" (IT 30.11.17).

Meanwhile Breandan Keating, the Chief Executive of the Port of Cork, has said that the port is seeking to develop a relationship with Northern Spanish and Western French ports to offset loss of the British route to the Continent. However, no firm plans could be made until the nature of the British Border with Europe became clearer (see *Eve. Echo* 4.12.17).

why did some of them become spies after being authentic, and others try to become authentic after being spies?

I assumed that the reason there were so many spies was of a kind with the reason that the conspiracy that was kept going until 1798 then went off at half-cock.

The Government criminalised a very widespread Reform movement in 1793. There was a stubborn streak in the spiritual (Biblicalist) make-up of the Reformers which led them to pursue what they considered a good and necessary end by conspiracy. But the Government was no less stubborn and it manoeuvred them into a corner in which, if they acted, it would not be for what they had sought.

Dawson makes only passing mention of Wexford, and the word Scullabogue does not appear in his Index.

Back around 1970, when I tried to figure out the United Irish North from history books, the Scullabogue incident in Wexford was treated as the reason for the half-hearted character of the rebellion in the North. Scullabogue showed what Papists were made of and the Ulstermen backed away. I knew so little that this made sense to me, and I believe I put it in some pamphlet at the time. But, after I had read the *Northern Star*, it seemed obvious to me that the reason the United Irish movement in Antrim and Down did little more than token rebellion in 1798 was that what it had committed itself to in the early 1790s was not something that could possibly have been achieved by rebellion against the Crown in 1798.

What it wanted was the British Constitution to be made functional in Ireland. It wanted representative government under the Crown. It sought this through a reform of the Irish Parliament. It was not nationalist in any other sense than that it wanted the Protestant Colonial Parliament, set up in the early 1690s, on the basis of the Williamite Conquest, to broaden its base by a franchise reform, and to begin to establish hegemony over the native Irish majority instead of just dominating it by military power.

In effect, it wanted the aristocracy of the Williamite Colony to develop Ireland into a British nation under the Crown by gradually incorporating the broken Irish society into the Colonial body politic.

That was Grattan's purpose after he led the Irish Parliament to assert its independence of the British Parliament in 1782, availing of the opportunity presented by Britain's difficulties in America. Grattan failed to persuade the Parliament from the

inside. Ten years later the United Irish movement exerted popular pressure on the Parliament from the outside—for the same purpose.

The Irish Parliament was an institution of the Anglican aristocracy in Ireland. It was "Patriotic" in the sense that it protested against subordination to the English Parliament which, guided by English commercial interest, curbed economic developments in the Irish colony that conflicted with English business interests.

In 1782 the Colonial Irish Volunteers, organised for defence against the French allies of the rebellious Americans, backed the assertion of independence by the Colonial Parliament in Dublin. Britain did not see its way to disputing the issue. And so "Ireland" became independent. But the Parliament held firm against Volunteer pressure for internal reform, and the Volunteers backed down. In Belfast, however, Volunteering activity was kept up and the United Irish movement developed out of it in the early 1790s.

In 1793 the popular reform movement was made illegal by the Irish Parliament and the Irish, the Catholics, were admitted to the Parliamentary franchise (but continued to be banned from sitting as representatives).

The Catholic reform was enacted under pressure from the English Government—and it was of no effect for lack of an Irish election.

The Irish Parliament was an independent Legislature, but the Irish Government was not a Government drawn from the Irish Legislature and responsible to it. The Irish Government was the English Government. The independent Irish Legislature chose not to conduct its own Government. It legislated for a country which it did not govern. And, looking at it from the other side, England had to govern a country for which it could not legislate. This was an absurd division of the powers of State. And it was "the connection with England" which Wolfe Tone declared to be the source of Ireland's ills.

Was Ireland a State from 1782 to 1800, or was it not a State?

From 1692 until 1780 the position was clear. Ireland was a conquered country under the British State, and within it, administered by a colonial regime with limited powers of legislature conferred on it by Westminster, but always subject to Westminster veto. Its Parliament legislated by permission.

In 1782 the Irish Parliament became an independent Legislature, and to that extent it took on the character of a State. But it

chose not to conduct its own Government, but to be governed by the British Government, and to that extent it was not a State. The reason why it chose this arrangement is obvious. It was determined to refuse to establish any representative connection between the great mass of the population of the country and itself. It was to continue to legislate as a Protestant Ascendancy—an Anglican Ascendancy—and it was prudent to maintain English Executive power as a shield against the populace.

The dynamic of representative government, with its inducements to opportunist accommodation in pursuit of power, could not operate in such circumstances.

The Colony, during its 18 years as the independent Protestant Irish nation, behaved with the recklessness that its lack of governmental responsibility made possible. The Government saved it in the Summer of 1798, and in the Autumn set about abolishing it.

There was some communication between the Government and United Irish leaders before the Union Bill was published. There was an outcry from the Parliamentarians of the Ascendancy that the Government, a moment after defeating the United Irish rebellion, had adopted its programme. And that was true enough. The British Constitution was to be established in Ireland.

Neilson, in prison, welcomed the Bill.

Neilson in prison had some communication with the notorious Lord Castlereagh. He and Castlereagh had a common source. Castlereagh, as Stewart, had been an Ulster reformer in the early 1790s. The Stewarts became Anglicans and could sit in Parliament and Castlereagh had been the popular candidate in the Down Election in 179, supported by Belfast, which had no election of its own. The Stewarts became Londonderry, aristocratic in the British interest. Young Stewart, called Castlereagh, proved to be a talented politician and was found very useful by Prime Minister Pitt, who himself underwent a natural evolution from reforming Whig to Tory Conservative.

Castlereagh saw that the Ascendancy Parliament was at best a futile affair. When advocating the Union Bill, he told it that its independent Ireland was only a Province of Britain and could never be anything more. It was an accurate summing-up of the situation, seeing that the Ireland that could be something more was not yet in business, and the possibility of it was not yet even suspected—though it asserted its existence quickly, once the stifling influ-

ence of the Irish Parliament was removed.

After 1801 the Irish in Ireland asserted themselves in the form of Cox's Magazine, the great Veto Dispute, and O'Connell's transformation under these influences from an English utilitarian into a nationalist of the actual Irish. The Ulster Plantation, having evolved into a coherent bourgeois society that was taking off into industrial capitalism, quickly felt at home under the Union, as it had never felt at home under the Anglican Irish Parliament. And the Anglican colony, that won its independence in the moment of England's difficulty but refused to become the first national state in the Empire, began its slow, bitter process of withering under the growing pressure of the populace with which it refused to make an accommodation, and slowly returned home.

That is the empiricism of the matter. It is how I experienced developments in Ireland from 1781 to 1831 when following through what happened in each of the major social components in the country during that half-century. The experience—or those experiences—does not accord with an intellectual scheme of history constructed very much later, with little regard for what was actually going on in Protestant Ulster, or Catholic Ireland, or among Anglicans, and then rolled backwards over those developments, concealing them from consideration in the present, but not removing them as determinants of action in the present.

In 1970 there was considerable discussion in Belfast about the *Transformation Problem*—ie, the transformation of the high-minded Presbyterian United Irish nationalists into reactionary Unionists—with Unionism being conceived as something akin to Fascism. It was a hopeless problem without a solution, because it was not an actual problem.

What the Presbyterians found in the Union was what the Irish Parliament had denied them: the British Constitution.

The incorporation of the Irish Parliament into the British had been sought long before the 1790s, and had been refused. When it was offered, it was welcomed. William Drennan, a theorist of the movement, who had moved to Dublin and had not laboured in the heat of the day, came closest to being an Irish nationalist, but when he returned to Belfast after the Union and published the *Belfast Magazine* he could only be a Unionist. And his protegee, F.D. Finlay, who in the 1820s launched the *Northern Whig* newspaper—that lasted for over a hundred

years—took it for granted that the Union was the framework of political action.

The *Northern Whig* supported Catholic Emancipation. But when O'Connell tried to switch the movement from Emancipation to Repeal of the Union, the *Whig* refused to follow. When O'Connell pressed the matter there was a bitter dispute between him and the Ulster reformers. If a date of origin is sought for Partition, other than the Government Of Ireland Bill, it is O'Connell's rupture with the Belfast radicals in 1831.

(About Scullabogue: I never took any interest in it. I could not see any incident that happened in the chaos of the Wexford rebellion, provoked by the Orange Militia as an arm of the Irish Parliament, as being of any historical significance.

On the other side, O'Connell criticised the Northern United Irish for leading the Catholics up the garden path, encouraging them to rebel only to abandon them. I could see grounds for that accusation. And I found, in some discussions around the launching of a Thomas Ledlie Birch pamphlet in Saintfield Library about ten years ago, that that view of the matter had not disappeared.

I took the reality to be that there were two substantial societies of very different kinds, which felt their way towards a tactical alliance in the early 1790s. But their association could only be marginal. And what the Presbyterians settled for was not open to the Catholics to settle for.

The French Revolution was also a source of misunderstanding. The Presbyterians, immersed in it, took it that with the Civil Constitution of the Clergy it had subverted the Catholic Church. But the Catholics could find inspiration in events in France without becoming Protestant to the slightest extent.

Walter Cox demonstrated only a few years later that it was possible to be a Jacobin Jacobite.)

*

The Act of Union destroyed the State apparatus of the Protestant Ascendancy less than 20 years after it had declared its independence of the British Parliament, and opened the way for the development of the other social forces on the island. The Irish Parliament abolished itself after a two year struggle with the Government, the British Government. During those two years dozens of Ascendancy pamphlets were published in Dublin, fiercely condemning the Union proposal, predicting that it would lead to an independence movement of the natives, and even threat-

ening rebellion against it in defence of civilisation. I have never seen that very vigorous pamphlet literature, defending the aristocratic Protestant Irish state, referred to in any of the great multitudes of histories published since 1970. And I have come across what I took to be signs of very rough treatment meted out to Protestant gentry during the years after the Union in order to encourage them to forget that they had lost their very own Irish Protestant state, and oblige them to be unconditionally loyal in future to the British Protestant state which had taken their state from them.

Another serious event following the Union that has been dropped from recorded history is the great dispute amongst Catholics on the appointment of Bishops, the Veto Controversy. The Hierarchy made an agreement with the Government giving it a veto on the appointment to Bishoprics of priests whom it considered disloyal. Walter Cox, with his *Irish Magazine*, led off a great Dublin middle class campaign against the Veto, which rumbled on for many years, and obliged the Hierarchy to disown the Agreement, resulting with unconditional Emancipation twenty years later.

Contemporary historians know how to deal with awkward historical facts. They ignore them. They also ignore the currently relevant fact that, when Westminster Partitioned the country in 1921, it insisted that the part remaining within the UK state should be excluded from the democratic political life of the state. What the Ulster Presbyterian community gained from United Irish activity in 1801 was whisked away from it in the imposition of devolution in 1921. A case could be made that it was thrown back into something like its pre-Union position.

1992. €6, £5

A Diplomat's Take On The North!

The subject of Noel Dorr's book is Unionist Ulster half a century after it had been perverted into Northern Ireland by the UK Parliament, and nationalist Ireland had formed a state in the 26 Counties which asserted a right of national sovereignty over the Six Counties.

I proposed in 1969, immediately after the August events, that the Southern state should recognise the Ulster Unionist community as a distinct national community that had evolved from the Ulster Plantation

and try to establish civil relations with it on that basis. The Ulster Unionists were still a considerable majority of the population of the North then, and there was no realistic prospect of enough of them being won to the Anti-Partitionist policy for the achieving of unity by consent. Unification by force was out of the question for lack of the required force, and it was beginning to be muttered that unification by conquest would be wrong as well as being impossible.

It did not seem sensible to me to keep up a continuous propaganda which nursed a grudge against the Ulster Unionists for not being Irish in the way that we were, while having no remedy to propose other than that they should admit that they were wrong. And also I could see that they were made of very durable stuff that would only become more durable if put under severe pressure.

The Taoiseach, Jack Lynch, rejected my 'two nations' proposal at a Fianna Fail *Ard Fheis* within weeks of it being made.

North/South *rapprochement* on the basis of the recognition of social realities was ruled off the agenda as national treason.

War was declared on Britain in the Summer of 1970 by the new IRA that was forged from the Loyalist pogrom of August 1969. That too was condemned by Dublin.

During the Winter of 1969/70 I observed the most unlikely people in Belfast becoming Provos—people who only a few months earlier had been assuring me that Anti-Partitionism was an obsolete sentiment which had no place in the modern world.

And I could see that it was not Partition that drove them to become soldiers in the new Army. It was the humiliating system of Northern Ireland sub-government which was excluded from the democratic life of the British state.

So I focussed on the indisputable fact that the Six Counties, when conjured into Northern Ireland in 1921, were made into an undemocratically-governed region of the British state. A political campaign was launched with the purpose of getting the Six Counties back into the democratic system of the state. It was very effectively conducted by David Morrison and it soon had Dublin lobbying Whitehall against it. And Cornelius O'Leary of Cork (joint author of a number of books with Patrick Maume of Cork), who was for a while the Politics Professor in Queen's Belfast, had a furious letter in the London *Times* against this monster, Morrison, who had emerged

from "*the wilder shores of Unionism*".

Provocatively undemocratic government in the North fed the War. Dublin condemned the War but it greatly preferred that undemocratic system of Northern government to any bringing of the very effective British system of democratic party politics to bear on the Catholic/Protestant conflict in the North.

I can only suppose that the reckoning was that the undemocratic system in the North aggravated Catholic/Protestant relations and prevented the region from settling down as part of the British politics. (T.K. Whitaker was a fundamentalist Anti-Partitionist, though he has somehow acquired the reputation of being something quite different. He was Lynch's adviser at the time, and one of his concerns was that the Northern Catholics might come to realise that the Catholics were much better off in the British welfare state (which was established in the North, even though the politics that created it were excluded) than they would be in a United Ireland. He need not have worried. The Catholics in the North knew very well what the score was in that respect. They were driven to war by the Northern political system, not by the illusions of a Southern Utopia.

Cause and purpose are not the same thing. Sometimes the cause of action is a purpose but that is not necessarily so. And, in the North, the cause was not expressed in the purpose the action set itself. People became Republicans wholesale in 1969-70 because of the drastic action of the Northern Ireland system on them in August. They would not have the Northern Ireland system any longer. But the aim they set themselves was a United Ireland. Even John Hume said, after the Derry massacre, that it was now *United Ireland or nothing*. Public thought on all sides confined the options to the semi-detached Ulster Unionism of Northern Ireland or a United Ireland. Dublin did it. London did it. "*Constitutional nationalism*" in the North did it.

Constitutional nationalism was futile in the undemocratic Northern Ireland variant of British democracy. That appeared pretty obvious from inside Northern Ireland.

A couple of British politicians saw it. James Callaghan, the Labour Home Secretary, was one of them. It seemed to me that it suddenly struck him on a visit to Derry what the source of the trouble was and he blurted it out. Modern Democracy is a system of party politics, connected

with government of the state, which elicits the consent of the populace to the actions of the State. These parties do not only reflect opinion in the populace, gather it up in bundles, and direct it on the practicalities of government, they also influence very largely the formation of the opinions which they represent.

Functional democracy does not reflect much on itself. It just ticks over. British democracy is highly functional. But its literary middle class was jolted into thought last year when the American populace bypassed the party system and elected a maverick President of the World, bringing raw, unprocessed opinion from the street into the White House. As a consequence, English liberal opinion is now acutely aware of itself as an elite, and sees democracy as a system of elites.

Callaghan saw that the reason he had to make an emergency trip to Northern Ireland was that the region had been excluded for generations from the essential democratic institutions that made Britain (i.e., the "*mainland*") what it was. He then made a weak gesture towards remedying the situation, but did not persist in the face of Labour Party hostility. And I'm sure that what is now called "*the deep state*" also had a word with him and let him understand that the State had a purpose for turning a region of itself into such a strange thing as Northern Ireland, and that the reason had not gone away. As far as Whitehall was concerned it was there to stay. Whatever was to be done could only be done within its context. And the fact that it was clearly an undemocratic enclave of the British state would be unmentionable everywhere the influence of the State could reach. And Leinster House was bipartisan with Whitehall in this matter—with the difference that it hoped that Whitehall, at some moment in the indefinite future, would push the North into its arms and bribe it for the favour of accepting it.

Noel Dorr was a very senior Free State diplomat—excuse the use of Northern Catholic terminology. He was around the corridors of power when the "*Troubles*" erupted in the North in 1969, and seems to have been in the inner circle of the administration when Lynch made his inflammatory Anti-Partition speech in August 1969 and revoked it the following May by scapegoating a couple of his Ministers, an Army Officer acting on his instructions, and his Liaison with the Northern nationalist community. And he seems to have played a part in Coalition discussion of what to do about the Sunning-

dale system of Power-Sharing when it was falling apart in May 1974 because of the duplicity that was written into the Agreement.

It is not the business of a diplomat to blurt out the factual truth about things—only exceptionally skilful diplomats who also command political power could achieve anything by that method. I have often wondered whether plain factual truth can have any actual presence in the medium of professional diplomatic thought. In any case it is not the business of a diplomat to tell it.

But how does a diplomat cope with facts when he becomes a historian? Dorr circles around them cautiously, bringing to mind the image of the cat and the bowl of hot porridge..

In order to think coherently about the North, it is necessary to have some definite idea of what the social groups are that are locked in conflict within it, and what the political structure is into which they are locked.

Regarding the first:

"In Ireland, over time, two different senses of what I would call 'community identity', offering two opposed agendas for the future, crystallised out of the centuries-long interaction between the two islands...

"What do I mean by 'community identity'? Something more than religious difference—though religion can play a part, and did in Ireland. The broader concept I have in mind is not easy to define. I am talking about the sense of relationship and community that develops among a particular population: a sense of continuity over time; a sense that they have a common history" (11).

Is this not a way of saying "*two nations*" if one feels that one must not use the term "*nations*"?

There are two durable Somethings in the North which have persisted over time and have never shown any inclination to become one. Attempts to fuse them activate their mutual repulsion. That is the central reality which Dorr tiptoes around throughout the book, never asserting it clearly, but never denying it, and always assuming it.

But the passage I have quoted continues:

"a sense that they have a common history. Or, perhaps, it would be more correct to say that they have a shared narrative about the past, passed on from generation to generation.

"Narrative, in the sense in which I use it here, is very different from the more objective balanced account we are entitled

to hope for from the historian. The kind of narrative I have in mind is necessarily selective. It is the story a community tells itself about its past, an account of the griefs, the trials and the triumphs that shaped it and gave it a sense of a common identity. For them it is simply 'our history'—but it is actually the result of a selective weaving together of aspects and events of the past which are seen as having helped to constitute the community and which, as such, the community has chosen to remember. It is epitomised in the easy, unselfconscious use of 'we': the first person plural..."

Does Dorr mean that there is a true narrative that is told by historians (or should be) and a false narrative which people tell themselves in constituting themselves as a community?

But, if it is the false narrative that constitutes actual communities, and actual communities are the essential subject of history, where do historians get the true narrative from?

And, assuming that there is a true narrative that is not constitutive of durable communities, and that it can be got, what is the use of it to actual communities who have constituted themselves as what they are by means of narratives which historians (some of them) hold to be false? On the whole, people live by what they think they are. They do not refer to a delusion when they say "*we*". Or, if one holds that they do, that means that delusion is what is functional in the human world.

Unalterable things in nature, fixed from time immemorial, are not the subject of history. History deals with human nature, which is by nature uncertain. Man is born free, as Rousseau said. Left strictly to himself from birth he will, if he survives, not become human at all. The cuckoo who has never seen another cuckoo grows to be a cuckoo all on his own. Humans, however they came about, are entirely social beings. Their being lies in thought, and even the most thoughtless think all the time.

Language is the medium of human thought and nobody has ever been born with a language. Languages were invented, God knows how. The individual has to pick up a language in childhood or never be able to speak properly. And that is barely the start of it.

People make themselves up in groups. They invent themselves. They tell themselves what they are. That is the mode of human existence.

In the North there are two bodies of such people. They present themselves as Ulster Unionists and Irish Nationalists. They know what they are because what they think they are is what they are.

I have seen historians try to change them by criticising their "*narrative*". But I have never seen a criticism that was not about some trivial detail, or did not expose a mistake in the critic's own "*narrative*".

Dorr says that "*it is difficult to give an account of what happened at any one point in Irish history without starting just a bit further back to explain how things came to be as they are*". The subject in hand is the Northern War, evasively referred to as the *Troubles*. I can see no reason to go back beyond 1919 for the cause of the War. The Ulster Unionists were set up in power over the Irish Nationalist community in a political arrangement that seemed so perfectly designed to aggravate the pre-existing antagonism between them, while depriving it of any means of resolution, that it is hard to imagine that that was not its purpose. I am quite certain that the statesmen who made that political arrangement knew that its effect could not be "*good government*". But I assume that they did not engage in this mischief-making just for the hell of it, and that their purpose in imposing *Northern Ireland* on the Six Counties, instead of retaining them within the British political system, had to do with their handling of Ireland as a whole.

Dorr remarks on "*the utter unsuitability of the 'Westminster model' for devolved government in the North*" (p376). But he does not remark on the unsuitability of "*the North*" for devolved government of any kind. No other region of the British state had it. And no other region of the UK state was so unsuited to having it. No other region had the kind of social division within it that was the most prominent thing about the Six Counties.

There was no Six County demand for devolved government. When the scheme was introduced in the 1920 Bill, the Unionist leader opposed it, saying that the Protestant community had no wish to govern Catholics. And the Catholic community did not wish to be governed by the Orange Order.

The two communities were at war with each other, not directly but as components of the Irish War of Independence, when the devolved system was imposed on them, and was not given to any other region of the state where it would have been harmless. The Ulster Unionists then had to

govern the Nationalist community, whether they liked it or not, as a condition of retaining "the British connection".

Following Collins's invasion of the North by the Free State, there was draconian suppression of the Nationalist elements in the Six Counties, which he had encouraged into open rebellion, by the forces both of the British State and of its devolved regime. Then, for half a century, what existed was suppressed warfare masquerading as Constitutional politics. The only issue in every election was whether the Six Counties should leave the UK and join the Free State. (One could say that every election was a Brexit Election!)

The outcome of every election was certain because the contention was not between political parties but between stable communities.

There was no political ground on which a party system relevant to the governing of a state might develop because Northern Ireland—whatever Southern and other Professors of recent times might say—was never a state. All affairs of state, including the welfare state, were dealt with by Westminster and came as a gift to the North from the outer space of the "mainland". All that there was to do within the Northern system was continue by other means the Treatyite invasion of 1922. But that could not continue indefinitely. War was resumed in 1970.

Devolution became general within the UK in the 1990s. Scottish and Welsh systems were established. The political parties that govern the UK state withdrew from the Six Counties after establishing devolved government there. They did not withdraw from Scotland and Wales but redoubled their activity in them. Did Noel Dorr not notice this?

The Northern Ireland system was left to function in accordance with its inherent logic until it went wild in 1969. It limped along formally until it was suspended in 1972. It was restored with alterations in 1974 in accordance with a 1973 Agreement known as *Sunningdale*. A semblance of elected devolved government was established. There was to be a power-sharing system monitored by a British Cabinet Minister in place of the free-standing majority-rule system: and the Council of Ireland provided for by the 1920 Act, which the Ulster Unionists refused to take part in then, was to be established.

The Unionist Party had split when Britain in 1972 demolished its 1921 system with the stroke of a pen. The Party led by

Brian Faulkner agreed to operate the new system with the SDLP (and Alliance). The Power-Sharing Executive took Office in January 1974. The prevailing sentiment in the Unionist community was not enthusiasm. There was an attitude of 'wait and see'. The rival Unionist Party opposed the new system but failed to raise any great demonstration against it. It was not subverted by them. What destroyed it was a Court action against it in Dublin which brought out the duplicity on which it was based.

Did the Dublin Government recognise, by signing the Sunningdale Agreement, that the Six Counties were legitimately under British sovereignty? If it did, then it was in breach of the Constitution under which it functioned. That Constitution asserted *de jure* sovereignty over the Six Counties, but deferred enforcement of that sovereignty for the time being.

Kevin Boland, ex-Fianna Fail, took the Fine Gael/Labour Coalition to Court on a charge of breaching the Constitution by recognising British sovereignty in the North. The Government pleaded in defence that the phrasing of the Agreement was such that it did not actually recognise British sovereignty by signing it. All its signature meant was that it did not as a Government intend to enforce the sovereignty clause, and that did not prejudice the right of any future Government to enforce it.

The Court found in favour of the Government.

This meant that Faulkner's Unionist Party, if it participated with the Dublin Government in a Council of Ireland, would be acting with a Government which asserted sovereignty over it, and denied the legitimacy of the sovereignty under which it acted.

It is difficult for a politician accustomed to the fluid British Constitution, which is whatever Parliament thinks it is from day to day, to relate to a fixed Constitution. Faulkner said later that he knew that the Southern claim of sovereignty had not been withdrawn, but I doubt that he did. Anyhow he agreed to continue with the system.

A prominent advertisement appeared in the Belfast Unionist papers in March—as far as I recall it was a paragraph in the middle of a whole page—which quoted the judgment of the Dublin Court, and said that if the Council of Ireland was proceeded with, without a new Northern Election, there would be a General Strike—a "*Constitutional stoppage*".

Neither London nor Dublin nor the UUP/SDLP took any heed of it. The Strike, organised by a Shop Stewards group calling itself the *Ulster Workers' Council*, was called in May. The leader of the British TUC, acting for the Labour Government, came to break it with a Back To Work March. He was ignored. The SDLP Leader and Deputy Prime Minister, Gerry Fitt, declared that the Strike, unauthorised by the TUC, was a Fascist revolution which must be broken—as if unofficial strikes were something unusual in Britain then.

Dublin might have remedied the matter by holding a referendum to amend the Constitution. Conor Cruise O'Brien, its spokesman on the North, said on radio that too much had already been conceded to the Unionists. (He pleaded after the event that only Fianna Fail had the influence to amend the Constitution as required.)

As the Strike proved to be effective, the entire Unionist community was drawn into it and paramilitaries claimed responsibility for it. But it was its effectiveness as a shop stewards' strike in the first instance, and the coherent realism of its demands, that brought it about.

At a certain point Faulkner resigned and the Secretary of State pulled the plug on the whole system, Power-Sharing, Council of Ireland and all.

But what was it about *really*??? That began to be asked after the event. It said it was about the Council of Ireland in the light of the Dublin Court action which reasserted the sovereignty claim that was widely thought to have lapsed. Its demand was that the establishment of the full Council of Ireland should be deferred, or that there should be a Northern Election to show that there was majority support for the Agreement as clarified by the Dublin Government in its pleading, and by the judgment of the Court.

The Government's refusal to negotiate with the UWC on its demands even when, a few days into the Strike, it became clear that it was effective. And so that question of what it was *really* about can never be answered because what it *said* it was about was never put to the test.

The impression left by it all was that the whole Sunningdale affair was essentially duplicitous.

I doubt that the reader could get a clear idea of the course of events from Noel Dorr's book, but I think he could get from it the feeling that duplicity was at the heart of it.

And that is something.

Dorr also gives an interesting account of discussions behind the scenes in Dublin, which show some awareness of what should be done, but also a fatalistic acceptance that it could not be done. But what goes on behind the scenes is of no account in critical situations requiring public action.

He gives a Dublin foreign policy description of the SDLP as a party which "*rejected violence... but would forfeit much of their support if they were to accept an 'internal settlement'...*" in Northern Ireland. In fact, the SDLP was itself committed to ending Partition as a priority. Gerry Fitt wanted to be both a Labour politician "helping lame dogs over stiles" and a militant anti-Partitionist.

I put it to him that he should give priority to one thing or the other but he refused. Shortly before the August 1969 upheaval he made a strong anti-Partition speech threatening the Government with the IRA if it did do something in that direction, and this aroused a great cheer. There was no IRA worth mentioning then. When an IRA did spring into being and went to war, Fitt was very much in two minds for a while, condemning the violence on the unbelievable grounds that it delayed the ending of Partition, which was otherwise at hand. Eventually he resolved himself into Fitt the Brit. In 1974 he seemed to be living in a wonderland all his own.

In 1971 he had responded positively to a reform proposal made by premier Brian Faulkner at Stormont. After coming back down to West Belfast, he rejected the proposal. We wondered at the time if that would happen, and it did. Opinion on the ground was strongly Republican and he would not confront it on an issue that might possibly have led to internal political evolution. But it seemed to me to be very much of his own volition that he refused to delay the Parliamentary tier of the Council of Ireland in order to preserve power-sharing in 1974.

I remember that the SDLP members of the Power-Sharing Belfast Government sat with the Dublin Cabinet for a photo-shoot as the future Government of Ireland early in 1974. And an SDLP MP said the Ulster Unionists would find themselves trundled into the Republic by Sunningdale whether they liked it or not.

But, if the SDLP only did these things to conciliate its electorate, and not because it was itself essentially anti-Partitionist, that means that Provisional Republicanism

was a strong civil as well a military force. And yet there is not a single reference to it in Dorr's Index.

Dorr says that "crucially the drumbeat of paramilitary violence on both sides continued in Northern Ireland, and, on occasion, in the south, where there was a very high death toll in the Dublin and Monaghan bombings" (p381). This treats "paramilitary violence" as a unitary thing.

My recollection is that the IRA was comparatively quiescent during the 1974 Strike. Dublin/Monaghan seems to have been a British action and was certainly not Republican. And, applying the same term, "paramilitary", to the IRA and the UDA etc., does not make them the same thing. The UDA soon lost all sense of political purpose and became an adjunct of the Army and Police of what was, after all, its state. The IRA quickly became the de facto armed force of the community that had no place in the state that held it. Dublin warnings against voting Sinn Fein went unheeded—and it was the case that a vote for the SDLP was not a vote against the IRA but was a vote for a 'Constitutional' party that could receive what was gained by the IRA.

In Chapter 21 Dorr asks whether the 1998 Agreement was Sunningdale for slow learners", as the Mallon SDLP claimed. He could not say that it was. But neither can he say that it was a deal made between Whitehall and the IRA, which does not appear in his story. He takes the intermediary diplomacy to be the substance.

He remarks in passing that "British governments had some experience of dealing, not always very successfully, with divided societies in other parts of the world", but he does ask why then Britain arranged that the "deep-rooted conflict of aspirations between two traditions... had been bottled up in Northern Ireland where it erupted in aggravated form" (p375). So we have not been wasting our time! such a remark would not have been made by a Dublin Establishment figure forty years ago.

He reaches the remarkable conclusion that it was possibly a good thing that Sunningdale failed:

"The violent conflict had not run its full course, and its futility had not yet become evident to those who were engaged in it. Republican and loyalist extremists with diametrically opposed views were locked into a zero-sum game... Some might say it follows from this that Sunningdale was premature—"Ripeness is all"..." (386).

Well, it was not Loyalists that the IRA declared war on, and made war on. It made war on the State and did not let the State re-direct it into a War with the Protestants. And the Nationalist community did not only experience futility during the Long War. The Dublin Establishment is perhaps too far removed from the War that gave rise to it—and too dismissive of it—to appreciate that things of many kinds can happen in the course of a war. The Nationalist community developed socially in the course of the War, and because of it. It ripened.

Brendan Clifford

Keeping up pretence of viable 'peace process'

On the eve of the Israeli General Election on 17th March 2015, Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu stated unequivocally that, if he were returned to power, a Palestinian state would not be established, (see *Netanyahu: If I'm elected, there will be no Palestinian state*, Haaretz, 16 March 2015).

Any handover to Palestinians of territory on the West Bank occupied by Israel since 1967 would, he asserted, threaten Israel's security:

"I think that anyone who moves to establish a Palestinian state and evacuate territory gives territory away to radical Islamist attacks against Israel. The left has buried its head in the sand time and after time and ignores this, but we are realistic and understand."

Asked if that meant there would be no Palestinian state during his tenure of office,

he replied: "*Indeed*" (see *Binyamin Netanyahu rules out Palestinian state if he wins*, Guardian, 16 March 2015).

In the election, he saw off his political rivals and his Likud party was returned once again as the largest party in the Knesset (with 30 seats out of 120). This enabled him to continue as Prime Minister in a new Coalition Government.

On 28th August 2017, at an event in the Barkan Settlement to celebrate 50 years of Israeli occupation and colonisation of the West Bank, thousands cheered Prime Minister Netanyahu as he restated his determination that Israel will hold on to the West Bank permanently. Here's an extract from his speech:

"We are here to stay forever. There will be no more uprooting of settlements

continued on page 30

Does It Up

Stack ?

SAVE THE CONSTITUTION

Gerald Howlin, a Public Affairs Consultant, writes a current affairs article for *The Irish Examiner*, usually on political matters, and on 20th December 2017 last, he choose to heap praise on the Dáil, the Seanad and their Committees. He stated:

"This Dáil with input from Senators is driving debate and to some degree actual decisions to an unprecedented degree."

He goes on to refer approvingly to the *Eight Amendment Committee*. This praise is very much over the top because, in the eyes of the people i.e. the electorate, what the present Dáil and Seanad are most noted for is inactivity and "*passing the baby*". There has certainly been a lot of talk and controversy in Leinster House but it can hardly be called "*debate*". There have been some mammoth blaming sessions around the Gardaí and the Department of Justice which did not fix the underlying problems even though heads have rolled or, more precisely, that of the former Minister of Justice Francis Fitzgerald, TD. Fine Gael. But the problems are still there—unresolved.

When a General Election is held, we all know, in theory, what we are doing in voting. That's all right in theory but in practice what most people will do is "*vote for our team*" and they vote for whoever is on the Ballot Paper attached to that team i.e. that Political Party. The election is very much viewed as a team effort and as public entertainment. "*Let our side win*" is the desire of most voters almost regardless of who the candidates are and with scant regard for the conduct of their Party in the previous Dáil. This sort of tribalistic approach to elections has produced the ruin of democracy. Politics is treated as a sport, it is endlessly discussed, talked about, written about, theorised about and tweeted about. The principal elected representatives are treated in the media as celebrities and are spoken of as "*players*" in the political arena.

Expressions like "*he has skin in the game*" are used. All of which is designed to make politics look like Rugby League or World Cup Soccer. And unfortunately, that is how many politicians seem to look at it as well.

The Law says that General Elections are to be held so as to elect representative legislators and ultimately an Executive Government but that is not the way politicians look at an election. Politicians look on a General Election as a path to power and riches, and their immediate supporters fall into two groups—one of which are the idealists who think their candidate will improve society and the economy, and the other, larger, group are supporting a candidate who will help them to join the gravy train—such as ambitious young solicitors, barristers, law students and would-be putative politicians.

There are, of course, decent politicians and decent political supporters and they do try hard to influence things for the good of the people, but it seems to me that the decent people are at present outnumbered. And then, there is the "*herd instinct*" and mobile phones. There was always a "*herd instinct*" but it mostly stayed under the surface, to be very occasionally awakened at times of great public disturbance, such as when it showed itself in the activities of a Lynch-mob or some other great spontaneous demonstration. That was before the mobile phone. Now that almost everyone has a mobile phone, the "*herd instinct*" can be stoked into action by phone apps calling up "*flash-mobs*". The herd thus can be mobilised by the use of shrewd crowd-psychologists. And this is happening. Mobile phones played a huge part in the latest US Presidential Election and also in the election of President Macron in France and in the pro-Catalan independence demonstrations in Barcelona. People have been organised and herded in a direction desired by a small well-funded group behind the scenes.

There is a strong indication that crowd-herding is taking place in Ireland in connection with a campaign to delete Article 40.3 from the Constitution of Ireland. Article 40.3 protects the lives of mothers and their unborn babies. When a mother is having a baby that is what she says. She never says: "*I am expecting a foetus*". A baby in the womb is entitled to feel it is the safest place to be. And it is. All of us were safe in our mother's womb. When a mother loses her baby before it is born—it is a huge misfortune and is called a miscarriage. It is seriously upsetting for the mother and indeed the father. You dare not tell a mother that she aborted her baby, unless you want to inflict enormous and lifelong suffering on her. Farmers hate abortion in their animals—as it is a great loss to them—not just in the financial sense. Human mothers call it a miscarriage because to the mother each baby is a

special human being, a human being who lived and grew and moved in her womb.

So why do some people want to kill unborn babies on purpose? Well, it seems to be mostly because the baby is going to get in the way of having a career or other life style choices. Some people want to have all the fun of recreational sex without the inconvenience of raising a child. Some who want to kill a baby will say "*it simply wasn't the right time*" for various reasons. There are many reasons for killing an unborn baby but in general the reasons are self-centered selfishness.

There are indeed hard and difficult decisions to be made in some cases. For example, in the case of an innocent teenager who has been "*caught out*" with an unwanted pregnancy: that is the time when family, friends, and community must rally around and support the young mother. A pregnancy may be unwanted and it may cause problems but the baby is after all one of the family from the time of conception. And there is always room for one more family member in an emergency.

In the past, Ireland could not face up to unwanted pregnancies and our society i.e. our own fathers, mothers, grandparents and the aunts wanted to hide away the unwanted pregnancy into the Magdalen Homes where nuns and social workers tried to do their best on very limited budgets. Has society not progressed at all? Has society regressed now to the ruthless point of solving the unwanted pregnancy by killing the innocent baby and thus covering it all up in a much darker place than the Magdalen Laundries ever were?

Article 40.3 of the Constitution, which preserves the lives of mothers and babies equally, is a very progressive Law and it has worked well in practice. Doctors, midwives, fathers and mothers know exactly where they stand under this Article. The mother's life will be saved in an emergency, even if the baby dies and if at all possible the baby will be saved. If the Article was not in the Constitution, there would be no protection under the Constitution for either the mother nor the baby. In that event, some medical people could do what they liked. Think about that! It would be chaotic.

Article 40.3 is not about baby killing. It is about baby-saving and some people behind the scenes do not see any money in Article 40.3: to do away with Article 40.3 would see Medical Defence Insurance go sky-high and the lawyers would be in the money defending negligent doctors.

There are a few good politicians in the Dáil and Seanad and there are many who are neutral on most things and let us hope that a majority will vote to leave the Constitution as it is. The money cost of a Referendum now would be much better spent building homes for the homeless.

BANKERS AND OTHERS

What is being referred to as the 'Tracker Mortgage Scandal' is in very fact the *Tracker Mortgage Criminal Fraud*. As John McGuinness TD, Fianna Fáil Chair of the Oireachtas Finance Committee, quite rightly said, it is time to jail the guilty bankers. A fraud was perpetrated each time a tracker mortgage contract was

illegally changed in favour of the banks and these changes were, in each case, decided on and implemented by an individual banker. Let them be prosecuted and jailed if found guilty on the evidence.

And by what authority did the Gardaí Acting Commissioner decide to pardon all the gardai who falsified drink-driving and speeding records?

Surely it is all part of the same picture in the present Dáil and Seanad, to facilitate baby killing and fraudulent bankers and criminal falsification of Garda records?

It just does not stack up!

Michael Stack ©

west of the Jordan river", in accordance with the 1999 Likud platform: he knows that, every so often, he must hold out the prospect of some kind of a Palestinian state being established.

Thus, when the newly elected President Obama pressed him to reopen negotiations with Palestinians in 2009, he allowed the phrase "*Palestinian state*" to pass his lips for the first time. In a speech at Bar-Ilan University on 14 June 2009, he said:

"If we receive this guarantee regarding demilitarization and Israel's security needs, and if the Palestinians recognize Israel as the State of the Jewish people, then we will be ready in a future peace agreement to reach a solution where a demilitarized Palestinian state exists alongside the Jewish state."

A few months earlier, he had stated in his election campaign that he would "not withdraw from one inch" of the occupied territories.

And when the EU foreign policy chief Federica Mogherini visited Israel in May 2015, he reassured her that a Palestinian state was possible on his watch, even though he had ruled it out a couple of months earlier on the eve of the Knesset elections. He said:

"I want to reiterate my commitment to peace. We want a peace that would end the conflict once and for all. My position hasn't changed. ... I support the vision of two states for two peoples—a demilitarized Palestinian state that recognizes the Jewish state." (*Netanyahu to EU's Mogherini: Still committed to vision of two states*, Haaretz, 20 May 2015)

And so the game continues—

Netanyahu pretends to believe in a "*two-state solution*" and the EU pretends to believe him, so that the pretence of a viable "peace process" can be maintained.

David Morrison

See the forthcoming March 2018 *Irish Foreign Affairs* for David Morrison's: *Israel must be forced to end the occupation, otherwise there will never be a Palestinian state*

Peace Process

continued

in the land of Israel... This is the inheritance of our ancestors. This is our land.

"Imagine that on these hills were the forces of radical Islam. It would endanger us, it would endanger you, and it would endanger the entire Middle East" (*Netanyahu vows he will never evacuate another settlement*, Times of Israel, 28 August 2017).

A month later, he repeated this unequivocal message to cheering crowds at a meeting in the Gush Etzion settlement (see *Netanyahu at Settlement Jubilee Ceremony: There Will Be No More Uprooting*, Haaretz, 29 September 2017).

So, the "peace process" is dead, isn't it?

It is clear from these and similar statements by Prime Minister Netanyahu in recent years that Israel has no intention of withdrawing from any of the territory it has occupied since 1967 so that a Palestinian state can come into existence. To do so, Netanyahu has said repeatedly would threaten the security of Israel.

You might have thought that would have signalled the end of the "*peace process*". It is not as if Netanyahu has been an enthusiastic supporter of a "*two-state solution*", who suffered a temporary relapse on 16th March 2015. On the contrary, his pre-Election promise in March 2015 mirrored an earlier one during the February 2009 election campaign, as a result of which he became Prime Minister. Then, he told supporters in Beit Aryeh, a small settlement in the West Bank:

"The election on Tuesday will be about one issue—whether this place will remain in our hands or will be handed over to Hamas and Iran. We will not withdraw from one inch. Every inch we leave would go to Iran" (*Netanyahu on peace*, Al Jazeera, 26 March 2009).

1999 LIKUD PLATFORM

This Netanyahu stance isn't surprising, since it is consistent with the 1999 Likud platform (see <https://freedomforward.files.wordpress.com/2011/05/likud-platform.pdf>), which—

- rejects the creation of a Palestinian state in the West Bank, and
- supports unlimited Jewish colonisation of the West Bank (referred to as Judea and Samaria by Israel).

Here are the relevant points from the platform:

- "The Government of Israel flatly rejects the establishment of a Palestinian Arab state west of the Jordan river."
- "The Jordan Valley and the territories that dominate it shall be under Israeli sovereignty. The Jordan river will be the permanent eastern border of the State of Israel."
- "Jerusalem is the eternal, united capital of the State of Israel and only of Israel. The government will flatly reject Palestinian proposals to divide Jerusalem"
- "The Jewish communities in Judea, Samaria and Gaza are the realization of Zionist values. Settlement of the land is a clear expression of the unassailable right of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel and constitutes an important asset in the defense of the vital interests of the State of Israel. The Likud will continue to strengthen and develop these communities and will prevent their uprooting."

This Likud platform may be nearly twenty years old, but these principles expressed in it have never been repudiated by Likud.

KEEPING UP THE PRETENCE

Of course, to keep up the pretence of a viable "*peace process*", Netanyahu knows that he cannot always "*flatly reject the establishment of a Palestinian Arab state*

· Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback

Would FF Take Its Seats?

Micheál Martin has recently spoken of his plans to extend the Fianna Fáil party into Northern Ireland and to contest elections there.

Can he give an assurance that if any Fianna Fáil candidates are elected to the Westminster parliament, they will take their seats in the House of Commons?

Eugene McEldowney. *Irish Times*, 21.12.17

REDMOND continued

John Redmond in Waterford. My late father, Patrick Whittle, who to my knowledge was never a member of the U.I.L., was handed a delegate's card. The card, I clearly remember, indicated that he represented Division 52 of the U.I.L. in Waterford.

My father, at the time, was a supporter of John Redmond's policy in common with most of the men of his generation. I asked him if he proposed to go to the convention and he informed me that he did not. I then told him I was anxious to go and hear what Redmond had to say, so he gave me his delegate's card.

The large room in the City Hall was packed when I produced my father's card and was admitted. As I sat there, I heard a din behind me and saw the late J.D. Walsh whom I did not know at the time, his face streaming with blood, being ejected from the hall.

This man was well known to have strong republican sympathies. All this happened before the meeting opened. I saw three or four other men being struck with sticks and ejected. As I sat there, I realized fully that, owing to my family being known supporters of Redmond, I, of course, would be coloured with the same brush.

On John Redmond stepping on to the platform, all present stood up on the seats and cheered loudly. I remained seated, and I assume I was judged a very quiet, odd sort of person for doing so. In the course of his speech, Redmond referred to the new Sinn Féin party as the "*effervescent scum of the body politic*", and predicted that they would "*soon run back like rats into their holes*".

Dealing with World War I., which was raging at the time, he stated that he had "*pledged*" the Irish regiments in the cause of the freedom of small nations. He stressed the fact that a large number of casualties were occurring in these Irish regiments fighting with the British army in France, and added, in a loud voice, "*These gaps must be filled*". Immediately the audience, to a man, leapt up and cheered vociferously.

As they stood cheering, Redmond called out a second time, "*These gaps must be filled*". Again, I remained sitting, a solitary figure on my bench. I was expecting a punch from some of those nearest me, but seemingly my being seated was misinterpreted. I recall clearly my contempt for the men

cheering, many of whom were known personally to me. I had contempt for them, for I knew that not one of them would ever join the British army, not through patriotic motives but through less worthy motives. At the time, the laneways and alleyways of Waterford were being drained daily of recruits for the British army. These young fellows, most of whom lived close to poverty, were the sons and grandsons of men who had worn the British uniform.

The cheering by the mass meeting that day was about the lowest piece of hypocrisy I have ever experienced. In point of fact, one solitary Ballybricken pig buyer joined the British army. He did so, following a prolonged bout of drinking, and I am convinced that, were it not for this, Ballybricken would have been without its one solitary representative in the British army during World War I. While listening to the cheering at that meeting, I felt that the whole thing was merely bluff. I knew that, when they spoke of filling gaps in the Irish regiments, the fodder would be provided by the unemployed or the semi-unemployed from the lanes and alleys of the city.

The second group comprised what I shall term the "*shock troops*" in the raids carried out by organized mobs in the city. I refer to the numerous element in Waterford which always was strongly represented in the Irish regiments in the British army. This type were the relatives of men who served in the British army and they were organized as mobs by the Ballybricken pig buyers who directed the elections. The relatives of soldiers on active service also included "*gentlemen*" known as ex soldiers, who were too old to serve. These latter were most difficult to deal with, as they all had experience of actual warfare in the British forces in Africa, India, et cetera. They were copiously supplied with drink during the two election campaigns and, while it used be said that the Ballybricken pig buyers were spending money in prodigal fashion, it was my belief that the finance was coming from across channel.

The third group in the Redmondite political setup in Waterford was the convinced Redmondite who believed firmly that Redmond was the saviour of Ireland and we, of Sinn Féin, were closely allied to the Bolsheviks in Russia.

The last line of Redmondite organism in Waterford was the Unionist party. Too cute, for business reasons, to show their hand, they backed Redmond's

party as the nearest approach to their own particular creed of Unionism.

I would like to set down here the fact that our mainstay in breaking finally the mobdom and rowdiness of the Redmondite party came largely from one class. I refer to the children and grandchildren of evicted farmers who lost their homes during the land league agitation and prior to it. A large number of these came into Waterford city to work. Some of them worked in the cellars of local bacon factories, some in the breweries; others had humble jobs, such as cart drivers, et cetera. Also in this group were sons and grandsons of men who had been evicted from their farms in South Kilkenny. Following careful consideration, I came to the conclusion many years ago that the groups referred to made up the core of resistance which finally broke the back of Redmondite rowdiness in Waterford" (Emphasis added).

Was Redmondite political violence a consequence of some special or exceptional feature of Waterford itself, as Whittle suggested? Against that view, such violence was not at all limited to Waterford, and it extended back into the period of dissolution of Parnell's supremacy, before Redmond took over. The violence was not exclusive to Waterford, or to Redmond.

On the other hand, and in support of Whittle's stance, there is evidence of polarisation in Waterford,—like Belfast for instance. Not so much on religious grounds, but socially as in left-right. It is notable also that Redmondite thuggery in Waterford and elsewhere was matched by the activities of Joe Devlin's Belfast Hibernian goons.

What about the Pig Buyers? The industrial and social history of Waterford as a food processing and exporting hub gave this caste or clique an economic stranglehold over a great many people in town and country who derived an income from breeding pigs. It seems they successfully extended this power into politics by means of their alliance with Redmond and his movement. It appears also that they had appropriated to themselves the remnants of popular memory of the Thomas Francis Meagher 1848 standoff, when Waterford went to the brink of the revolutions breaking out in Europe at that time.

In hindsight it is more difficult to understand the connection between veteran Fenians and Redmondism. Whittle, as an activist of the new re-born Fenianism, tried to explain this. *The first article in this series addressed the conundrum.*

Pat Muldowney

REDMOND continued

were turfed out and settled down outside the walls in Ballybricken.

These events were the first military and political steps in the conquest.

For most of its existence Waterford was a fairly typical English city in Ireland. Its motto "*Urbs intacta manet Waterfordia*" (*Waterford remains loyal*) was awarded by Henry VII when it refused Perkin Warbeck and Lambert Simnel, pretenders to the English throne.

But the city rejected Henry VIII's religious reformation. Waterford cleric Luke Wadding was the political and diplomatic brains behind the 1642–1649 Confederation which was defeated by Cromwell. Thomas Hussey was an international diplomat who, as chaplain to the Spanish Embassy, reinstated Catholic religious practice in London in the 18th century. When he was appointed Bishop of Waterford he broke with the compliant and submissive practice of the Irish Hierarchy, and helped Edmund Rice to get a system of basic education started. When Hussey died an Orange mob attacked his funeral and tried to throw his coffin into the River Suir.

Young Irelander Thomas Francis Meagher was a scion of Waterford Catholic merchants. He was the first to defy Daniel O'Connell, declaring that Ireland would be liberated by the Sword. He is credited with creating the Irish tricolour flag, modelled on the French revolutionary tricolour. When he was arrested in Waterford in 1848 the citizens rallied to his defence, created barricades, and armed themselves with pikes and guns. They were opposed by five British warships. Meagher averted a clash and went to prison.

Many Irish people have probably heard of Thomas Francis Meagher and his Tricolour contribution to national symbolism. Probably very few have heard of Luke Wadding who created the present day Irish nation by combining the old English settlers and the indigenous Irish into a single body politic. And few will know anything much of Thomas Hussey who helped initiate the political revival of that body after a hundred and fifty years of Cromwellian and Glorious Revolution subjugation.

Any town or city which has existed for more than a century or two will have many such snippets of more or less interesting historical information. But these do not 'explain' Waterford's Redmondite/Pig Buyerite fetish for political violence.

Why Waterford and not Sligo? Why the pig buyers and not the haberdashers? Redmond's biographers are silent on all

this, so we turn to Nicholas Whittle, a Waterford native who had direct personal experience of Redmondite pig buyer violence.

Whittle participated in the Tramore Ambush of 7th January 1921, barely escaping death from gunshot wounds. In the two 1918 elections won by Captain William Redmond, he was Sinn Féin's Director of Elections.

The following is extracted from Whittle's 1955 Witness Statement.

"Men from most of the thirty-two counties had witnessed scenes in Waterford two years earlier [in the 1918 elections] that stamped on their minds the impression that the fires of nationality burned much lower in Waterford than in any other part of Ireland.

The success of the Tramore ambush lay, therefore, in the fact that the lull in the Anglo-Irish war was broken by a major engagement in a district where it was least expected. This shot in the dark which came from Tramore (known generally as an easy-going holiday resort), in my opinion, did much to brace up the I.R.A. throughout the country, as, on the other hand, it must have caused deep apprehension amongst the higher British authorities in Dublin.

I shall now qualify this statement I have made by adverting to the fact that, late in the year 1917, Eamonn Waldron, a school teacher in Galway, was arrested by the British and charged with sedition. Having been jailed, he was further sentenced to deportation from Co. Clare. He was given the option of residing in either of two places in Ireland, Belfast or Waterford. He elected to come to Waterford. The safest place, deemed safest by the higher British authorities in Ireland a year after the 1916 Rising, had suddenly, out of the blue as it were, switched over and taken its proper place with the nation in its struggle for freedom. In this latter fact lay the great importance and success of the Tramore ambush. ...

"...[The 1918 general election defeat] was a hard blow to us, as I was convinced that we had the requisite number of votes to give a slender majority, but the combined efforts of the R.I.C. and the organised mobs cut across the accomplishment of victory for Sinn Fein.

There is an aspect or two of the election which I consider historically important enough to dwell upon here. I first refer to the extraordinary combination of forces which beset the path of Irish Republicanism in Waterford. I shall enumerate the groups seriatim.

Firstly, there was the spearhead, viz., the Ballybricken pig buyers. I once asked the famous historian [of Waterford and County], the late Canon Patrick Power, D. . if there was any historical

background to the Ballybricken pig buyer, as they appeared different generally to the ordinary run of Waterford citizens. He told me that somebody else had asked him precisely the same question. "My reply to you", he said, "is going to be the same as I gave then."

"*There was*", Canon Power said, "*no historical background to the peculiar characteristics of the Waterford pig buyers. In common with men who make their living by dealing with livestock, they acquired a love of things garish. They resembled the gypsy by the love of show, of shined brasses in the homes and their ignorant outward show generally.*" My personal recollection of all the Waterford big buyers was that they were an absolutely illiterate class, without a knowledge or respect for learning. They came out of a period when the pig buyer and the cattle dealer literally bludgeoned the small farmer when the latter came to offer his stock for sale at a fair. An organised system of what I should term "*blackmail*" existed amongst them in the method of buying. Behind the front line was a second line known as tangles, the latter making the running for the former.

Through the two groups, a technique was evolved whereby each buyer would select freely his own victim at a fair and none of his competing buyers would interfere. In fact, farmers who set out to break this discreditable technique were frequently beaten up at fairs. These same pig buyers were the moulders of the blackguardly election methods which were typical of the Redmondite party in the Waterford elections.

I have one very clear recollection of the type of mind which dominated these men. It was in September or October, 1916, [October 6—P.M.] when John Redmond, the leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party made, what I think was, his first public statement since the rising. The occasion was a convention of the United Irish League in Waterford which was held in the large room in the City Hall.

Actually, owing to the fact that there had not been an election, or a need for an election, for about twenty years in Waterford (as John Redmond was always automatically returned unopposed for that constituency), there was in reality no built-up organization, with the exception of the top group of his followers. At the period in 1916, an engineered convention of the United Irish League was ordered to be held by

continued on page 31

ULSTER continued

frustrate the aspirations and defeat the wishes of the Irish people as a whole. That is a claim which, on the purest principles of democratic Government, neither this House nor any Legislative Assembly founded upon democracy, and framing Its policy by democratic principles, can ever yield to.

The right hon. Gentleman has drawn a picture—I am sure in perfect good faith, not at all in an inflammatory spirit—of the possible consequences that we may have to face if legislation of this kind is carried in defiance of the opinion of those for whom he speaks. I have always myself held the same language, and held the same language, because I have always felt the same thing in regard to that. I cannot bring myself to believe, without in any way undervaluing the reality and intensity of the feelings of those whom he represents, that when the whole situation as it will emerge, after the passing of this legislation, becomes clear, and when it is realised as I said at the beginning, what a solid protection the minority in Ireland have with regard to their just rights and interests, not only in the provisions of the Bill itself—fettering and limiting the powers of the Irish Parliament—but in their continued representation in the Imperial Parliament here—I cannot bring myself to believe that they will not, when they reflect upon these things, see that it is their duty as good citizens and loyal subjects to accept the legislation of the Imperial Parliament. I shall certainly not speculate and lay down contingent policies in view of any other hypothesis, because that hypothesis I do not believe to be in conformity with probability, reason and common sense.

While I believe that I yield to no man in my respect for the genuine feeling of Ulster in this matter, I cannot believe that it will ever be possible or right for this Imperial Parliament to abstain from doing that which it believes to be just, to be politic, and to be in the best interests of the Kingdom and the Empire as a whole, because by so doing we may do that which is unpalatable to a minority, and something which that minority may, as they think, justly and legitimately resent. I hope I shall not be thought to be using unsympathetic, still less arbitrary language, but I do believe that it would be the worst example possible, in the interests of democratic government, if such a principle as that were ever recognised by this House or any Parliament

(January 1st, 1913. *Report Stage of the Third Home Rule Bill*).

January 1, 1913: Sir Edward Carson's amendment to exclude Ulster from the Third Home Rule Bill defeated.

January 16, 1913: Home Rule Bill carried (367-257) in the House of Commons; defeated (326-69) in House of Lords on January 30, 1913.

July 7, 1913: Home Rule Bill again carried (352-243) in the House of Commons; again defeated (302-64) in the House of Lords on July 15, 2013.

NORTHERN IRELAND: WHAT IS IT?

Professor Mansergh Changes His Mind.
-By Brendan Clifford. 278pp £20 postfree.

Contents: This book is called Northern Ireland: What Is It? It might also have been called, Northern Ireland: What Is It For? After all, there must have been good reason to establish such a perverse system of government in a society so divided. Or perhaps 'The State Of Northern Ireland' would have been to the point. The ambiguity of that title also goes to the heart of what this book is about: the governing arrangement established by Britain and the trouble it has caused. The 1920 Government of Ireland Act described itself as providing for the "good government" of an area broken off from Ireland—but the forms it

set up made bad government inevitable. In a sense "Northern Ireland" was a time-bomb planted by stealth with the detonation coming some fifty years later.

But why was this done? What was "Northern Ireland" for? That is a question which has never been considered.

This book considers what was established in Northern Ireland and why. The why is important. It had—and continues to have—to do with the handling of the bit of Ireland which broke the Imperial State: an Ireland which had to cope with seeing a national minority misgoverned across the Border.

Professor Nicholas Mansergh was a historian, constitutional expert, and part of the inner ruling class of Britain. He wrote a book on Northern Ireland in 1936 which correctly described the constitutional form while misconceiving its politics. In 1983 he altered his opinion of "Northern Ireland" and endorsed an academic description of it as an Irish 'state', setting a trend picked up by a medley of other academics. This book takes a look at those writings and takes issue with their approach, which fitted in with the new Oxbridge project of "*Re-Writing Irish History*". History-writing has become a political project. If war is a continuation of politics by other means, it might be said that politics is a continuation of war by other means. Britain may have lost in 1922, but the war is not over yet.

"Northern Ireland" is clearly continuing to serve the purpose for which it was set up.

John Redmond's Violent Politics

Who were the Ballybricken Pig Buyers?

Nicholas Whittle's Witness Statement

The Pig Buyers bought pigs and sold them to the bacon factories. They consisted of a hundred or so families who lived around the Fair Green in the Ballybricken area.

Unlike the Waterford clerk-typists, haberdashers, jarvey drivers, dockers, nurses, or bicycle repairmen, the pig buyers of Ballybricken were John Redmond's political enforcers, the hard men who won his elections for him by brute force and intimidation.

When Redmond was buried in Wexford in 1918, his coffin was not carried by his nearest and dearest family members. Nor by his trusted and faithful fellow-MPs in the Irish Parliamentary Party who had fought the good fight by his side in the House of Commons. No. At that most sacred, solemn and tragic moment Redmond's dead body was carried by the Ballybricken pig buyers.

What made the pig buyers so special? What set them apart from the clerk-typists, the haberdashers, the jarvey drivers, the

dockers, the nurses, and the bicycle repairmen? We are told that Redmond is the original source of Irish democracy. If that is so, what innate talents did the Pig Buyers possess that enabled them to confer this special grace upon us?

The obvious place to search for an explanation is in the acclaimed biographies of Redmond by Dermot Meleady and Chris Dooley. But when you consult the indices of these books, under "P" for Pig Buyers, or "B" for Ballybricken, you are left none the wiser.

Waterford was exceptional in stemming the demise of Parnellism in 1892, and in holding out against Sinn Féin in 1918. Was there something special about Waterford? Founded by the Vikings, it was Ireland's first city. Dermot McMorough, King of Leinster, married his daughter Aoife to Strongbow in Waterford (making him heir to the kingdom of Leinster) when the Norman Lord captured the city in 1170. The Norse inhabitants

continued on page 32



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 36, No. 1

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

CLAUSE 1.—(Establishment of Irish Parliament.)

Asquith on Ulster: 1913

House of Commons Debate— 1st of January, 1913,

Hansard, Volume 46-cc377, 483. Report Stage of the Third Home Rule Bill.

The *Prime Minister-H. H. Asquith*—An absolute veto. Let me come to inquire what Ulster, for this purpose, really means. The right hon. Gentleman [Sir Edward Carson], in the concluding part of his speech, seemed to put forward the case that this was a more logical and reasonable Amendment than the one already discussed and rejected in Committee, which proposed to exclude certain of the Ulster counties from the operation of the Bill. If this Amendment were carried, the whole of Ulster would be excluded.

What is Ulster? I have here a very useful map in which Ulster is coloured. By looking at that map I see that, dividing Ulster according to its representation—leaving population for the moment—between those who are in favour and those who are against Home Rule, the whole of the North-West, the whole of the South, the larger part of the middle—by the middle, I mean the county of Tyrone—are almost unanimously in favour of Home Rule. That is a geographical fact; there can be no dispute about it whatever. Under this Amendment the whole of Donegal, which returns a united Nationalist representation, the whole of Tyrone, of which three divisions as compared with one return a representation in favour of Home Rule, the whole of Monaghan and Cavan, part of Fermanagh, part of Armagh, and part of Down, although they have a preponderatingly Nationalist population and are represented in this House by Members in favour of Home Rule, would be excluded from the benefit of the Home Rule Bill. That cannot be disputed. It is not disputed by the right hon. Gentleman. In point of fact, as was clearly indicated in Committee, there are only two counties in Ulster which

return a uniform Unionist representation— Londonderry and Antrim.

The whole of the rest of the Ulster representation is either wholly Nationalist or divided between the Unionist and Nationalist parties. I confess that, to my mind, if you are to have a segregation of one part of Ireland from the rest, there is no argument whatsoever in favour of excluding the province of Ulster as a whole; the only argument, whatever it be worth, is in favour of the Amendment which was debated and rejected when we were in the Committee stage.

If you look at the population, how does the matter stand? In what I will call, for convenience and brevity, Unionist Ulster—that is, the part represented in this House by Unionist Members—the population is, roughly speaking, 680,000 Protestants, 270,000 Roman Catholics. On the other hand, if you look at Home Rule Ulster, that part which is represented here by Nationalists or Members in favour of Home

Rule, the Roman Catholics there are 436,000, and Protestants 194,000. If you take the province of Ulster as a whole, roughly speaking—I do not pretend to precise mathematical accuracy—there are in it, nine Protestants to seven Catholics. Anxious and most anxious as he may be to conciliate all reasonable opposition, and above all, to give such effect as he can to whatever is reasonable, to whatever can be given effect to in the apprehensions and sensibilities of Protestant Ulster—how is it possible, in the face of figures such as these, for anyone who accepts the principle of this Bill, to justify the exclusion of the whole province of Ulster from the operation of the Bill? The argument has really only to be stated to refute itself. I have pointed out already that the right hon. Gentleman quite frankly and sincerely says that, even if this proposal was agreed to, it would not in any degree mitigate the hostility of himself and his Friends to the granting of Home Rule to Ireland as a whole.

The effect, therefore, of carrying this Amendment, as I have shown, when the facts and figures come to be analysed, is totally unsupported by logic or reason. The effect of the carrying of the Amendment would be to render the rest of the Bill practically unworkable, and in no way to facilitate the passage through the two Houses of Parliament of such wreckage of the Bill as remained. It is indeed, as I have said, a claim which I do not think you will find the people of Great Britain will ever recognise or acknowledge, a claim of a small minority, a minority I agree whose material prosperity, whose intelligence, whose strong religious feeling entitle them to every possible degree of consideration and respect—it is a claim on the part of a relatively small minority in Ireland to

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

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

1 Sutton Villas, Lower Dargle Road
Bray, Co. Wicklow or

33 Athol Street, Belfast BT12 4GX or
2 Newington Green Mansions, London N16 9BT
or *Labour Comment*, TEL: 021-4676029
C/O Shandon St. P.O., Cork

Subscription by Post:

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

Electronic Subscription:

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

You can also order from:

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

continued on page 33