

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

November 2019

Vol.34, No.11 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.33 No.11 ISSN 954-5891

Some Guidance For The EU!

The case with Brexit, as we write, is that Britain has become a Parliamentary Democracy which refuses to govern. The Opposition in Parliament has become the majority. The business of the Parliamentary majority is to appoint a Government and enable it to govern, but the present majority insists on remaining the Opposition. The power to legislate independently of the Government has been bestowed on it by the Speaker, a former member of the ultra-Right *Monday Club* who is doing penance for his sins by shifting things towards anarchy.

The present arrangements only need to be perpetuated for there to be effective anarchy. Anarchy just means “*no Government*”. And a nominal Government, maintained in Office by a Parliament which is hostile to it and prevents it from governing, is virtual anarchy.

What Britain had from the time of the Hanoverian Succession in 1714 until 2019 was *Parliamentary Government*, in the form of government by the *Crown in Parliament*, in which the sovereignty of the Crown was exercised by the leader of the majority in Parliament.

There is no necessary connection between Parliamentary Government and Democratic Government. For more than two centuries British Parliamentary Government was anti-democratic. The system now established might be described as an *anti-Government Parliamentary Democracy*.

Under the traditional system, Parliament could defeat Government Bills but it could not itself initiate legislation. Now it can legislate, independently of the Government, and against Government policy, and not be responsible for implementing what it legislates. It has power without responsibility.

continued on page 2

Meanwhile . . . Another EU Matter

The dominance of Brexit has taken the spotlight off other EU issues. There are very significant developments at the core of the EU—the Commission. The new President, Ursula von der Leyden, is facing a series of problems even before she takes up her job and they will grow and be largely of her own making.

The Commission was the new, unique, instrument that was created to realise the European project. It was the putative European State. It acquired an essential tool for doing its job—the right to initiate legislation that would apply across Member States. It consisted of Commissioners nominated by the Member States and taking an oath to serve the object of the project. It was in this sense *ademocratic*—not anti-democratic as it has been regularly described. Something that had to be created could not be voted for—or against. Democracy is a method of running institutions such as states but it does not by itself create such institutions.

continued on page 5

Budget 2020

Competent On Brexit, Inadequate about Everything Else

Regarding this year's Budget, a Dublin City University academic, Eoin O'Malley, tweeted that the Irish system responds well to what are perceived to be acute crises but can only produce sticking plaster solutions to long-term chronic problems. This provoked a reply from

Minister for Finance Paschal Donohue's senior advisor, Ed Brophy, questioning whether this acute-versus-chronic problem was unique to the Irish political system ('Crises like Brexit jolt Ireland into action, but long-term planning is for the birds', Mark Paul, IT, 11 October).

The implication behind Brophy's tweet was that all the Western democracies face chronic problems, including in housing, and none have demonstrated the capacity for long-term planning that such problems require. Commenting on this Mark Paul argued that even the Chinese have messed up in using long-term planning as testified by the air pollution that their rapid industrialisation has caused.

continued on page 12

CONTENTS

Page

Some Guidance For The EU. Editorial	1
Meanwhile . . . Another EU Matter. Jack Lane	1
Budget 2020: <i>Competent On Brexit, Inadequate On Everything Else.</i> Dave Alvey	1
Readers' Letters: Why Tory MPs Were Expelled. David Morrison	
Brexit And British Labour Party Policy. Martha Seale	3
LEST WE FORGET (4). Extracts from <i>Irish Bulletin</i> . This issue lists British Acts Of Aggression, 9 - 29 November 1919 (ed. Jack Lane)	6
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (Clair Wills And The Story She Tells, Part 13)	10
Toxin-Laden Atmosphere Surrounds Climate Change Campaign. Tim O'Sullivan	13
Inscrutable Politics. Donal Kennedy	14
A Minor Setback Before The UK Exit. Dave Alvey (Brexit Summary, Oct.)	15
Middle East Cauldron. Editorial	17
Wackypedia. Jack Lane	18
Working Britain In The 1950s. Wilson John Haire	19
Mr. Dudgeon OBE: A Belfast Virgil. Paul Hyde	21
Casement: Speculation And A New Conspiracy! Jack Lane	22
Centenary Of How The American Legion Marked Armistice Day 1919. Manus O'Riordan	23
England's Crisis Of Democracy, 1919. Pat Walsh	27
Biteback: The Occupied Territories Bill. Gerry Liston, <i>Sadaka</i> (Letter <i>Irish Times</i>)	29
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Lest We Forget 1; Lest We Forget 2; Martin Mansergh)	30
British Roulette. Wilson John Haire (Poem)	31

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

James Connolly
Slums And Trenches,
(back page)

If the Irish Establishment had not made itself wilfully ignorant of the political history of Ireland in the 1970s, rather than face facts about the North, it would know that Legislative Power without Governmental Responsibility was what brought the Irish Parliament to grief in 1798. The 1782 settlement brought about an extreme division of power between the Irish colonial Legislature and the Government (based in Dublin Castle), which remained a Whitehall Department of State.

In 1798 the (London) Government suppressed the rebellions provoked by the Parliament, and then it abolished the Parliament it had set up in 1691, inadvertently making room for the Irish populace to engage in a national development after 1800.

British Parliamentary Government became democratically-based only in 1918. But, as is the English way, when it became democratic itself it made a universal principle of it in other realms, regardless of circumstances. And, in 1919, as the world Super Power, it established forms

of ultra democracy in the new states created to take the place of the 'authoritarian' order of Europe which it had destroyed. In the matter of democratic government for others, it gave primacy to democracy over government and produced a system of disorder. A short while later the primacy of government began to be restored by the rise of fascist movements.

Our guess would be that the traditional authority of government in Parliament will be restored by the Tory Party, that the anarchist illusions which have overcome so many MP this year will be forgotten, and that the Labour Party will revert to the position of a Loyal Opposition waiting to become the Government, instead of continuing as the leader of a miscellaneous-majority Opposition whose purpose is to disable government.

The two-party-system is imprinted on English political culture as a kind of Platonic form. But a resolution in the other direction is certainly possible, and would be a good thing for Europe—and for Ireland, if it still had a sense of national purpose.

Parliamentary Democracy against Parliamentary Government has just taken the form of a law requiring the Government to ask the EU for a further extension of the Brexit deadline, even though that is against Government policy. That is the Benn/Bercow Act. (Bercow is the Speaker of the Commons, who has made himself the leader of Parliamentary direction of Government.) Its purpose is to make the Government a puppet operated by Parliament and humiliate it for Labour Party political advantage when it will eventually have to face an election.

The Government complied with the Act to the extent of posting to the EU an unsigned photocopy of the letter in the Act, along with a letter of its own which says in effect that it does not want an extension.

The EU is an arrangement made between Governments, not an arrangement made by Parliaments. There was no European Parliament while Governments were making the functional arrangements that became the EU.

The Spanish Government has many internal discontents, and it is faced with a democratically-based national rebellion which it is treating as Britain treated the Irish democratic rebellion in 1919. The EU does not interfere. If it did, it would be undermining itself. But it is interfering in British politics. It has allowed itself to be drawn into British politics by putting a Parliamentary majority which refuses to govern on a par with the Government which the Parliamentary majority opposes but refuses to bring down. It is treating the British state as being under a dual system of authority, and being without a Government.

Bobby McDonagh, former Irish Ambassador to the UK and the EU, advocates treating the UK as being under dual authority—which of course undermines the Government's authority. (*Who Should The EU Deal With*, *Irish Times* Oct. 24). He says that the unsigned letter written by Benn and passed on to the EU, along with Government letters, was a valid request by the Prime Minister for an extension, "whether he likes it or not". The implication of that is that the Parliamentary majority which refuses to govern is the authority with which the EU should deal. But he backs away from that conclusion by saying "the current blockage at Westminster obfuscates" the matter and presents the EU with a dilemma.

The EU has chosen to face itself with a dilemma by recognising a non-governing

body as being a body it must deal with, along with dealing with the nominal Government. He says:

“The answer to this dilemma must surely be for the EU to deal with Britain’s democracy in all its complexity by recognising the House of Commons has constrained the prime minister to request an extension.”

The answer to the dilemma is to intensify it!

Parliament, without significant dissent, organised a referendum so that the electorate as a whole could decide by direct vote, instead of through constituency elections, whether the state should remain in the EU or leave it. The supporters of remaining in the EU, which included the main body of the Government, told the voters that leaving the EU would be bad for the country economically. The supporters of leaving the EU said that the most important thing about leaving would be the restoration of national sovereignty, that the economic consequences could be dealt with, and that economic opportunity would follow.

The Prime Minister who called the referendum refused to undertake implementation of the decision. The new Prime Minister called an election, in which both parties undertook to implement the referendum result. The electoral contest, therefore, was not between Leavers and Remainers. But, in the new Parliament, it turned out that a majority of MPs were covert Remainers and they set about preventing the implementation of the Referendum decision. Their justification in the first instance was that the electorate had been misled by the Leavers and therefore did not know what they were voting for—as if the Leavers had been the Government and had not allowed the Remain case to be put!

The next Remain argument was that the Referendum imposed no obligation on Parliament to implement its decision because it was no more than an advisory opinion poll. This case was put by Benn, but almost *sotto voce*.

Latent in this argument was the view, held by Parliament through most of its existence, that the people were unfit to decide matters of state. At best they could be trusted to choose between two parties which were in basic agreement with each other. But the populace had irresponsibly been given the power to decide a fundamental matter of state. It had made a wayward decision. And now it was up to Parliament to save the people from the consequences of the decision they continued on page 4

Why Tory MPs Were Expelled For Voting Against The British Government

Criticism has been made of Prime Minister Boris Johnson’s expulsion of Tory MPs who voted against the Government. It has been pointed out that Johnson himself had done so in the past. However, I agree with the statement in *The Battle Of Brexit Intensifies* (Dave Alvey, October *Irish Political Review*) that the vote by some Conservative MPs to take control of business away from the Government was different in kind from earlier votes by Conservative MPs against May’s Withdrawal Agreement.

Nevertheless, it must be said that the new Government never had a working majority, even with DUP support—and, because of the Fixed-Term Parliament Act, the Prime Minister didn’t have a solution to that problem, namely, calling a General Election. The Fixed-term Parliament Act should be repealed so that a Prime Minister again has the power to call a General Election at his sole discretion.

This removal of Prime Ministerial power has also reduced a Prime Minister’s ability to impose discipline on his party and get Government business through the House of Commons—because he can no longer make important votes a matter of Confidence and threaten to call a General Election.

(As I understand it, the *Fixed-term Parliament Act* was a LibDem demand, enacted by the Cameron Coalition Government to prevent David Cameron collapsing the Coalition Government unilaterally.)

David Morrison

Brexit And British Labour Party Policy

Readers may have followed the recent UK Labour Party 2019 conference and felt puzzled. The 2019 conference decided to fight the next general election with the promise of negotiating a new Brexit deal with Europe and then putting that deal to the British people in a 2nd referendum but without any Party recommendation on how the people should vote. Instead it will be left up to individual Labour MPs to argue for a Remain or Leave with a deal as they see fit.

Why has Labour settled on this policy? The answer lies in the numbers.

There are 650 seats in the UK Parliament. Only 649 are contested since the speaker’s seat is never contested. An analysis of the 2016 Referendum result shows that 409 of the 649 constituencies voted to Leave Europe while only 240 votes to Remain.

In the 2017 general election Labour won 262 constituencies but 160 of those seats were won in constituencies that voted Leave in the Brexit Referendum. So some 61% of Labour MPs are sitting in Leave constituencies while some 39% are in Remain constituencies. If Labour argued for Remain in a second Referendum they would likely lose many of seats in Leave constituencies thus ending the possibility of a Corbyn government with socialist policies. In contrast with Labour, some 74% of Tory seats are in Leave constituencies.

Although the majority of Labour’s MPs are from Leave constituencies, the majority of Labour’s members are from Remain constituencies. Corbyn wants also to keep them onside. And of course he has 102 MPs in Remain constituencies. Hence the commitment to holding a second Referendum with Remain as an option.

So Labour cannot come out unequivocally for Remain or Leave if it is to win a general election. However Labour did make a great strategic error in not letting May’s deal through Parliament since it would have resulted in a soft Brexit and we could now be discussing political policies around the NHS, Housing, Education etc. The moment was lost and Labour may be in ‘shallows and in misery’ for another 5 years.

Martha Seale

This letter first appeared in October *Labour Affairs*

Advice for EU

continued

had made when power was irresponsibly delegated to them. But that was a view that could not be stated openly, least of all by Benn's party—the Labour Party with its routine rhetoric of populism.

And Bobby McDonagh is of the opinion that the EU should help the anti-Government majority in Parliament to save the British people from themselves. He praises—

“the immense courage of those parliamentarians in Westminster who continue to seek to advance the UK's real long-term interests...”

And he says that the EU “cannot but have significant sympathy for the growing enthusiasm of British pro-Europeans”.

What grounds are there for supposing that the seeking of party-political advantage against the Tory Government by preventing it from implementing the Referendum decision has anything to do with pre-Europeanism? The explicit policy of ‘Remainers’ is “*Remain and Reform*”, which is the policy effectively set in motion by Thatcher.

John Bruton, when he saw British Europeanism at close quarters, was irritated by it. It was continuous pressure for Exemptions and ‘reforms’ in the British interest, with every concession instantly becoming part of the *status quo* and being in need of further improvement.

When the British populace was brought to think about Europe outside the routine of domestic party-politics, as it was in the recent European elections, it elected the party whose only policy is that it is anti-Europe.

The British are not European. They broke with Europe half a millennium ago, and made themselves into the greatest World Power ever seen by fostering a series of half-a-dozen balance-of-power wars in Europe. They put themselves in thrall to a powerful sense of destiny—which Professor Foster never cared to comment on in his capacity as an English historian. At various junctures they gambled everything on their Providential destiny, rather than reduce themselves to equality with an enemy by negotiating a settlement with an enemy.

It would be pleasant to think that they had shrugged off that sense of singularity by a free existential act of self-negation, but we see no sign of it.

And Bobby McDonagh is entirely mistaken that “*Each member of the European Council*” represents “*a democracy every bit as vibrant, if not as volatile, as the UK's*”.

All the EU states are post-1945 constructions, with the exception of Spain, Portugal and Ireland, which were neutral in Britain's last major act of mayhem in the world: World War 2. (And official Ireland is in denial about the De Valera era, which warded off domestic fascism and deterred Britain from forcing it into its World War, just as Spain is about the Franco regime which pulled the society together into national cohesion by forceful methods, refused to co-operate with German fascism, and made provision for transition to a democratic system when the national state was strong enough to bear it.)

British democracy is something else. The new-fangled European states are bewildered by it. Its political culture seems to consist of an extremist rhetoric of civil war, of revolution and reaction, of a conflict of antagonistic systems. The Government, from the viewpoint of the Opposition, is always intent on destroying the country. It seems to be a democracy barely surviving, on the brink of anarchy—and it could be argued that that is what authentic democracy must be. The European democracies, constructed in the shadow of the World War, and of the Soviet power which destroyed the Nazi system, appear *kindergarten* affairs by contrast.

In March 1914 the rhetorical antagonism went to the point of the Opposition raising its own Army to counter the Government's Army. A year later that Opposition joined the Government—and made no more apology for what it had done than the IRA did in 1998.

This English mode of politics by all-out antagonism always seems to be entirely in earnest, but always proves to have been no more than role-playing. And one of the things it can do is draw others into internal British affairs to their own disadvantage. Michael Collins was drawn in in 1921, and it obliged him to launch a spurious ‘Civil War’ in 1922. And Bobby McDonagh is now encouraging the EU to get drawn in.

A spokesman for the Scottish Nationalist Party, Brendan O'Neill, told *Sky News* on October 24th that they had “*got the Prime Minister in a cage*” and they would do nothing that risked letting him out. An election would let him out and therefore they would support the Labour

Party in preventing it, even though they were certain to win it in Scotland, and would not contest it anywhere else.

The Government in its cage seems to have decided to withdraw from the business of legislation because any Bill it introduces could be taken over by the majority Opposition and turned against itself. (Even though the Opposition has been given the right to introduce Bills independently of the Government, it still cannot enact Bills involving money, but can take over Government Bills.) The Government seems to be going on strike against a Parliament controlled by the Opposition in order to oblige the majority Opposition to call an Election.

Part of the Opposition case has been that Brexit violates the Good Friday Agreement, which is sacred. We could never see how it did that. But now it seems that the Taoiseach wants to discard the GFA by restoring majority rule in the North.

The essential thing done by the GFA was that it provided the conditions in which War could be ended. It ended the War by abolishing the principle of majority rule in the North, and giving constitutional effect to the fact that there were two peoples in the North. That fact had always been obvious but had been denied constitutionally. The new arrangements recognised that there were two electorates in the North with no political overlap between them.

That fact followed inevitably from the structures imposed by Britain in 1921. In 1998 Britain recognised the fact of two peoples and set up a kind of apartheid system for them, abolishing the majority political status of the majority community. Under the new arrangement, each took a piece of the devolved government independently of the other.

This was possible because all the main structures of State continued to be run by Whitehall. There was no general Devolved Government, only distant departments of government, which were chosen by Unionists and Nationalists in turn, in order of their electoral support.

It does not seem that Dublin ever understood what it agreed to in 1998. John Bruton recently said it was a system of reconciliation, when it was clearly the opposite: a recognition of division.

1998 provided for a veto by one side on proposals made by the other. This was then to the advantage of the Nationalists. At present the two peoples are close to parity and the Veto will soon be to the advantage of Unionists. And Varadkar, who played

no part in the War or the settlement, now suggests that the essential thing in the GFA should be discarded when it comes to the most divisive issue in the North!

The Unionists, with their 10 Westminster MPs, unexpectedly got the balance of power at Westminster in 2017. They installed the Tory Party in Government but voted against Teresa May's Deal with the EU. And now they have voted against Johnson's Deal and regret having voted against May's, and are coming to think that defeating Brexit gives them the best chance of maintaining the Border.

It has not yet clicked with them that their 1921 agreement to operate a Six County system cut off from British politics isolated them and made them incomprehensible within British politics. They might possibly have rectified that situation, when we suggested it almost fifty years ago, before the IRA had fought the War to a successful conclusion that gave it Constitutional standing with far-reaching effect on the spirit of the Nationalist community.

Another EU Matter

continued

The job of the Commission was the create a new European *demos* as the essential basis for a new state and this was a delicate long-term task, as the existing democratic national *demoi* were not going to disappear without good reason in the absence of a credible and sustainable alternative. The Commission was very successful in its mundane work and a European polity began to take shape. The natural tension and conflicts that inevitably existed between it and the Member States were handled very well. So well and so successful did the Union become, that it attracted new Members, including the UK—that had done its level best to prevent it coming into existence in the first instance by setting up an alternative, EFTA, to stymie it. But the UK had later to decide that if you can't beat them you had better join them.

Later, the directly elected EU Parliament came into existence in 1979 because in this age of democracy any political institution has to be seen to have the trappings of democracy. This Parliament existed in parallel to the Commission and there was no organic link between the two. It was like

a fifth wheel and a Johnny-come-lately to the project in hand.

As a Parliament worthy of the name, it lacked some basic elements—it was not based on a European *demos* as that had not come into existence and Parliaments cannot create such a thing. It can represent and reflect them when they have been created—which the Commission was successfully doing by sheer hard work but was nowhere near completion.

The Parliament did not initiate legislation, nor did it have an Executive. There was therefore no Government party and no Opposition party and it could not call an election of itself. It was a classic talking shop and nothing else and had/has two well-appointed alternating locations to do its talking.

After being set up, Parliament had to find something to do. Its first real interaction with the Commission was in 1999 when it censured the Commission for so-called Corruption and sapped its moral authority, its only source of power—all led by Pat Cox, leader of the European Liberals—to the sycophantic applause of all Irish commentators. It was a power struggle, which the Commission lost: and it has never recovered from it. Yet Ireland was delighted as 'our man' had punched above his weight!

The Parliament was then given *co-determination* rights—co-authority—with the Commission in crucial areas and now it is on the verge of controlling the Commission itself. It is acquiring more power without acquiring any corresponding responsibility—the sure recipe for anarchy. It can propose but does not have to dispose.

Von der Leyen was chosen from nowhere to be President. She was the lowest common denominator for President. Her strategy as President of the Commission is to satisfy prevailing fashions and forces in the Parliament. She wants a gender balance in the Commissioners nominated by the Member States and, who knows, this demand could be extended to other human categories—colour, LGBT, age, etc.

Crucially this qualification on candidates challenges the rights of the Member States to nominate their best choice for the Commission's work. This weakens a crucial, long-standing link in the EU structure, and that will lessen the Member States' commitment to the Commission.

The policies and abilities for the job in hand will become secondary considerations in nominating Commissioners. Respect for the Commission will thereby lessen among Member States.

Her second more crucial policy proposal, to ensure the growing power and authority of the parliament, was to "*support a right of initiative for the European Parliament*". Such a practice would be the death knell for the Commission's crucial role in the European Project, as it could remove its basic focus and source of authority in the EU. Up to now, only the Commission has initiated legislation.

Parliament has already displayed its muscle against the Commission by rejecting some nominated Commissioners; and it reminds the Commission that it can reject the whole lot if it so decides—which is a power they have given themselves. Parliament is saying in effect that it can control the Commission if it so wishes. The Parliament is no doubt inspired by the 'Mother of Parliaments' at the moment, which has taken control of the House of Commons from the Government.

Whereas that is a temporary state of affairs in Westminster—Government will reassert itself there—it could become a permanent state of affairs in the EU if Parliament pushes its luck and takes control of Commission business. After all, there is no EU Government as such to assert itself and the Commission cannot recreate itself. Only the Member States can do that. The text books don't cater for the unique situation in the EU—they always deal with yesterday's settled issues.

Then there would be a conflict directly with the Member State Governments of the EU and they will certainly prevail by asserting themselves and their authority against the European Parliament: and both the Parliament and the Commission will be the losers. It will be a conflict between two democratic forces—a real one represented by the Member States and a manufactured one represented by the Parliament.

The result will inevitably be an inter-governmental arrangement in Europe but not an EU. It is an uncomfortable fact but there can be too much democracy in certain political situations!

Jack Lane

LEST WE FORGET (11)

THE FOLLOWING ARE ACTS OF AGGRESSION COMMITTED IN IRELAND BY THE MILITARY AND POLICE OF THE USURPING ENGLISH GOVERNMENT - AS REPORTED IN THE DAILY PRESS, FOR THE WEEK ENDING NOVEMBER 22nd, 1919.

Date:- November:-	17th	18th	19th	20th	21st	22nd	Total.
Raids:-	1	82	13	33	28	3	160.
Arrests:-	4	7	2	1	9	10	33.
Sentences:-	12	-	-	-	3	3	18.
Proclamations & Suppressions	3	-	-	-	-	-	3.
Courtmartials:-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2.
Armed Assaults:-	2	1	1	-	-	-	4.
Daily Totals:-	22	90	16	36	40	16	220.

The Sentences passed on political offenders in the above six days totalled seven years, seven months, and two weeks.

=====

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17th, 1919.

Raids:-

Armed police raided the offices of the “Clare Champion” a weekly paper published at Ennis, and carried away type and other property.

Arrests:-

Mr. Martin Thornton, Irish Language teacher, and Mr. Patrick Hohan, both of Tucker Street, Castlebar, were arrested on a charge of sedition. Mr. Leo Callaghan was arrested at Mallow, Co. Cork, on a charge of participating in an endeavour to obtain arms on a charge of illegal assembly.

Sentences:-

Mr. Patrick J. O’Brien of Kells, Co. Meath was sentenced by courtmartial to imprisonment for one year and six months on a charge of possessing ammunition. Messrs. Martin, Thornton and Patrick Hohan, above mentioned were tried by “Crimes Court” and each sentenced to two months’ imprisonment. Thornton on a charge of reciting at a concert and the latter on a charge of singing a patriotic ballad: “The Dublin Brigade”. Mr. Michael Costello, above mentioned, was sentenced to two weeks imprisonment on a charge of “unlawful assembly”. The police witnesses declared that the unlawful assembly consisted in singing a song while passing the police. At Nenagh eight young men named Clery, Loughnane, Ahern, Herbert, Carroll, Kelly and Greene, were each sentenced to six months’ imprisonment for “unlawful assembly” and endeavouring to obtain arms. All the prisoners mentioned as sentenced in this list refused to recognise the right to try them of the Courts before which they were brought.

Suppressions & Proclamations:-

At Thurles, Co. Tipperary, the usual weekly market was suppressed by fully armed police and military who occupied the market place and prevented country people from offering their produce for sale. Two other fairs in the District were in the same manner suppressed.

Armed Assault:-

At Strabane, Co. Donegal, the people who had gathered in the town on the occasion of the half-yearly fair, showed sympathy

to a political prisoner who had just been arrested. They were immediately set upon by a large body of police who beat men, women and children with the butt-ends of their rifles. Many were seriously injured. At Kilcommin, Co. Tipperary, a small fair was in progress when it was discovered by a flying column of military and police. Those attending the fair were dispersed by bayonet charges and the cattle were turned loose.

Militarism:-

The Daily Chronicle of this date says: - “Few people in England realise that a year after the armistice, civilians in Ireland are still being tried by courtmartials – a form of tribunal which had been unknown in Ireland for 120 years”.

=====

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18th, 1919.

Raids:-

Military and police fully armed raided and searched upwards of a score of private houses at Bantry, Co. Cork. At Dunmanway, Co. Cork, military in full trench kit and armed police, forced their way into the business premises of prominent Republicans. Some twelve houses were searched. Throughout the County of Sligo, military and police raided approximately fifty private houses.

Arrests:-

Dr. Doyle of Gurteen, Co. Sligo was arrested by armed police who previously in the day had fired into the car in which he was driving and wounded him. (See below). John and Patrick Kilcommins, Lisnagall, Patrick O’Neill, Rathbann, and Patrick Curley, Caltra, all of Co. Galway were arrested on a charge of “unlawful assembly”. Pádraig O’Dubhain, Irish Teacher, Killarney was arrested at his hotel by armed police, and was handed over to the military. Mr. James Hunt, Gurteen, Co. Sligo was arrested on an unstated charge.

Armed Assaults:-

At Ballymote, Co. Sligo, armed police endeavoured to arrest a Sinn Fein organiser named Patrick O’Hegarty. Mr. O’Hegarty was driving a motor at the time. When the car, at the call of the police, did not stop, the police fired several volleys into it

and wounded the chauffeur named O'Grady and Dr. Doyle above mentioned. The police then followed the car and when it reached Gurteen, surrounded it and made another effort to arrest the occupants. The car again managed to break through the police cordon and was again fired into. The police defeated in their efforts at arrest attacked the crowd attracted by the firing an injured many of them.

=====

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19th, 1919.

Raids:-

Armed police raided the houses of Messrs. P. M'Carthy, C. Hallissey, T. Young, D. McCarthy, P. Ahern, T. O'Neill, J. Keefe all of Dunmanway, Co. Cork. At Caheragh, Co. Cork, armed military and police raided some half-dozen houses.

Arrests:-

Two brothers John and Wm. Breen of Gorey, Co. Wicklow, were arrested on a charge of endeavouring to obtain arms.

Armed assaults:-

At Nenagh, Co. Tipperary, the townsfolk held a public welcome for the two brothers John and Wm. O'Brien, who were released from Limerick Jail after twenty-two months' imprisonment, during which the English Law Agents made every effort to convict them of a murder of which they are clearly innocent. A meeting was held and as it was about peaceably, to disperse, the people were suddenly, and without provocation, attacked by armed police, beat down many men and women with the butt-ends of their rifles. During the night the police set upon many groups of people who gathered in the streets. Upwards of fifty persons were injured.

=====

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20th, 1919.

Raids:-

Armed police raided the National School rooms at Skibbereen, Co. Cork, where classes in the Irish language were being held. The residence of Mr. P. Hogan, Cratloe, Co. Clare was forcibly entered by police and searched. Police raided the premises of the Railway Station at Baltimore, Co. Kerry, and ransacked the rooms. At many places in and near Carrick-on-Suir, Co. Tipperary, large bodies of armed police tore down posters advertising the Irish National Loan.

Arrests:-

Mr. James Dolan, Member of the Irish Parliament for North Leitrim, was arrested on a charge of "seditious speaking".

Courtmartials:-

Mr. C. P. Lucy, Pembroke Street, Cork, was tried by courtmartial at the Royal Victoria Barracks, Cork, on a charge of possessing a revolver. Mr. Timothy Noonan, 17 Thomas St., Cork, was tried by courtmartial on a charge of possessing ammunition and explosives. Both prisoners refused to recognise the right of the court to try them stating that the Irish people having set up their own Government were amenable to that Government only.

=====

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 21st, 1919.

Raids:-

At Gorey, Co. Wexford, armed police raided some twenty houses. Between three and four o'clock a.m. armed military and police raided eight private houses in Tipperary town. Forcing their way into the residences, they ordered the occupants, women as well as men, out of their beds, and searched all the rooms.

Arrests:-

Mr. Daniel O'Sullivan, Tralee, was arrested on his way to business and handed over to the military authorities.

Eight men named: - P. Moore, J. Duffy, D. Carroll, C. Maloney, S. Foley, D. Kelly, C. Allen, and M. FitzPatrick, were arrested, Messrs. Moore, Fitzpatrick, and Kelly for advocating the Irish National Loan and the other five for giving a welcome to prisoners released on hunger strike from Mountjoy.

Sentences:-

Messrs. E. Donnelly, Tullyard House, Armagh, and Ed. Hughes, Tullyglushnevin in the same county, and Professor Liam O'Brien, M.A. of Galway University, were sentenced to terms of imprisonment for advocating the Irish National Loan: Mr. Donnelly and Professor O'Brien to three months each and Mr. E. Hughes (aged 70) to two months. During the hearing of the trial it was admitted by the police witnesses that on arresting Mr. Donnelly they threatened "to put a bullet through him" on the plea that that was "British Law in Ireland". At Letterbreen, Enniskillen, Mr. F. Leonard, a supporter of the English Government in Ireland, was fined 2/6 for being in possession of a revolver. At the same court James McManus, Drumane, also a supporter of the English Government was fined £1 for having a rifle and a sporting gun in his possession
NOTE: - See Monday's list: - Patrick J. O'Brien of Kells, County Meath, not a supporter of the English Government, was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment for possessing not a rifle or sporting gun or revolver, but ammunition only.

=====

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 22nd.

Raids:-

A large party of police raided the residence of a farmer at Ballycullane near Athy. The houses of P. Hogan and a neighbour were, at Kilfadda, Carrigaborig, raided in the early hours of the morning by armed police.

Arrests:-

Edward Malone of Dunbrin was arrested on a charge not stated. Nine men, whose names have not appeared in the press were arrested at Gorey, Co. Wexford on a charge of endeavouring to obtain arms.

Sentences:-

At Lisbellow, Thos, McManus, of Tattymacall, was sentenced to two months' imprisonment for having in his possession documents which if published might cause disaffection. At Drumshambo Mr. James M. Dolan, Member of the Irish Parliament for Leitrim, was sentenced to two months' imprisonment on a charge of publicly advising his constituents to subscribe to the Irish National Loan. Mr. William A. Clancy of Clifden, Connemara, recently tried by courtmartial at Galway on a charge of possessing arms and ammunition, was sentenced to nine months imprisonment.

THE FOLLOWING ARE ACTS OF AGGRESSION COMMITTED IN IRELAND BY THE MILITARY AND POLICE OF THE USURPING ENGLISH GOVERNMENT, AS REPORTED IN THE DAILY PRESS, FOR THE WEEK ENDING NOVEMBER 29th, 1919.

SUMMARY:-

November.	24th	25th	26th	27th	28th	29th	Total.
Raids:-	2	251	1	2	20	219	495.
Arrests:-	1	5	-	-	-	5	11.
Sentences:-	-	-	4	-	6	-	10.
Proclamations & Suppressions	3	4	2	2	-	1	12.
Armed Assaults:-	4	4	1	-	-	-	9.
Courtmartials:-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1.
Daily Totals:-	10	264	8	5	26	225	538.

The Sentences passed on political offenders in the six days above mentioned totalled seven years, seven months, and two weeks.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 24th, 1919.

Raids:-

Fully armed Soldiers and Police raided 44 Mountjoy Street, Dublin, the residence of Mr. Michael Collins, M.P., Minister of Finance in the National Government. The residence of Mr. M. J. O'Neill, Mount Bellew, Co. Galway, was raided by armed police.

Arrest:-

Mr. M. J. O'Neill, Mount Bellew, Co. Galway, who was recently released in broken health from Galway Jail, was re-arrested in bed although he was still under medical care.

Proclamations & Suppressions:-

A public procession arranged to be held at Limerick City in commemoration of the Manchester Martyrs, was proclaimed and suppressed by the English Military Authorities (see below). At Cork a similar procession was also proclaimed. A National Concert arranged to be held in the City Hall, Cork, was suppressed by Military and police, who occupied the building. A Prison Order was published decreeing that all political offenders will be treated as common criminals, and that any who protest against this treatment will be left to die.

Armed Assaults:-

At Limerick City police armed with rifles, bayonets, revolvers and batons attacked a public procession and dispersed it. Efforts by the processionists to continue their demonstration resulted in three hours of bitter fighting in the streets of the City. Many civilians including women and children were seriously injured. At Thurles, Co. Tipperary, two men who had just arrived on the night train from Dublin were questioned by armed police. Upon refusing to answer they were fired upon. They succeeded in making off, but the police fired several volleys after them, wounding, it is stated, one man seriously. As Derry City armed military and police attacked a large body of civilians, charging them with fixed bayonets. At Gorey, Co. Wexford armed police attacked a crowd who were cheering a political prisoner who was being removed to Waterford Jail.

Secret Trials:-

At Gorey police barracks when John Breen of that town was put upon his trial for endeavouring to obtain arms the Press and the public were excluded from the trial.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 25th, 1919.

Raids:-

Armed police in large numbers raided the residence of Mr. E. Corbett of Croughwell, Gort, Co. Galway. Mr. Corbett was recently released from Maryborough Jail in broken health. Military and police in full war-armament raided over 200 houses in County Tipperary. They were accompanied on

their raids by aeroplanes and armoured cars. In the town of Macroom, Co. Cork, and in the out-lying districts, military and police raided upwards of fifty houses.

Arrests:-

Mr. Bernard Halligan, Auditor, was arrested at Dundalk Station and removed under heavy escort to Belfast Jail. The charge has not been stated. Four men whose names have not been published were arrested at Limerick City for taking part in a proclaimed procession in honour of the Manchester Martyrs.

Proclamations and Suppressions:-

At Kilmallock, Co. Limerick, public demonstrations in memory of the Manchester Martyrs were proclaimed. Military and police in full equipment occupied the town of Bantry and prohibited the holding of a public procession. A similar procession was suppressed in Tipperary Town where military with fixed bayonets occupied the principal streets. In Youghal, Co. Cork, local public bodies were notified by the police that no public demonstrations would be permitted.

Armed Assaults:-

At Limerick City the armed police in dispersing a national procession drove a section of the processionists into St. John's Temperance Club. The police then followed in and beat unmercifully those who had taken refuge in the Club. At Fermoy, Co. Cork, the troops again broke barracks and wrecked many of the principal shops. A Motor car returning from a Republican meeting at Killeshandra, was held up by armed police and the occupants overpowered and searched. At Nenagh, Co. Tipperary armed police forced their way into a local dance-hall and dispersed those who were giving a farewell entertainment to Mr. John Hackett who was leaving for America. The police explained their action by saying that no permit had been given by the Military for the holding of the entertainment.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 26th, 1919.

Raids:-

A large body of armed police raided the City Hall at Limerick and took possession of it.

Sentences:-

Mr. Noel Lemass of Capel Street, Dublin, was sentenced by Courtmartial held in Dublin on 10th November to one year's imprisonment with hard labour for illegal drilling and for having ammunition in his possession. By the same Courtmartial Mr. William Troy of Cabinteely Co. Dublin and Mr. Thomas Moran also of Cabinteely were each sentenced to six months imprisonment, with hard labour, for illegal drilling and the possession of firearms. John Hannon of Ballymote, Co. Sligo, was sent to prison for one month to await trial on a charge of unlawful assembly.

Proclamations and Suppressions:-

A session of the Sinn Fein Arbitration Court at Limerick City was proclaimed and suppressed by the police. A Meeting at Limerick City of the Industrial Commission set on foot by the Irish National Government was proclaimed by Order of the English Military Authorities in Ireland.

Armed Assaults:-

A protest has been made by prominent citizens of Limerick against the brutality of the police who in dispersing the recent public demonstrations "entered" (so the protest says) "the rooms of St. John's Temperance Society, assaulted members and smashed pictures, gas fittings and other articles, although none of the members of the Society had anything to do with the stone-throwing by some juveniles". At Fenor, Co. Waterford, the appearance of military and police as strike-breakers in a local trade-union dispute led to a conflict between the armed forces and the civilians in which upwards of a score of the latter received serious injuries. The police charged repeatedly with fixed bayonets.

Militarism:-

The recent proclamation by the military authorities that all motor drivers and owners must have permits for their cars has led to the decision of the Motor Drivers' Trade Union not to apply for such permits. The police officials interviewed by the Daily Press now state that drivers will be challenged to stop. If they do not do so they will be fired upon. "In the event of drivers refusing to stop" declares one police official "we have power to shoot and shoot we must".

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 27th, 1919.

Raids:-

Large bodies of war-equipped Military and Police raided 76 Harcourt Street, Dublin, the Headquarters of the National Government. At the same time other bodies of troops and police raided 6 Harcourt Street, the Headquarters of the Sinn Fein Organisation. The raiders at both places held warrants for the arrest of Republican Members of Parliament, who, however, were not on either premises.

Proclamation and Suppressions:-

The Usurping Government in Ireland has issued a proclamation suppressing all National Organisations all over Ireland. The Organisations which come under the terms of the Proclamation are:- The Sinn Fein Organisation. The Sinn Fein Clubs. The Irish Volunteers. The Cumann na mBan (Irish Women's League). The Gaelic League (a league for the revival of the Irish language.) This proclamation is signed by four members of the Privy Council, three of whom were ardent supporters of the threatened Carsonite rebellion. The fourth signatory is best known for his bitter attack upon the Irish Clergy in Co. Meath. At Thurles, Co. Tipperary police entered the weighing yard of the Cattle Market and dispersed owners and stock, the holding of Fairs being prohibited by the English military authorities in that and many other districts.

Court-martial:-

Rev. Fr. O'Donnell, Australian Chaplain, was court-martialled at Westminster, London, on a charge of speaking seditiously to an acquaintance at the Imperial Hotel, Killarney. The evidence disclosed that Capt. O'Donnell's conversation was taken down by an English Officer at the Hotel. His arrest was immediately ordered and he was kept in a filthy cell and deprived of all intercourse even with his legal advisers. Capt.

O'Donnell denied that he ever used the words written down by the English agent. He was subsequently acquitted.

Provocation:-

The London Times commenting upon the suppression of Sinn Fein all over Ireland sees in it an effort to force the Irish people into violence, and says:- "It is inconceivable that any responsible members of Parliament or politicians would deliberately advocate the provocation of an outbreak in Ireland, in the hope that Home Rule might thus be drowned in a sea of blood and repression, but we fear there are some who would contemplate a rebellion in Ireland at this time with thoughtless equanimity".

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 28th, 1919.

Raids:-

Mr. Conor A. Maguire, M.A., LL.D., Solicitor of Claremorris, was sent to jail for one month for having solicited contributions to the Irish National Loan. Messrs. Patrick Moore, Michael Fitzpatrick, and David Kelly were at Tipperary Town sentenced to one month's imprisonment with hard labour, and two further months for refusing to give bail. The offence for which they were sentenced consisted in posting advertisements for the Irish National Loan. At the same Court, Messrs. Cors. Moloney (Son of Mr. P. Moloney Republican M.P.) and John Duffy were sent to jail for one month on a charge of unlawful assembly. The unlawful assembly consisted in joining in a public welcome given to Tipperary prisoners who had been released after six days hunger-strike, from Mountjoy Jail, Dublin.

Provocation:-

The London "Daily News" organ of the Liberal Party in England, commenting upon the suppression of Sinn Fein all over Ireland says:- "No action more provocative and at the same time more futile has been taken since Forster endeavoured by like methods to destroy the Land League It means presumably more British troops for Ireland, more disturbance, more bloodshed The Government policy towards Ireland is not merely madness - it is madness charged to the full with the promise of tragedy."

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29th, 1919.

Raids:-

Armed police raided a train at Thurles, Co. Tipperary, searching all carriages. At 4 a.m. armed police and military forced their way into the house of Mr. Ml. O'Connell, Main Street, Thurles, and ordered the inmates, men and women, out of bed. They searched the premises minutely. All private correspondence found in the house was read. At Youghal, Co. Cork, armed police raided over a dozen houses. Police fully armed raided several houses at Newry. At Fenor, Kilmacthomas, Knockaderry, Amber Hill, and Kilmeadon, all in Co. Waterford, large bodies of troops and police raided upwards of two hundred labourers' houses.

Proclamation:-

A meeting arranged to be held in the Sinn Fein Hall, Omagh, Co. Tyrone, and at which Mr. Arthur Griffith, acting-President of the Irish Republic, was to speak, was suppressed by police and military.

Confiscation:-

The police raided the premises of the Mineral Water Co. at Newry, and confiscated a large parcel of literature dealing with the Irish National Loan.

"There are in the country probably about 5,000 absolutely unbilletable persons. They are unbilletable owing to personal habits which are sub-human. Camps or institutions under suitable supervision must be instituted for these".

Richard Dawson Bates, Northern Ireland Minister of Home Affairs, on refugees from the Belfast Blitz. 5th May 1941.

"I have been working nineteen years in Belfast and I never saw the like of them before. If something is not done now to remedy this rank inequality there will be a revolution after the war."

The Moderator of the Presbyterian Church General Assembly in Belfast, speaking of the Blitz refugees 3rd June 1941.

Clair Wills – Part 13

In her monumental work *Lovers and Strangers: An Immigrant History of Post-War Britain*, Clair Wills divides her book into chapters with such diverse titles as 'Eastenders', 'Dancers', 'Troublemakers', 'Broadcasters', 'Drinkers' et cetera because she wants textual space to narrate her history. She is quite specific about this and uses what "the West Indian novelist and migrant George Lamming called alternative 'ways of seeing'..." (Lamming's phrase) but this approach seems to have confused some of her reviewers.

Certainly, Roy Foster in his Irish Times review, 9th September 2017, sees her book as being

"organised by ironic occupational criteria (Carers, Troublemakers, Bachelors, Scroungers and so on) rather than by origin or *ethnikos*: this enables the experience of Poles, West Indians, Bengalis, Irish and Cypriots to be mingled and mapped against each other, rather in the manner of a teeming 19th century novel".

But here Foster contradicts himself: because the second part of this sentence is all about the origin—the national identity—and that is everything to Wills's huge endeavour. The immigrants came from the farthest parts of the Empire and war-splintered Europe and, of course, Ireland.

As Wills states:

"Recovering these stories, the local narratives which have become buried under the larger political history, has involved a process of excavation combined with something more like 'misreading', or 'reading from the inside out'. As far as

possible I have tried to narrate the history of migrants' and refugees' encounters with Britain through the experience of the immigrants themselves, and through contemporary accounts of that experience: contemporary interviews, articles and letters in the local and community press; manifestos; short stories; autobiographies; political essays; as well as oral poetry and folk songs ranging from Irish ballads to Trinidadian calypso, Punjabi *qisse* and bhangra lyrics."

Wills is right to state that she uses the voices of some immigrant communities more often than the others. That is because, quite simply, the

"first wave of post-war Caribbean migration included significant numbers of well-educated men and women, many on university scholarships, who were eager to turn their hands to all sorts of writing, whether for local papers, the Caribbean programmes on the BBC World Service or for more political and intellectual movements; the Caribbean Artists Movement, *New Left Review*, or the movement for a West Indian Federation."

The voices of Stuart Hall, V.S. Naipaul and George Lamming therefore appear throughout her analysis, which I think ends up giving it a rather slanted viewpoint. As Wills acknowledges: "*Polish, Cypriot, Italian or Maltese migrants lacked any comparable cultural scene*". And then of course there were the Irish. But Wills also wants to use alongside the writings of the immigrants, the official accounts which include: "the records of police constabularies investigating 'coloured' crime, reports of interracial tension inside government hostels, statements by police and the judiciary

on the Notting Hill riots, parliamentary debates on immigration and race relations legislation, ethnographic and sociological surveys of attitudes to race in relation to the housing crises, and employment."

When Wills mines the official documentation, she is rather naively, in my opinion, disturbed to see that the accounts show an "us" discussing "them". But surely, when Government Agencies are trying to see what the issues are in housing, employment, crime, interracial tensions, etc., they have to lay out the problems first if they have any hope of finding solutions. Because Wills finds problems with this "*official approach*", she wants to try something different and her solution is this:

"In attempting to do justice to the migrants' post-war present, I have shaped this history around various characters—the lover, the scrounger, the troublemaker, the broadcaster, the bachelor, the dancer—which I try to interpret from both sides from the perspective of the ordinary British person looking from outside in, and from that of the ordinary migrant, looking from inside out. My cast of characters is by no means comprehensive. Many facets of migrants' professional, religious and domestic lives are touched on only lightly here. But I offer this shifting kaleidoscope as a counterbalance to the tendency to see the history of post-war immigration in monochrome, as primarily a story of the relationship between black and white".

Wills credits the "*wonderful opening passage*" of Muriel Spark's novel *The Girl of Slender Means* as helping her "*whenever I lost the thread*" of her narrative because of the former's portrayal "*of the poverty and destruction of post-war London*". This brings us to the following statement by Wills which I found utterly unbelievable.

"This never failed to remind me of two things; first that, cushioned or not by wealth, everyone experienced the same post-war Britain; *everyone* was us in that present of the 1940s and 1950s..." (The italics are by Wills.)

This assertion is absolutely ridiculous—how could the wealth of those who had it—and, in the words of one politician, "*never had it so good*" compare in any way with those of the migrants, especially the labouring migrants whose poverty and working/living conditions were so brutalising, as Wills herself latter on attests to.

The second thing that Wills refers to is —

“that dismantling the wall between inside and outside, although it may make unusual demands on the mind’s eye, can bring into focus a new understanding of the vernacular... The story is not of immigrants as ‘dark strangers’, or, still less, ‘bloody foreigners’, but of the lives lived and imagined by immigrants themselves. Put bluntly, not how did they appear to the British but what did the British, those white strangers, look like to them.”

But weren't a lot of the migrants white themselves? So here there is a sense of Wills eye wandering back to the 'coloured' perspective? What the West Indian writer George Lamming called “*alternate ways of seeing*”—which Wills had already spoken of as having given her a way to navigate the history she wants to tell. Wills fatefully uses the voice of V.S. Naipaul and what he calls “*the human story*”. She surely knows enough about Naipaul not to quote him as being helpful to the immigrant voice—after all the authorized biography of him ‘*The World is What it Is*’ by Patrick French was published in 2008, and knowledge that had been widely spread within the international literary community who knew Naipaul—suddenly became mainstream. French was “*undeceived*” by his subject—not that Naipaul cared. He had his knighthood, his Nobel Prize, his pots of money and plenty of women.

“Bigoted, arrogant, vicious, racist, a woman beating misogynist and sado-masochist—the Nobel laureate Sir VS. Naipaul has not turned a hair since this uniquely ugly list of traits was laid bare about him some months ago. But then, again, it was he who allowed the descriptions of himself to be detailed by his authorised biographer ...”

Such is the opening sentence to a review of the book by Geoffrey Levy while other reviewers like the writer Craig Brown turns to Naipaul’s racism, writing:

"At one point, he" (Naipaul) "tried saving time by writing off entire populations in one go. Tibetans are 'the dirtiest people in the world', Argentines 'vain and aggressive', Americans 'egomaniacs', Spaniards 'the most immoral people I have known', Pakistanis 'dreadful people', the British lower classes 'an absolute menace, animals eating far more than they deserve' and so on."

Brown also reflects on how Naipaul dismissed women writers in particular—the novels of Jane Austin were “*mere gossip*”. He then went on to dismiss “*Hardy, James, Eliot, Conrad and indeed most English novelists and all the French ones*”. Brown’s final summing up is succinct:

“His” (Naipaul) “first editor found herself going off Naipaul’s novels the more she got to know the man who wrote them. As his father suspected, it is an empty sort of truth that contains no kindness, no gentleness, no love for one’s fellow man.”

And Brown suspects that

"like it or not, this biography will change the way we read Naipaul’s books, and for the worse..."

He is right and in these days of female empowerment - the likes of Naipaul will serve to show us all how far we had, and still have, to travel, to get away from the infected poisons of the past.

So how come Clair Wills comes to use uncritically the voice of Sir V.S. Naipaul? After all she does acknowledge that at age 17 his brilliance was spotted by the British Council and he got a scholarship from them to come to the UK to study at Oxford. He left Trinidad in 1950 “*but he got to travel in some comfort*”. He got “*on a plane to New York (changing planes in Puerto Rico) and having spent a night in a hotel in New York, he took a liner to Southampton*”, the trip paid for by the Council.

Not for him the awfulness of the Windrush migrants’ experience which Wills lays bare in the following statement.

"After three weeks at sea, the ships themselves had become less-than-dignified containers of human hopes and desires: victims of weeks of drunkenness, gambling, seasickness, or plain weariness swayed around the vessels now stinking of sweat, urine and vomit. None of this is visible in the photographs of West Indians arriving in Tilbury, Southampton or Waterloo in the 1950s. They have saved their smartest clothes for the moment of arrival—determined to make an impression, on the relatives come to meet them and on ‘England’ in general."

Wills is very good in her analysis of “*the shock of arrival*”, both for the migrants and the British officials from various agencies there to process them. And that is because she uses the authentic voice of George Lamming, who writes about the amazement of officials who could not believe that those embarking had no funds other than the clothes they stood up in and seemed intent that the good intentions of the “*mother country*” would see them through. This kind of ‘magical thinking’ to use Joan Didion’s phrase from another experience, soon exasperated the best intentions of both migrant and host.

The cold weather was a shock but they had been warned about that, but it was another aspect altogether that transfixed the inward-bound crowds. And that was the sight of working class Britons going about their usual jobs.

"The vast majority of the new arrivals modelled their idea of British people on the colonial officials and missionaries they had encountered in the Caribbean. They had met no others. A number of women, headed for nursing training, recall the shock of ‘seeing ordinary white people doing ordinary work. You were sort of made to believe that they lived in a more aristocratic way, that they didn’t clean floors and they didn’t sweep streets’."

Again George Lamming was spot on in his analysis as Wills records:

"The shock of white hands doing ‘nigger work’ as Lamming put it, was the beginning of learning that whiteness in Britain was not a social category—defining a hierarchy of class and power, as it did in Jamaica, Trinidad and Barbados—but a political one, defining those who belonged and those who did not. ‘One doesn’t realise one is coloured until one comes into white society; I became black in London, not in Kingston... Writing in 1960, after ten years’ experience of living in London, Lamming reflected that ‘most West Indians of my generation were born in England. They were born in their twenties, to a new collective consciousness of themselves as Caribbean, and as Black, and these new political identities were to shape the immigrant experience in the years to come’."

Thus the migrant experience shocked the newcomers into a ‘race consciousness’ and that went for the people of the ‘mother country’ too. The seismic shocks of later racial strife were being laid down, and would eventually explode into all out riots. Some commentators believed it could have turned out all so differently, if only English officials had prepped the locals more and damped the expectations of the newcomers to more achievable levels. But I contend that is mere daydreaming as Britain’s shattered war economy and declining Empire reach was the beginning of a new epoch that would end up requiring quite different solutions. Getting by—would only last for a very temporary period.

Julianne Herlihy ©

To be continued

Budget 2020

continued

The Housing Crisis

So, arising from the Budget, is a lowering of expectations regarding the perennial problems of health, housing and cost overruns in infrastructure projects to become the order of the day? It might be argued that Brophy, being an advisor, does not reflect Government or even civil service thinking but experience and the evidence of recent media discussions suggest otherwise.

A discussion on The Late Debate programme on RTE Radio (9 October) confirmed that the present Fine Gael Government has run out of sticking plaster ideas on the housing crisis. The panel comprised Eoin O'Broin of Sinn Fein, Richard Boyd Barrett of People Before Profit, Fine Gael Senator Michelle Mulhearn, Fianna Fail Councillor Malcolm Byrne, and John Downey from the Irish Independent. As the political reps made their points both the presenter, Katie Hannon, and John Downing interjected that the excuses being offered by Mulhearn on behalf of the Government had been made too often over too long a period to have credibility. Eoin O'Broin's point that Rebuilding Ireland, the Government's long-term housing strategy, had failed, simply could not be answered.

Up against the ropes Senator Mulhearn sought to divert attention from the Government to the bodies that hold the statutory responsibility for providing social housing: the local Councils. This ruse, which Government spokespersons have used before, was vigorously disputed by Malcolm Byrne. There the matter rested until a letter was published in the Irish Times from Dermot Lacey, an experienced Labour member of Dublin City Council. Lacey argued:

"...it is only since responsibility for housing has been transferred to the National Housing Authority that our crisis has grown. An incomprehensible decision-making process, a pattern of destruction of local government powers, huge withdrawal of funding in good times and austerity years, and an ideological opposition to social and affordable home provision have been the hallmarks of national housing policy in recent years.

The Departments of Housing, Planning and Local Government and the Department of Public Expenditure and Reform are key obstacles to social and affordable housing in this country. Giving either

of them even more control would be a recipe for further chaos and condemn those on the housing list to decades more of inactivity" (IT, 12 October)

This hits the nail on the head. Over many years a pro-private sector mindset has been assiduously cultivated in the upper echelons of the public service, at both national and local levels. In a nutshell, the public sector has been made to adopt the anti-public sector bias of liberal ideology. As things stand, the private sector itself would be better served by an independent public service that provided adequate social and affordable housing, and a cost-effective health service. Commitments made in Budget speeches about addressing problems in the delivery of public services are becoming more threadbare with every passing year.

BREXIT PREPARATIONS

The Government was right to base Budget 2020 on an assumption that the Brexit negotiations would end in No Deal; such has been the likeliest outcome in recent months. The Brexit measures announced by Donohue also make sense, as Seamus Coffey of the Fiscal Advisory Council has stated. As outlined in the Minister's speech, Brexit preparations already in place include: enhanced physical capacity at the ports and airports (Michael Noonan as Finance Minister initiated that investment); training and supports to increase customs capacity; the recruitment of 750 extra staff in key areas; and a €600 million cheap loan fund for companies.

In 2020 a further €200 million will be allocated across a number of Departments and Agencies to increase staffing, upgrade infrastructure at ports and airports, and invest in relevant technology and facilities management. An additional expenditure of €650 million, combined with a contingency fund of €390 million, will be borrowed in response to a No Deal outcome. The purpose of the package will be to minimise the shock effects of Brexit by assisting "vulnerable but viable" enterprises. The expenditure excludes EU funding so further funding may be available from that source.

An anomaly has come to light regarding the ports: Rosslare technically forms part of the Fishguard and Rosslare Railways and Harbours Company, a 19th century joint venture company. It is now operated on a commercial basis as a division of Iarnród Éireann, but on the Welsh side Stena Line continues to be involved in the company. Wexford Fianna Fail TD James Browne has called on Minister for Trans-

port Shane Ross to resolve the ownership issue in advance of Brexit.

PUBLIC FINANCES

A notable achievement of the Fine Gael/Labour Coalition that came to power in early 2011 was the successful implementation of Fianna Fail Finance Minister Brian Lenihan's Four Year Plan for Economic Recovery. Restoring order to the public finances, an important objective of the plan, was realised within a few years while the Troika was overseeing the economy, and progress in that area has continued steadily: a surplus has been recorded in the Government accounts for this year and the high debt to Gross Domestic Production ratio is slowly reducing.

Given that record, it is not surprising that in his Budget speech Paschal Donohue should draw attention to the importance of financial rectitude. As a number of commentators have highlighted, however, there is a glaring problem in the way that Donohue has been managing the public finances, revolving around the doubling of the tax take from company profits.

What has happened is that international concerns about the tax avoidance activities of major digital companies has caused those companies to register their profits for tax purposes in countries like Ireland that have a low rate of Corporation Tax. In this way windfall corporation payments have flooded into the Irish public accounts.

The bonanza originates from a small number of large multi-national companies. As new OECD regulations take effect in the coming years, the bonanza will disappear. Economists reckon that a €6 billion hole in the Irish public finances will need to be plugged, through either public spending cuts, tax increases or a combination of both. The current Fine Gael Government has used these Corporation Tax receipts to fund overspends in health service and other public expenditure. So Paschal Donohue's self-plaudits regarding the Government's financial management ring hollow. In retrospect (always a comfortable vantage point!), he should have used the windfall to pay once-off bills or run down the public debt.

DECARBONISATION

The climate change agenda has moved up the order of political priority in the last year. The challenge is to devise strategies that reduce carbon emissions while protecting the livelihoods of workers and the interest of communities who stand to lose from decarbonisation.

The political representative who has been leading the way on this is not a Government Minister but the Fianna Fail TD for Offaly, Barry Cowan. Through the Confidence and Supply negotiations in advance of the Budget, Cowan has championed the concept of a 'Just Transition' as a means of adjusting to the climate change agenda. His request that a Just Transition Forum to be established in the Midlands to provide community feedback and buy-in on the disbursement of public funds phasing out peat production has been accepted through 'Confidence and Supply' (the formula ensuring Fianna Fail support for the Coalition on 'Confidence' and Budget votes).

Describing the Just Transition project as "a litmus test for how Ireland converts from a country that is highly dependent on fossil fuels to meet our carbon targets for 2030", he believes the project should be expanded outside of the Midlands area as required in coming years.

In general Fianna Fail takes a more progressive approach to fiscal policy than Fine Gael. Before the Confidence and Supply arrangement came into effect, the talk from Fine Gael sources was that fiscal expansion would be implemented on the basis of two thirds increased public spending and one third tax cuts. Fianna Fail used its influence to dissuade the Government from implementing tax cuts, still a sore point with Leo Varadkar, apparently.

Another politician unhappy with the Government's handling of the climate change agenda from the perspective of social equality is the co-leader of the Social Democrats, Roisin Shortall. In a letter to the Irish Times she was critical of that paper for editorialising about the protection of the most vulnerable sections of society from increases in carbon tax while making "no attempt to establish whether or not this was actually done" (IT, 15 October).

Shortall described the Budget as regressive, meaning that it affected those on lower incomes more adversely than those on higher incomes. Citing an Economic and Social Research Institute report, she argued that half of those on the lowest incomes don't receive fuel allowance, so the Government's €2 increase in that allowance will have limited effect.

The Budget will also have a regressive effect, in that the Minister for Finance has chosen not to increase the tax and USC (Universal Social Charge) bands; this will

push many workers who get pay increases in 2020 onto the higher rate of tax.

Budget 2020 was framed with a clear focus on Brexit and an eye to the impending General Election which is certain to be called before preparations for the next

Budget begin. The question therefore is: will the electorate judge the Government on its competence regarding Brexit or its biased passivity regarding everything else?

Dave Alvey

Toxin-laden Atmosphere Surrounds Climate Change Campaign

Climate change 'the most serious issue' for the majority of voters rang out the headline on top of the front page of *The Irish Times* for 16th October 2019. The headline was prompted by the results of a recent opinion poll. 54 percent of those questioned said they were prepared to reduce their standard of living to combat climate change. However, they proved most unenthusiastic about any specific way their living standard could be curtailed: by, for example, paying more for petrol or for diesel.

Such surveys, as always, contain their own internal biases. For instance, the public were not polled on the all-important question as to what extent they were prepared to doubt that climate change, such as it is, could be the result of human activity. There was no space in the spectrum of possible answers for such uncompromisingly dissident shades of opinion.

For the purposes of the survey such views were not presumed to exist.

PUBLIC MANIPULATED

The public is not just being manipulated by press headlines and articles and the way they are being framed. There are stories being pushed which appeal to the imagination and to the emotions. One especially is the story of the Swedish sixteen-year-old, Greta Thunberg. She has, we are led to believe, inspired a grass roots movement of her age group which seeks to move world leaders to action to save the world from the looming catastrophe of man-made climate change. She has addressed the United Nations.

Second-level school goers in their thousands have marched in protest across Europe in sympathy. Is this all a grassroots movement responding spontaneously to a perceived crisis? How is it that these demonstrations have been so well co-ordinated? Is it all the result of young people meeting up on internet sites like Face-book to co-ordinate, or could there be something more happening? Could all this have been orchestrated by powerful

influences working behind the scenes? Could this be a case of 'revolution' from above?

Strangely this 'grass-roots movement' has the backing of such powerful Establishment actors as The World Bank, the Bank of England and Goldman Sachs. Whatever could be afoot?

According to author and geopolitics commentator F. William Engdahl:

"Make no mistake. When the most influential multinational corporations, the world's largest institutional investors including BlackRock and Goldman Sachs, the UN, the World Bank, the Bank of England and other central banks of the BIS (Bank for International Settlements) line up behind the financing of a so-called green Agenda, call it Green New Deal or what, it is time to look behind the surface of public climate activist campaigns to the actual agenda. The picture that emerges is the attempted financial reorganization of the world economy using climate... - to convince us ordinary folk to make untold sacrifice to 'save our planet'..." (<https://journal-neo.org/2019/09/25/climate-and-the-money-trail/>)

PANIC BUTTONS

The situation is now described as a "climate emergency". Panic buttons have been pressed. Alarms screech. At such a fraught point of history, dissent cannot be countenanced. The position is just too grave. We do not have the time. We have to put up and shut up for our own good, before it is all over.

Things have become so bad that those supposed requisites of democracy; freedom of opinion and freedom of expression, have become superfluous, if not downright dangerous.

How grave does a situation have to become that the right to free and open discussion needs to be set aside? How bad do things have to be that the only valid response has to be one of panicked conformity? Who or what has the authority to tell us when such a situation has been reached?

But could it be this is one time when we really need to speak up and ask questions?

The campaign behind *Climate Change* has, to date, achieved an impressive level of societal regimentation. Dissenting opinion is almost completely absent from the readers' letters pages of contemporary newspapers. This is in contrast to even half a decade ago.

If we show any sign of stepping out of line we are abruptly told "The science is settled".

But just how settled is it?

Dr. Mototaka Nakamura, originally from Japan, received a Doctorate of Science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), and for nearly 25 years specialised in abnormal weather and climate change at prestigious institutions that included MIT, Georgia Institute of Technology, NASA, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, JAMSTEC and Duke University.

In his book *The Global Warming Hypothesis is an Unproven Hypothesis*, Dr Nakamura explains why he believes the data foundation underpinning establishment global warming science is "untrustworthy" (<https://electroverse.net/another-climate-scientist-with-impeccable-credentials-breaks-ranks/>).

EDITORIAL STANDARDS

Nir Shaviv is an Israeli astrophysicist and Chairman of Jerusalem's Hebrew University's Physics Department. He says that his research, and that of colleagues, suggests that rising CO2 levels play only a minor role in earth's climate compared to the influence of the sun and cosmic radiation. The level of heat given off by the sun waxes and wanes over time. This has an effect on the earth's climate patterns.

"Today we can demonstrate and prove the sun's effect on climate based on a wide range of evidence, from fossils that are hundreds of millions of years old to buoy readings to satellite altimetry data from the past few decades", Shaviv explained. "We also can reproduce and mimic atmospheric conditions in the laboratory to confirm the evidence... All of it shows the same thing, the bulk of climate change is caused by the sun via its impact on atmospheric charge, which means that most of the warming comes from nature—a freshman physics student can see this" (<https://electroverse.net/acclaimed-israeli-astrophysicist-suggests-that-the-sun-drives-earths-climate-not-co2/>)

An article outlining Shaviv's views, as

summarised briefly above, was posted on the internet site of Forbes magazine on August 9th last, . . . until it was taken down, a few hours later, for not complying with the magazines 'editorial standards'.

Politicians, journalists and scientists are under pressure to conform to their assigned role within the *Climate Change* agenda. However, the Internet presented the great hope of a world where there yet was free and open exchange of opinion.

This potential has been undermined in recent years as powerful interests have wrestled control over large parts of the World Wide Web. This has been especially true in regard to the Internet facilities normally in use among the general public: the user-maintained encyclopaedia *Wikipedia*, the search engine *Google*, and the social media platform *Facebook*. In the case of each, steps have been taken to sharply bias the information presented to unsuspecting online users in favour of the Establishment perspective. The online encyclopaedia, *Wikipedia*, naively trusted by most internet users is the worst offender.

ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT

The environmental movement, regrettably, has been co-opted into the global Establishment. It has become house-trained and acceptable to the Powers That Be. When it became clear that the up and coming world superpower, China, had plans to opt for nuclear reactors as its chief new means for electricity generation, there was no outcry. Opposition to the nuclear option for power generation has become so very 'last century' (<https://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/>

[current-and-future-generation/plans-for-new-reactors-worldwide.aspx](https://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/current-and-future-generation/plans-for-new-reactors-worldwide.aspx))

The current *Climate Change* frenzy must inevitably shape future trends across the globe. There will be less demand for the fossil fuels, oil and natural gas. As a result, the influence of countries profiting from their export will be curtailed, among them: Venezuela, Iran and Russia.

The nuclear power industry will (discreetly) prosper. More investment will be directed into renewable power generation technologies, such as wind, tidal, wave and solar, which will result in new discoveries making these more efficient. Perhaps new forms of motor engine will be brought to market which are not powered by petrol, diesel, gas or electric current. Financial instruments such as shares and bonds with a 'green' theme will increasingly be in demand and subject to speculative manipulation.

The notion of a global emergency provides a seductive pretext for the usurpation of power from nation states by international bodies such as the UN.

However, we cannot predict how the world will evolve. In a decade from now *Climate Change* may be viewed as paramount or, instead, it may be seen as a mostly forgotten passing fad.

TOTALITARIAN ATMOSPHERE

What is ominous is the lack of openness and transparency. People are being manipulated on many levels. There is politically an atmosphere whereby totalitarianism gradually manifests itself.

Tim O'Sullivan

Inscrutable Politics ! ?

Where in 'The Free World' could thousands of masked rioters repeatedly attack the police with weapons such as iron bars and not suffer a single death? And call on outside powers to come to their aid?

Londonderry? London? York? New York? Texas? Paris, France? Dublin?

The Hong Kong Police were originally modelled on the Royal Irish Constabulary and served the same masters in London. In the last decades of British rule they had a reputation for corruption. Britain's chief legacy in China was drug addiction. Opium, grown under British auspices in India was pushed at the point of a gun and the deployment of gunboat "diplomacy" on China, a crime not forgotten there. A few

years ago a British trade delegation arrived in China wearing Poppies—for "*Remembrance Day*". The Chinese Remembered and the delegation got up their noses. In my lifetime there were parks in Shanghai with notices barring dogs and Chinese. Recent protesters in Hong Kong carried Union Jacks. The Hong Kong Police have behaved with disciplined restraint in the circumstances.

Other spokespersons for the "pro-Democracy" demonstrators have called for help from the United States. At the height of the Cold War the US planned, to annihilate China with nuclear weapons if war broke out between the United States and Russia. That lunatic policy was abandoned after the then head of the U.S.

Marine Corps argued against it. China had no nuclear weapons at the time, nor was there much love lost between Soviet and Chinese leaders.

China in 1949 was an impoverished, insulted, abused and threatened country. Threats have not been abandoned, and dangerous zealots in the Henry Jackson Society such as Douglas Murray advocate "pre-emptive" nuclear strikes against Communist-ruled States. The cocaine-smuggling, rabidly anti-Irish, Michael Gove

is a mentor of Murray, and the most likely successor of Boris Johnson if the latter falls (or is pushed) under a bus.

Which is why I admire how China has made itself a rich country, free of famine and opium addiction, and prudently equipped to withstand threats from its external enemies, the canting hypocrisy of the Western media and the sleevy tendency of its domestic Quislings.

Congratulations, China!

Donal Kennedy

October Brexit Summary

A Minor Setback Before The UK Exit

The status of Brexit as of the Saturday sitting of the British House of Commons on 19th October is that the process will continue to be delayed by the deadlock within the British political system. At the sitting the Letwin Amendment passed by 322 to 306 votes. The Amendment stipulates that a final Commons vote approving Boris Johnson's Deal with the EU must be delayed pending the completion of the Deal's transposition into legislation.

This development represents an embarrassment for Johnson in that under the terms of the Benn Act, having failed to deliver a Deal by October 20th, he must apply for a further three month extension to the Article 50 negotiations, a course of action he had promised not to take. Ultimately, however, these delaying tactics from the Remainers are merely stoking up frustration within the UK electorate and within the EU-27.

THE OPPOSITION TO JOHNSON

The arithmetic behind the vote reflects the DUP's defection to the anti-Government side at Westminster, an outcome that was not surprising given that Party's concerns about the Border in the Irish Sea as proposed in Johnson's Deal. But the real driving force behind the opposition to Johnson is an alliance between Conservatives like Oliver Letwin and Labour figures like Keir Starmer, facilitated by the biased rulings of Speaker John Bercot.

In the early part of his career Letwin was a diligent backroom boy in the Thatcherite camp. Along with the Eurosceptic ideologue, John Redwood, he wrote an influential pamphlet entitled, "*Britain's biggest enterprise: ideas for radical re-*

form of the NHS". The work sets out the case for establishing the NHS as a Trust and advancing the Privatisation agenda as much as possible within the system.

Keir Starmer, on the other hand, is from the Blairite wing of the Labour Party, the wing that orientated its policies towards a soft version of Thatcherism. The common thread with these politicians is economic liberalism — a philosophical belief system in which the role of the State and the political system are greatly diminished in favour of corporate enterprise mainly based on international trade. Brexit, and the force of English nationalism that lies behind it, are anathema to most economic liberals.

Despite their advocacy of a second referendum, the weak card in the hand of the economic liberals is their attitude to democracy. They are not overly concerned with the will of the people as expressed in referenda or even in elections; in their book the exercise of national sovereignty must not be permitted to damage economic welfare as determined by international market indicators.

A CONTRIBUTION FROM THERESA MAY

From the perspective of outside observers as much as of UK citizens, the case for democracy was well argued at the Saturday sitting in Westminster by former Prime Minister Theresa May. She put the following questions to her fellow MPs:

"When this House voted overwhelmingly to give the choice of our membership of the EU to the British people, did we really mean it? When we voted to trigger article 50, did we really mean it? When the two main parties represented in this House stood on manifestos in the 2017

general election to deliver Brexit, did we really mean it? I think there can be only one answer to that: yes, we did mean it; yes, we keep faith with the British people; yes, we want to deliver Brexit" (Hansard).

On the question of a second referendum she stated: "*you cannot have a second referendum simply because some people do not agree with the result of the first.*" She concluded by firing a shot across the bows of Labour:

"I have heard much from those on the Labour Front Bench over the last three years about the importance of protecting jobs, manufacturing and people's livelihoods. If they really meant that, they would have voted for the deal earlier this year. Now is their chance to show whether they really care about people by voting for this deal tonight" (Hansard).

May was immediately answered by Labour MP Peter Kyle, one of the movers of the Kyle-Wilson Amendment in a previous Brexit Debate, which proposed that any agreed Deal be put to a confirmatory referendum. Kyle's point was that both the May and Johnson Deals, between which there are substantial differences, "*cannot represent the will of the people*" (Hansard). But that misses the point that referenda decide broad principles and democratically-elected Governments decide the detail of how electoral decisions are implemented. For example, if the Scottish electorate voted for Independence, would the details of all subsequent Agreements between the UK and Scotland need to be voted on by the electorate? Using referenda to decide on detailed policies would surely generate a hopeless level of division.

PROSPECTS OF THE JOHNSON DEAL

On the question of democracy, both the electoral evidence since the Referendum and opinion surveys suggest that public support for Brexit in Britain has remained solid. A YouGov poll published on October 18th shows 41% of voters want MPs to support the Johnson Deal, compared to 24% who want them to vote against. The same momentum in support for the Deal was evident in a Comres poll, published days before the YouGov one, showed 54% wanting the Referendum result to be honoured compared to 32% who didn't.

Notwithstanding Boris Johnson's defeat over the Letwin Amendment, there is a good chance that a majority of MPs will ultimately approve his Deal. Amber Rudd has said that, along with most of the 21 Tory rebels, she will support it. Difficult to understand though it is, Oliver Letwin himself told BBC television on October

20th that he will vote for it. His reasoning for tabling the Amendment was that he wished to rule out the slight possibility that a No Deal crash-out would occur after October 31st. The art of Parliamentary machination, no doubt, has a logic all its own.

THE MEDIA CARICATURE OF JOHNSON

Back in early September the *Irish Times* columnist, Fintan O'Toole, characterised Boris Johnson as a "*shameless chancer*" whose mode of operation is "*habitual mendacity*" (IT, 3 September). That depiction was widely shared through the usual group-think of the Irish media and political elites. With honourable exceptions (George Parker of the *Financial Times* who frequently guests on RTE radio comes to mind), the commentators in the liberal British broadsheets have taken a similar line.

Since winning the Tory leadership contest on July 24th, Johnson's actions have shown that the prevailing judgement of his character is surface deep. If anything, Johnson has demonstrated a skillset consistent with the pragmatic tradition of his party. Without splitting the Conservative Party, he has rallied the Tory Brexiteers and in the process, presumably, re-established credibility with the section of the electorate that voted for Farage's Brexit Party in the European Elections. He refused to be phased when Parliament undermined his negotiating strategy with Europe by passing the Benn Act. Nor was he deflected from his avowed task of '*getting Brexit done*' by the Supreme Court Ruling against his prorogation of Parliament.

When most commentators doubted that a deal between the UK and the EU was possible within the available time frame, he successfully negotiated a Deal that ticks most of the many boxes that such a negotiation required. Of course some of the credit for the 17th October UK-EU Withdrawal Agreement belongs with others, initially with Leo Varadkar and his team and latterly with Michel Barnier and his team, yet Johnson made the necessary compromises on both the Single Market and Customs Union regulations for Northern Ireland that facilitated the breakthrough.

THE PROBLEM OF THE IRISH MEDIA

The overall Irish response to Brexit was well summed up in last month's *Irish Political Review* in an Editorial entitled, "*In Limbo Land*". The Editorial pointed up the extraordinary spectacle that contemporary Ireland presents in the context of Brexit: a country "*that does not know what world it*

is to be part of". Given that the governing elite committed tacitly to an ever closer relationship with Britain some time after 1970, Brexit might have been expected to pose an existential challenge of some sort. In the event a decision was made six months after the 2016 Referendum that Ireland would align unwaveringly with the EU, and that decision explains the Government's relatively consistent position over the three years. But old habits die hard. The hankering to be an unlikely outpost of the British mainland still flourishes in the institutions populated by the elite, albeit under a low profile. How much better off we would be if the political class had a sense of its origins in Republican Ireland!

The area of Irish life where pro-British sentiment is most obvious is the media and that is the area where the difficulty in dealing with Brexit is most apparent. An example occurred on Mary Wilson's *Drivetime* programme on RTE radio shortly after the Supreme Court Ruling against Johnson. There had been some tetchy exchanges in the Commons and, emboldened by Johnson's apparently weak position, Wilson ran a discussion on the British Prime Minister's use of inappropriate language. Introducing the topic she played a clip from Westminster in which Labour MP Paula Sherrif criticised Johnson for using terms like '*Surrender Act*' to describe the Benn Act. Pointing to a plaque commemorating the murdered MP, Jo Cox, Sherrif stated: "*We stand here under the shield of our departed friend, with many of us subject to death threats and abuse every single day.*"

Following Sherrif's remarks Johnson stated: "*I've never heard such humbug in all my life*". I don't recall the names of the panel that Wilson had assembled but all fervently agreed that Johnson's use of language had indeed been inappropriate and that corrective action was needed.

It never occurred to the participants that the Parliamentary opposition had played hardball in passing the Benn Act and that, in the circumstances, it served their interests to curtail the expression of anger against it. Public representatives need to use colourful language in order to communicate the complexities of politics to a usually indifferent public. In this instance Johnson needed to describe the *Benn Act* in derogatory terms because the anger felt by the large pro-Brexit constituency in Britain needed airing. Apart from using her programme as a weapon for propagandising political correctness, Wilson seemed blithely unaware that her bias against

both Brexit and Johnson was colouring her judgement as a broadcaster.

The disorientating effect that Boris Johnson is having in Ireland has also been evident in recent *Irish Times* Editorials. On October 17th an Editorial headed, "*A fair hard-won compromise*" contained a grudging acknowledgement that Johnson was displaying more flexibility than his predecessor. The following day it editorialised how Brexit was "*a defeat for the liberal, progressive ideals that held sway in Britain for much of the past half-century*". And on October 20th, cheered no doubt by the passing of the Letwin Amendment, the Editor reverted to putting the boot into Johnson. Brexit has disrupted the project of forging a close Anglo-Irish relationship—the *raison d'être* of the *Irish Times*—so commentary must be weaponised against it.

As has been adverted to in this Column previously, the most extreme manifestation of the 'close to Britain' agenda of the Irish media is to be found in the *Sunday Independent*. Some months back, when final strategies for dealing with the October 31st deadline were being discussed, Declan Power argued against putting "*all out hopes in the basket of EU solidarity*". He wrote:

"In Ireland today, Dan O'Brien, Eoghan Harris and Ray Bassett have all been doing their bit to prod us into some further examination of our collective approach to Brexit in general and the backstop in particular" (*Irish Independent*, August 24)

The commentators mentioned by Power had all been pressing the Irish Government to cut the British some slack in defiance of the EU. This campaign had influential supporters in leading RTE personality, Miriam O'Callaghan, and, though he would probably deny it, Fianna Fail Leader Micheal Martin. The logic of the campaign was that the guiding principles of the pre-Brexit alliance with Britain should continue to hold as if the Brexit negotiations had not occurred. Did Harris *et al* seriously expect Dublin to allow London to lead it by the nose and act as Britain's fool in Brussels in the new circumstances? Fortunately that craven agenda was left high and dry in 2016 although it may take the slow learners at the *Independent* a bit more time to adjust to the new realities.

ENDNOTE

As this is being written, the news is out that, in complying with the Benn Act by formally requesting a further extension to Article 50, Boris Johnson has sent a

second letter saying that he is opposed to any further delay to Brexit. This presents Donald Tusk and the European Council with a dilemma. If the European Council wishes to answer the dilemma in a responsible political manner, laying the basis for a respectful future relationship with Brexit Britain, it should endorse the

position of European Commission President Jean Claude Juncker by refusing the extension. Although unlikely with Tusk at the helm, such a stance would signal that the EU leadership has the competence to move the Union forward decisively as a political community.

Dave Alvey

Editorial

Middle East Cauldron

The *Irish Times*, Britain's echo in Ireland, editorialised hysterically on October 15th about *Trump's Historic Mistake*.

That mistake was his decision that the United States should stop trying to police the world, and should accept that no resolution is possible in state terms of conflicts which are essentially tribal wars. The case in point was the Kurdish presence in Syria, Iraq and Iran.

The term "*tribalism*" is freely used to disparage the national conflict in the Six Counties. It is an absurd description of the Unionist and Nationalist political movements. The Unionist community, founded as a British colony four centuries ago, was never tribal. The Nationalist community in the region ceased to be tribal in social organisation or political outlook soon after the colony was established on their territory. The Maguires, O'Kanes etc. ceased to be social orders in the 17 century.

Both Unionists and Nationalists are State-oriented. Their conflict, which led to a long war of the Nationalist community with the State, arose from the fact they were both excluded from the political life of the state which held them, when Britain partitioned Ireland. The Westminster Government partitioned Ireland in 1921, held the Six Counties within the UK, excluded them from state politics, and set the Unionist community to police the Nationalist community in a political vacuum.

The 26 County State then denied legitimacy to the continuing British rule in the Six Counties but did nothing towards ending it. Its political parties boycotted the Six Counties, just as the British parties did. The Unionist majority had not asked to be set up in a sub-government to police the Nationalist minority. They said what they did not want was a separate Six County system. And Nationalists, of course, did not ask to be policed by the Unionist community.

It was the perverse 'statesmanship' of the British State, supplemented by the merely trouble-making approach of the Irish State that produced war. And the war was ended when substantial alterations were made in the structure of the franchised British sub-government in the Six Counties.

It is not possible that tribal life could revive in Ireland. But it is the social order in which the Kurds live across three states. And it is an intensely satisfying mode of life. It does not generate existential discontent as the artifice of state citizenship does. It is durable. It does not disrupt itself through its functioning, as the state does—especially the progressive Capitalist State.

But the State—accurately described by Nietzsche—as "*the coldest of all cold monsters*"—generates immense military power, regimented and bureaucratised. It produces the 'individualism' of multitudes of identical atoms which are easily combined into vast armies with ever-increasing powers of destruction, with which one of those individuals can exterminate thousands of strangers about whom he knows nothing but what his State propaganda tells him, and feel good about it because it is *moral*.

The source meaning of '*morality*' is *custom* and, despite the transcendental pretensions of State propaganda, that remains its effective meaning in practice. Tribes and States have different customs.

State citizenship was decreed to be the only reputable mode of existence by the first world organisation: the *League of Nations* set up by the Victors in Britain's Great War 1914-19. That position was reinforced by the United Nations in 1945. The effective meaning of "*nation*" is "*state*". The ideal and purpose of the UN is the establishment of human uniformity throughout the world by means of a uniform system of identical states. If it was

realisable, it would be as a single world state with a directing centre and a series of sub-governments. But it is not realisable, and an all-out effort to realise it would lead to a very different result.

The United States was close to being the directing centre of a world of subordinate states in 1945. It had Britain, France and China in tow, and Germany was being remade under its supervision. The only major state outside its influence—the only other independent state—was Russia. But unfortunately for the Americans Russia could not be brought to order without a war, and it was possible that Russia might win that war and become the ruler of the world apart from the United States itself. It had defeated Nazi Germany and had a substantial stratum of support in almost every country in the world.

But the USA had the atom bomb. It seems that Churchill favoured nuclear war on Russia. The famous philosopher, Bertrand Russell, openly advocated nuclear war on Russia so that there could then be peace for ever more. But Washington delayed, and in 1948 Russia made the nuclear bomb.

There was stalemate, with two independent Powers in the world, each capable of inflicting enormous damage on the other. So there was peace.

And there was space for a weak 'non-aligned' block to grow between the two power blocks.

The USA restored viable capitalism in the region of the world under its influence and the President was in effect President of the capitalist world.

The process of attrition between the two world systems went on for almost fifty years. It ended with the collapse of the Soviet system and the extension of the American-monitored capitalist system across eastern Europe and into Russia. The President was then very close to being President of the world. Only China, which had escaped from it, remained to challenge it. However, its mode of intervention in Russia was entirely predatory. It provoked the restoration of an effective Russian State. And the revolutionary Chinese State stabilised itself and China became a major industrial Power.

American world-power was eroded by these developments. Its policing interventions became less effective. It no longer overawes the world. All Trump has done is acknowledge this fact by refusing to act for the European Union, which is largely an American creation, in the matter of policing the relations between the Kurdish

tribes and the states in which they live.

The *Irish Times* says: "In one move, he has betrayed the Kurds, cemented Assad's future, given Russia a strategic victory and breathed new life into Islamic State". And: "Russia and Iran have played destabilising roles in Syria for years, while Erdogan..., having facilitated the growth of Islamic State is now sending Syria back into the abyss..."

What is Syria in the British mind? Britain delegitimised the Syrian Government/regime/state a few years ago, as the Irish State de-legitimised the British State in the Six Counties. And Britain gave its blessing to the forces that were intent on overthrowing the Assad regime, without looking too closely at their credentials. Those forces were forces suppressed by the Assad regime. The regime was liberal and secular, and the forces it suppressed were Islamist.

A pretence was made that there was a liberal, secularist democratic force in the anti-Assad movement, but it was impossible to see what purpose such a force could have in acting with Islamist forces to overthrow the liberal secular regime. The British Government must have known very well that the destruction of the Assad regime would have led to an Islamist state.

The British media has now dutifully forgotten what the British position on Syria was only a few years ago.

Britain failed to throw Syria into the abyss, and it cannot now bring itself to acknowledge that the Syrian State has survived thanks to assistance from Russia. And, if it does not recognise the Syrian State, what does it think Turkey is "invading"?

Iran has certainly extended its influence. The USA had marked it down for invasion twenty years ago but, urged on by Britain, it chose to invade Iraq instead. A more realistic decision would have been to invade Iran in alliance with Iraq, Saddam Hussein's Iraq being the chief upholder of Western liberal values in the region. But it chose to make a shambles of Iraq, and Iran extended its influence by intervening in the effort to bring order out of the shambles.

Syria refused to join in the American/British adventure in Iraq—despite being threatened with destruction if it failed to do so. It chose to act honourably and take the consequences. The result was that

native, supremacist, Muslim discontent was fanned by America and Britain, with foreign-subsidised forces encouraged. At one point it looked possible there might even be Western 'feet on the ground'!

As to Islam: it is one of the major cultures of the world, with a capacity to expand without being the instrument of an Imperial military power. Britain, in its Great War, destroyed the State-structure that it was part of. Germany had sought to preserve and reinforce the Ottoman

Empire as the expression of one of the great cultures of the world. That was one of Britain's reasons for making war on Germany—it wanted Arabia for itself and did not want the Ottomans to develop modern viability. The Ottoman State was destroyed, but Islam did not wither, and in the present condition of the world it is unlikely to wither.

The prospects for a uniform World Order of de-tribalised, secularised, non-descript states are not good.

Wackypedia!

There is a longstanding assertion in Wikipedia that the Irish Communist Organisation (ICO) defended the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. Naturally it has then been repeated *ad nauseam* in other social media outlets.

The item says: "In 1968, the ICO issued a press release which defended the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia[6]", and the reference, (6), given is "Irish Times, 23 August 1968, p.6." That *Irish Times* report says:

"Czech chiefs "betrayed" workers.

The Irish Communist Organisation last night in a statement protested 'at the hypocrisy of the Capitalist powers, the revisionist Communist and Workers Parties in condemning the recent Soviet action against Czechoslovakia while actively supporting the anti-Marxist economics and politics which—in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia—led to it.'

The statement said that the development of the counter-revolution in the guise of economic reforms and 'democratic socialism' in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe was proceeding much more rapidly in Czechoslovakia than elsewhere. 'The Soviet Union and its allies having failed to convince Dubcek to slow down the pace of reforms at last resorted to open militarist methods in a desperate attempt to save the situation. The action would have the effect of bringing about genuine socialist awareness of modern revisionism and its connections with capitalism.

'The Czechoslovak workers,' the statement said, 'have been betrayed by their leaders and, leaderless, are being used as pawns against their real class interest by two set of deserters from Socialism.'

By any stretch of the imagination this hardly equates with a statement of support for the invasion and the *Irish Times* does not present it as such.

Anyone who took any interest in the ICO in those days knows that one of its

distinctive positions was criticism of the development of 'market socialism' by the Soviet Union and by other eastern European states. It was viewed as the road to capitalism and not a development of socialism. This approach was elaborated in many of its publications. Can the outcome of that development now be denied?

The ICO statement explained that some states in Eastern Europe were developing this policy at a more rapid rate than others and this created conflicts between the states concerned. And conflicts between putative capitalist states can get to a stage where military conflict is resorted to as a solution. There was nothing new in this and this is how the ICO explained the invasion.

It would seem weird in the extreme if the ICO being critical of what the Soviet Union was doing at home then decided to support it in imposing militarily its policies on another state! Of course it did not do so. In fact it elaborated its position on the invasion in some detail, including the full press release, in its monthly magazine, *The Irish Communist*, of August and September 1968 but neither is given as references in Wikipedia.

Another claim that keeps being repeated is that "Its publications also opposed the campaign to free the Birmingham Six, insisting on their guilt.[48]". The sources given are "Worker's Weekly, 30 February 1988, and "Shoot to Kill: Truth a Casualty" by Madawc Williams, *Irish Political Review*, March 1988."

In fact there was no *Workers Weekly* published on 30th February 1988. After a diligent search for evidence of this alleged 'insisting on their guilt', I discovered a passing remark about the Birmingham Six in relation to an illustration of the different political attitudes in the Republic and the UK towards verdicts in murder cases associated with the War at the time when the 'shoot to kill' policy was highlighted. It simply said that "the Birmingham Six

case is another indication of how difficult it is for London and Dublin to comprehend each other's concept of 'justice'. The Foreign Office chickens are coming home to roost" (*Workers Weekly*, Vol. 2 no. 668).

The *Irish Political Review* reference is a Letter to the Editor that sought to illustrate the old saying that truth is the first casualty of war by pointing out how the verdicts of the courts on 'shoot to kill' murder cases during the Northern Ireland war were accepted or rejected according to the politics of those concerned, as was the case with the Birmingham Six.

Therefore there is no evidence given for the allegation of "insisting on their guilt".

On the other hand, the Wikipedia article does not seem to have noticed that I explained some years ago that I knew one of the Six, Hugh Callaghan, and what I thought of his and the others' guilt. I wrote then in a reply to Steven King:

"I should declare an interest here. I was a family friend of Hugh Callaghan who one would need to know for about two minutes to realise he was innocent — as all the prison officials immediately realised. Hugh loved singing, playing music and playing cards, mostly in pubs. The idea that he could conceive of, or carry out the blowing up of a pub is about as credible as him planning to blow up his local Church. His 17 year ordeal was occasioned by his concern to return a pound he had borrowed from one of the other Six and his inability to resist a game of cards to pass the time while waiting for a train. To suggest, as King does, that I or any associates considered him or any of the others guilty is about as scurrilous as you can get—and I have developed a pretty thick skin for such allegations" (*A Review of What? Irish Political Review*, Jan. 2009, pp. 36-37).

A technique used in these Wikipedia slurs is to take an extract from something published—by anybody—over the last 50 years, out of hundreds of publications and thousands of articles, and assume that this extract was an inviolable position: as if ICO material was produced somewhat like *Pravda* or *L'Osservatore Romano*. The operating practice of the ICO was nearer to anarchy than any other political tendency.

Another technique is to report claims by authors that David Trimble and Enoch Powell made positive references to the organisation and then to assume that these were valid and authoritative sources on ICO positions—and then implying that such comments were reciprocated by the organisation.

I suggest that Wikipedia changes its name to Wackypedia.

Jack Lane

Working Britain In The 1950s

Julianne Herlihy, whom I am reluctant to correct as her articles are always interesting reviews, in the October issue of the *Irish Political Review*, wrote of Clair Willis' *Lovers and Strangers, An Immigrant History of Post-War Britain*. No, I haven't read her book but in the review of it I gather that there are a number of issues that seems to bring the past into today's situation on the black immigrant, which has to be totally different.

"In the forgoing analysis what I found disturbing was the extent of the Trade Unions were involved in pitched battles almost to keep out immigrant cheap labour and then seeing the later get the lowliest/dirtiest jobs."

The late 1940s/1950s was not like today with its cheap labour. It was a time of powerful Trade Unions, some communist-led, others social-democratic, a few outright right-wing and one in particular—the Union of Small Shopkeepers—led by adherents of the Union of British Fascists.

It was the period of austerity in the 1950s, due to the debt racked up by WW2. Wages for manual workers barely covered the week for food and rent. Paid on Thursday, the money had run out by Tuesday. That required a request for what was called a sub, to be paid by the employer. A pound maybe, but never over two pounds, subtracted out of Thursday's wages. So you were constantly in debt.

The two major industries where immigrant labour—both Caribbean and Irish—found work was in building and transport. The building industry mostly required skilled carpenters. This was provided by apprentice-served Irish and Caribbean carpenters. The Union rate was paid, and in most cases, because of the building boom, it was above the Union rate.

Maintenance skilled work in the NHS, office blocks and transport paid the bare Union rate. This work was mostly done by workers who had already reared their families and now just required a steady job at a slower pace. The Union rate was maintained by organising workplaces to a 100% Union membership. The communist-led Unions, or at least having communist personnel, also combated racism in the workplace. Even the smaller building sites, that were unorganised, paid the Union rate and above, in competition for skilled labour.

Unskilled building site labour got less than the skilled worker but they still got

the Union rate for the job. But all workers came together as one at meetings. Each skilled trade or unskilled workforce had their rep. on the job. The Works Committee was composed of the most militant no matter what label they came under. This was compounded by a Federation steward, who could be skilled or unskilled, which brought unity.

There was no room here for undercutting the wage or running racist campaigns. The General Foreman, who hired labour, might on occasions try to recruit white faces only. The anti-Irishism lessened a bit with the arrival of the Caribbean. But the General Foreman in that mood couldn't hold out with his views, when there was such a shortage of building labour during this building boom.. The General Foreman usually became educated in race relations.

The transport system, like London Transport and British Rail, employed quite a lot of Caribbean labour—the women as canteen staff, the men as bus conductors, porters, tube train platform staff and track maintenance staff. The majority of people doing these jobs were white. White workers could also be disadvantaged through not getting a chance of being apprentices. In transport it was the Union rate through Trade Union organisation. The wage rate per hour was low but there was one advantage: there was free transport passes and subsidised canteen meals. British Rail issued an annual pass on top of that, which could take you by rail as far as Turkey.

Also, it was a job for life. There was one disadvantage in the building trade and that was the weather. A severe Winter with snow could halt building because it wasn't the weather for concreting. There could be shutdowns for weeks. It was no use going on National Assistance benefits for that was penury, so any job was welcome. That's when you found out how low wages could be. Warehousing was one and shop portering was another. These jobs were held mostly by the unskilled white. The lower down the scale you got the more racist it became.

Housing in the 1950s was as bad as it is today with slum landlordism in vogue. But the difference was that council flats and houses were being built throughout the UK on a massive scale.

Food also was of a poor quality. The Caribbean was appalled by it. This astonished some whites who believed the

immigrants were eating Kitty Kat (a cat food) and using the WC as a washing machine! In the meantime, in the building industry, that kind of talk had people pushed off the building sites with their Union card cancelled.

Personally I thought the 1950s Caribbean a good generation. They all seemed to have a definite outlook. There were many left-wingers, and enthusiastic Trade Unionists. Trinidad produced the most, followed by Jamaica. Either that or they were religious with a will. They were forthright about their poor backgrounds. They had stories to tell about the Windrush and the same about immigrant ships. Tales about violence on board as the large islanders chased the small islanders all over the ship to beat them up.

Living in the UK, the antagonism continued. The group treated the worse were the mixed-race. The blacker Caribbean boycotted them. The white boycotted them. Then there were the poor whites of Jamaica, known there as the Red Legs. They puzzled the British white for they spoke Jamaican patois. They could be found in the transport system working as bus conductors or as platform staff for British Rail. At that time the main newspaper among the black immigrant was the West Indian Gazette, a left wing paper with a communist editor.

Overall the Caribbean immigrant was a strong healthy race who didn't need middle-class patronisation. Indeed black gangsters exploited the white middle-class, un-street wise do-gooders, through rape and robbery. People like Michael X (cloning himself from the militant US Black Muslim Michael X) was such a one. He also worked as an enforcer for Rachman, the slum landlord in the 1960s, throwing old people's cats over balconies, dragging their mattresses into the street and dancing on them.

It mustn't be forgotten that the Irish also had their thugs and gangsters and brutal enforcers who worked in pubs. A certain Irish building company got its start in the 1950s by raiding building sites and thieving machinery and tools. This was carried out by men wielding pick-axe handles, in preparation for any resistance. They recruited from the Camden Town Rowton House, a male hostel where some Irish, down on their luck through lack of money in working in poorly-paid jobs, or some through alcoholism, lived.

The black immigrant filled whole streets very quickly and seemed able to get mort-

gages as far back as 1960. Harlesden, in London, which at that time was as much Irish as Kilburn and Camden Town, saw some of the first Caribbean, who had some scheme whereby they clubbed together to take possession of houses through a mortgage. Each family took it in turn to acquire a mortgage. Parties at weekends were usually accompanied by the hiring of a full-sized juke box which made the locals angry as it blared into the night. I couldn't see any oppression there.

With the huge influx of black immigrants, there were amidst them the gangster element who were coming to England for bigger spoils. They were mostly in the Notting Hill area and Kilburn areas of London where cannabis became more prevalent. But it had been around before that, brought in by Indian seamen, who also caught some 'time' when they brought it into Belfast, spending five years in prison.

There was also some racism between the Caribbean and the African. The African immigrant in the 1950s came from a more privileged background than the the Caribbean. Some bore the title of Prince from certain tribal backgrounds and had got the opportunity to be apprentice electricians mostly. I came across a couple of them when working in the Shepperton Film Studios. That was 1960 and they were settled in Kilburn, where they lived in large houses on mortgages. The African tended to sneer at the Caribbean and his large cowboy-type hats, seeing them as aping the Western. The reply from the Caribbean was pure racism in line with white racism.

Every borough in London had its Irish dancehall. The bands playing mostly had part-time musicians. There were also the County Clubs set up on a 32 County basis.

There seemed to be a lack of black girls among the immigrants, who were mostly young men. There wasn't a lot of mixing

between black and white. A number of white women who would go abroad today to find partners, older women, women disadvantaged by weight or by looks, managed to get young black husbands.

That meant mixed race children and more racism through jeers and ditties.

Finally, the description of the Irish mentioned on the mail boat to England:

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

Hardly the Irish I knew from all over the island of Ireland. I suggest they were young teenagers, Irish speakers, without English from the Gaeltacht. There was criticism at the time about teaching Irish exclusively and then not following it up with a system where people could sustain themselves in day-to-day living.

I came across such a Irish speaker while working on the building of a hydroelectric dam in the Scottish Highlands in the early 1950s. He was a 15 year old boy from Donegal. He was being taught English by the Scots and Irish workers on the site. He understood enough English when he was told not to go about telling everyone he was 15 when he had been taken for 18 by the contractor.

His job was carrying material up a 100 foot vertical ladder on the face of the dam when the metal rungs were icy. One such climb I remember watching was with him carrying a 56 pound bag of nails on his shoulder. He was smoking a cigarette which seemed longer because of his thin face. He was enjoying his job. It was money and it was slightly over the Union rate. And we were all his father, and maybe his mother sometimes!

W.J.Haire.

10.10.19

Roger Casement
on the Great War:
a commentary

by

Pat Walsh on Casement's

"Sir Roger Casement on Sir Edward Grey"

and

"A pacific blockade"

ATHOL BOOKS See <https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>

Mr. Dudgeon OBE: a Belfast Virgil

Mr. Dudgeon states in the October *Irish Political Review* that he wishes to take up Jack Lane's challenge as posed in the June issue; I interpret this to mean that Mr. Dudgeon has at last found proof of the material existence of the diaries in 1916, something which no other Casement author has done. He will no doubt agree with the premiss set out on page 107 of my book *Anatomy of a Lie*:

"Any proof of the material existence of the bound volumes in 1916 must be of the same standard as the proof given for the existence of the typescripts at the same time—independent witness testimony."

Mr. Dudgeon will agree that lowering the standard of proof for the bound diaries cannot be justified and nothing less than independent testimony will constitute evidence.

However, I cannot find in Mr. Dudgeon's article any independent testimony at all. In circa 1,800 words not a single instance of witness testimony is cited. Therefore, he has found no evidence and he joins the other illustrious Casement authors who in some fifty years of collective research also failed to furnish a single instance. (In my book I seriously underestimated the full period of that collective research.)

In place of independent testimony, Mr. Dudgeon proposes the following:

"They are the recently made public Scotland Yard (MEPO) files and the Security Service (KV) files. In both, detailed mention is made of the diaries being in existence and in the government's hands from 25 April 1916."

That mention of diaries is made in these files does not constitute evidence of their material existence; otherwise, writing *God bless* would be sufficient proof of God's existence.

Mr. Dudgeon continues:

"There is also evidence of certain people seeing diary manuscripts or photographs of manuscripts before the execution in those files and elsewhere. Those outside government who saw manuscript material in some form include US Ambassador Walter Page, American journalist Ben Allen, John Quinn in the United States, Rev. John Harris and Henry Massingham, editor of *The Nation*. It is true that nowhere do they or anyone else set down precisely what they saw and what form these volumes took."

This is very confused and slippery. The 'manuscript material in some form'

in the second sentence above inexplicably becomes 'what form these volumes took' in the third sentence. Therefore 'diary manuscripts' in the first sentence refers to volumes which must mean the bound volume diaries now at Kew. But who are these 'certain people'? Can we assume they are those named? A photograph is not manuscript material nor is it a volume. A typescript is not manuscript material. There is only one form that *manuscript* material can take and that form is the form of a manuscript. If not handwritten it is not a manuscript. Mr. Dudgeon agrees that no-one left a description sufficient to identify *with precision* what they had seen. Therefore he admits that there is no independent witness testimony for the material existence of the bound volume diaries at that time. Yet there is witness testimony for the existence of the typescripts and some photographs (long disappeared).

Mr. Dudgeon agrees that none of those named above stated that they had seen any volumes. Chapter 7 of *Anatomy of a lie* carefully lists that they (and others) saw typescripts and photographs only and the sources are cited in the chapter End Notes.

Only Ben Allen attested to seeing a roll of handwritten pages which, being of almost legal size and torn at the top, do not correspond with the bound volume diaries.

Mr. Dudgeon writes:

"Hyde's central and novel assertion is that because there is, *in his view*, no evidence outside official records of the *diaries in manuscript* being seen before Casement's execution, the typescripts which did so exist must have been forged first" (emphasis added).

Firstly, it is not a matter of my view or opinion but a matter of absence of evidence. Secondly, "diaries in manuscript" is misleading because it suggests that the typescripts are also diaries which they are not.

Mr. Dudgeon writes:

"Duffy was well aware of what might emerge having looked over three suitcases of his documents in London in 1915 and presumably destroying everything."

This extraordinary statement is a perfect example of Mr. Dudgeon's unique inves-

tigative approach which owes something to magic realism, something to solipsism and something to paranormal powers. The statement is hermetically sealed against verification by logical enquiry. It rests upon mind-reading, second sight and telepathy—psychic gifts which enable Mr. Dudgeon to confuse belief with knowledge. If there is a documentary source for this statement, we are unaware of it because Mr. Dudgeon has not divulged it.

Mr. Dudgeon's approach is certainly *sui generis* and I am surely not the only one who finds his actual writing quite challenging, consisting as it does of original syntactic mechanics, shifting registers, demotic verve, predicative and attributive nervousness—all of which persuades me I am lost in a grammatical earthquake zone, a semantic black hole. Mr. Dudgeon is our Belfast Virgil, *nostro maestro* guiding us down into the obscene inferno of the Black Diaries with exegetical interpolations to clarify our confusion, banish our suspicions and our fears.

Mr. Dudgeon complains that I have ignored his book and he is correct. The reason is as follows: Mr. Dudgeon is totally sincere and does not resort to deceit and innuendo. He genuinely believes that the diaries were written by Casement. Few Casement authors can claim the defence of honest belief which Mr. Dudgeon can justifiably claim. I ignored Mr. Dudgeon's book, firstly out of respect for his sincere belief and, secondly, because I could not find any structured arguments in it. His book is not a biography and his highly idiosyncratic approach excludes critical engagement. It is a kind of guide book to what he believes rather than what he knows. His very evident inability to distinguish between belief and knowledge is what distinguishes Mr. Dudgeon's book and marks it as both 'special' and unassailable. It is special in the sense that the title refers to Casement's sexuality, a subject about which I know nothing at all, never having met Casement or corresponded with him. It is unassailable since it cannot be denied that he believes what he has written. I have no wish to criticise Mr. Dudgeon's sincere beliefs or to change them.

Mr. Dudgeon also complains that his visitor comment was not published in full on the now defunct *decoding-casement* website. His comment was about a page long and contained detail the significance of which readers would not have understood unless they had studied the 1910 diaries. His concluding sentences were published because they seemed to represent a synthesis of his overall position.

Many of the other points in Mr. Dudgeon's article are covered in *Anatomy Of A Lie*. I will, however, comment on the following three points.

Irish Political Review readers will be delighted with the results of Mr. Dudgeon's 'facts accountancy', which very generously attributes 1,000 facts to my book, too many I am sure. He tells us that his book contains 10,000 facts and readers need not check this. All facts being of equal probative value for Mr. Dudgeon, he wins the facts contest which makes everyone happy.

Mr. Dudgeon proposes that, since there is no report in Government files of any forgery taking place, it follows that no forgery took place. His trust in Government is touching; his faith in British Government institutions, police and secret services is deeply moving, perhaps incurable and rare among his fellow Unionists. It is strange that Mr. Dudgeon cannot understand how the poisonous homophobia of 100 years

ago was exploited as a potent political weapon by those he trusts.

Mr. Dudgeon writes: "In the event, as when he betrayed Casement in 1914 in Norway, Adler changed his mind and did not sign." *Irish Political Review* readers might wish to see Mr. Dudgeon's evidence for this alleged betrayal. Chapter 11 in my book deals in depth with the allegation and demonstrates that the alleged betrayal was invented by Brian Inglis for his 1973 biography and that Inglis based his invention on a secret false document prepared in 1914 by British officials in Oslo.

To conclude. Mr. Dudgeon is wrong to identify me as an *aficionado* (fan or devotee) of Casement. I have no heroes. My interest is strictly confined to establishing the truth about the diaries. Despite his formidable psychic gifts, Mr. Dudgeon has clearly failed to provide evidence which unequivocally demonstrates the existence of the diaries before the execution.

Paul R. Hyde

Casement—speculation & a new conspiracy!

Tim O'Sullivan has repeatedly sought to refute Paul Hyde's contention that the diaries now at Kew did not exist during Casement's lifetime by continually distorting Hyde's case. I don't understand why he does this. He repeats the distortion again in his latest piece "*Casement—typescript tensions*" (*Irish Political Review*, October 2019) claiming:

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

He later describes it as "*the Typescripts-only Theory*".

I refer Tim to page 40 in Hyde's book and the National Archives record PRO HO 144/1637/311643/139 Ref. 20261, where it is demonstrated that photos were indeed made of the typed pages.

This is simply not Hyde's case and repetition does not make it so.

Everyone knows that both police typescripts and "*photographic representations of hand-written material*" were shown in

1916. There was also original handwritten material shown—but not given—to Ben Allen of the Associated Press. Hyde's point is that there is no evidence of *volumes* being shown or circulated and there is now no evidence of what was contained in the "*photographic representations of hand-written material*" or the original material shown to Allen because it has all disappeared.

I have, I hope, already shown the evidence for such hand-written material and photographs of handwriting, in the case of the two people who left some record of the showing and what they thought of what they were allowed to see. These were the legal eagle, John Quinn, who saw photographs and the Associated Press reporter, Ben Allen, who saw a roll of handwritten pages. I would be glad to know of any other recorded information on this material and what happened to it. I will not bother repeating what I said about their views and experience, except that Tim has not referred to it at all, even though it refutes his case and confirms Hyde's.

Tim repeats the speculation that the volumes were not shown because interpolations would be evident in the originals but not in monochrome photographs. This only begs the question of why pho-

tographed copies of volume(s) were not shown or published (even extracts) in any newspaper—which were also only monochrome in those days? Either or both of these courses of action would have been a very simple solution to the supposed problem of covering the forger(s) tracks that Tim speculates about. But no volumes are mentioned, and no newspapers are given the scoop of the day or the scoop of the century as it would no doubt have been labelled.

If the latter had happened, I am absolutely certain plenty '*professional witnesses*' would have materialised to confirm the case about Casement's alleged homosexuality and we would now have volumes of '*evidence*' about Casement's alleged homosexual activity that would put the *Black Diaries* in the shade!

He again repeats the outlandish suggestion that the following clear statement from a Civil Service report: "*The Ambassador was given photographs of two passages from the typescript*" (History of the Casement Diaries. March 1959 Working Party PRO HO 144/23481) actually means the opposite—that it refers to passages from a manuscript. Now we are literally in *Alice in Wonderland* territory with Humpty Dumpty who declared: "*When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less.*" Debating with Tim is as frustrating as it would be debating with Humpty. It gets pointless.

Tim ranges far and wide but his case against Hyde is built on sand. In desperation his speculation rises to a flight of fancy (I hope) that Hyde's book is the spearhead of a very widespread conspiracy that is afoot about Casement and the diaries:

"Could it be there is some hidden element operating behind the scenes, which deliberately or otherwise, seeks to hobble the pro-forgery camp with a skewed and inadequate theoretical template? Among plausible culprits we find Angus Mitchell, conniving space-alien, MI5, the Aubane Historical Society, Irish America or a combination of some or all of the above."

You will note, dear Editor, that you are not included which is a bit of a mystery. Obviously, I see no point whatever in following Tim there. It again reminds me too much of *Alice in Wonderland*—this time following her down the rabbit hole.

This is a realm even beyond Tim's normal speculation and apart from anything else life is far too short to bother with it.

Jack Lane

Centenary Of How The American Legion Marked Armistice Day 1919

Writing in the 'Irish Examiner' on September 9, about the [Ciara Hyland](#) documentary "*De Valera i Meiriceá*" which was transmitted by TG4 on September 10th and 17th, Richard Fitzpatrick related:

"One of the most arresting sections of the 'De Valera i Meiriceá' documentary covers an interesting pitstop at a native Indian reservation in Spooner, northwest Wisconsin (on October 18, 1919). De Valera was received by the Chippewa tribe and made a chief... A photograph of him taken in Indian headdress is probably the most enduring image of his American tour. It illustrates both his solidarity with another oppressed people and also speaks of the personal pride he felt at being embraced by the tribe. It's often said that the source of his nickname 'The Chief', which he carried with him through his formidable political career, stemmed from the tribal meeting."

Fitzpatrick also related:

"De Valera wasn't roundly welcomed. It had been less than a year since the US fought alongside the British in the Great War so many Americans, especially ex-servicemen, opposed his campaigning to break from the British Empire. The 'Los Angeles Times' newspaper labelled him "President of Nothing" (15 November) ..."

And that paper had already availed of the Chippewa Nation's honour to Dev in order to post a derisive front page headline the previous day, 15th November: "*Rebel Chief Given Portland Snub*".

Ah, yes, the American Legion and Portland, Oregon. The second lead headline on that same front page, relating to Portland, read "*Legion Veterans Tear the Irish Flag from De Valera Car*". The top banner headline, relating to Los Angeles itself, read "*Service Men Wreck Headquarters Of I. W. W. Here*". The IWW were the Industrial Workers of the World, also known as the Wobblies, the Syndicalist Union movement founded in Chicago in 1905, for which James Connolly had worked as an organiser until his return to Ireland in 1910. At the November 1915 funeral in Chicago of the martyred IWW troubadour, Joe Hill, it would be the Irish Labour leader Big Jim Larkin who would give the English-language oration. The IWW would attract the particular hatred of the American Legion's US Army veterans because of its opposition to US entry into the Imperialist Great War in 1917.

(See http://free-downloads.atholbooks.org/pamphlets/Connolly_in_America.pdf to read my thesis "*Connolly in America*" (1971). Google "*The Road to Sing Sing*" and "*Larkin in America*", simultaneously, to read online my chapter of that name in '*James Larkin—Lion of the Fold*' (1998).)

September 1919 was to see the birth of two new parties, the Communist Party of America and the Communist Labor Party. Larkin was a co-founder of the CLP, which had John Reed as its International Secretary. (The CPA and the CLP would achieve unity in May 1921, under the name CPUSA.) In the meantime, a hysterical 'Red Scare' had seen Larkin arrested in New York on 7th November 1919—the second anniversary of the Russian Socialist Revolution—put on trial in April 1920 on charges of "*criminal anarchy*", and sentenced the following month to 5 to 10 years imprisonment in Sing Sing. In January 1923 the newly-elected Governor of New York, Al Smith, released Larkin, declaring:

"I pardon Larkin, not because of agreement with his views, but despite my disagreement with them. Political progress results from the clash of conflicting opinions. Full and free discussion of political issues is a fundamental of democracy. Stripped of its legalistic aspects, this, to my mind, is a political case where a man has been punished for the statement of his beliefs."

11th November 1919 was declared Armistice Day, the first anniversary of the end of the supposed "*war to end all wars*". How the American Legion chose to mark the occasion in each of the Pacific West Coast States - Washington, California and Oregon — was anything but pacific. In '*The I. W. W. - Its First Fifty Years*' (1955), Fred Thompson related how the first Armistice Day "*commemoration*" in Centralia, Washington State, developed:

"When the Armistice Day parade, November 11, 1919, stopped in front of the IWW hall in Centralia, there was no doubt what the intent was. Once before on April 20, 1918, a parade had stopped at the IWW hall and demolished it, the banker taking the secretary's desk. In June of 1919 a Citizens' Protective League was talking of driving the IWW out of town, and the blind IWW newsboy had been kidnapped, taken out of town and told not to come back at the risk of his life. A ways and means committee of the League was elected to attend to the details of driving the IWW out of Centralia, and

it was common talk that the Armistice Day parade would be used for this purpose. IWW lumberjacks consulted a local attorney ... who told them they had a legal right to protect their hall by arms. On November 7 it was announced that the parade would march ... to the corner past the IWW hall, turn and march past it again. When the parade came, the postmaster and ex-Mayor McCleary were each carrying a coil of rope, conspicuously prepared for a lynching... Paraders after the turn of line of the march broke out and when they broke through the door of the IWW hall, IWW members shot and killed three of the attackers. Then the mob surged in, beat and arrested the defenders, except one, Wesley Everest, a returned soldier, who went out the back of the hall, holding the mob at a distance with his automatic as he retreated towards the river. There he offered to surrender to any officer of the law, but not to the mob. Dale Hubbard, son of the banker who had taken the IWW desk in the 1918 raid, stepped out to take him; Everest shot and killed. Then his revolver jammed and the mob had him. They beat him, rammed a rifle butt down his throat, and threw his bleeding body in the centre of the jail... That night the mayor and city electrician shut off all lights in the city and the businessmen opened the jail, and took Everest out to lynch him..." (p 132, see www.iwww.org/history/library/Chaplin/centralia-conspiracy/13 for a more detailed IWW account).

In '*Rebel Voices - An IWW Anthology*', edited by Joyce Kornbluh, further related:

"His body was hung to a railroad trestle above the river, and as word spread through the town, automobile parties drove out during the night to see the hanging corpse by automobile lights... Centralia was in a state of hysteria and panic. The American Legion controlled the town and organized armed posses to hunt Wobblies... Arrests of suspected IWW members numbered over 1,000. 'The city commissioners were deprived of their police power; the power has been assumed by the American Legion', wrote a University of Washington professor who had come to investigate the case." (1988 edition, p 256).

The following were some Associated Press dispatches on 12th November 1919:

"Oakland, California - A crowd of citizens entered the headquarters of the Communist Labor Party (co-founded by Larkin- MO'R) early today and wrecked the interior of the place. Large quantities of radical literature, red flags and furniture were burned in the streets by the mob. The mob was said to have consisted of 400 former service men and members of the American Legion. The offices of the 'World' a socialist organ, situated in the building also was wrecked... The wrecking of the committee's headquarters was

carried out in a methodical fashion and with such swiftness that by the time the police arrived on the scene, the crowd had dispersed and none could be identified as having been connected with the raid."

"Centralia, Washington - Nineteen alleged Industrial Workers of the World are in jail here today. The men were rounded up yesterday and last night after firing on the Armistice Day parade, which resulted in the death of four members of the American Legion and the lynching of an I. W. W. member. There was no disorder here this morning... State troops today patrolled this city where, during an Armistice Day celebration yesterday, four members of the American Legion were shot and killed and five others wounded by men said to have been members of the Industrial Workers of the World and the secretary of the local branch of the Industrial Workers was hanged by a mob..."

"Portland, Oregon - Federal officials today began an investigation of the antecedents and activities of 53 men taken into custody by the police in a raid on headquarters of the 'Council of Workmen, Soldiers and Sailors' last night. Reports that speakers at a meeting of the council had denounced the American Legion and had charged members of the organization with responsibility for the riots at Centralia, Washington, yesterday, in which four men were killed, caused Mayor George Baker to order the raid..."

This was the self same day that the American Legion in Portland also had its go off de Valera. 89 years later, the then President of Ireland, Mary McAleese, visited Portland and, on December 13, 2008, she unveiled a Celtic Cross Memorial in Mount Calvary Cemetery, to the survivors of the Irish Famine who had come to that city in its wake. She paid them a fine tribute, but her second speech later that evening, marking the 70th anniversary of the All Ireland Cultural Society of Oregon, was more problematic. President McAleese declared:

"In 1919, some years before the birth of the Society (19 years, to be precise-MO'R), that great Irish-American Éamon De Valera visited Portland. The Ireland that he came from was at that time struggling for its independence, it was a poor land bowed down by centuries of colonialism and grinding poverty. He came to Portland seeking help and support in Ireland's attempts to take her rightful place among the free and independent nations of the world and it was no accident that he arrived here for in following in the footsteps of many an Irish emigrant he knew he would be among friends. Now I follow in his and their footsteps..."

But no mention of how Dev had needed the protection of his own from the then prevailing bigotry in Portland.

Portland's anti-Irish Catholic bigotry was to provide the most fertile ground for Ku Klux Klan expansion outside the Deep South, with the blessing of the aforementioned Mayor George Baker. In his 2019 study, *"The Rise and Fall of the Ku Klux Klan in Oregon During the 1920s"*, Ben Bruce has related:

"At the turn of the 20th century the Klan experienced a major revival across the United States. By the early 1920's, nationwide membership had reached over two million. What came to be known as the 'second Klan' was fundamentally different from its harbinger in several ways. First, the second Klan victimized a different population. With African-Americans dealt with by institutional segregation, the new Klan instead targeted Catholics, Jews, immigrants and social deviants... As the new Klan grew, recruiters began searching for new territory in the West to expand into. Being over ninety-five percent white, eighty-five percent native-born and mostly Protestant, the Oregon population was a perfect target for the Klan. Oregon soon became home to the largest KKK organization west of the Mississippi River with over 30,000 sworn members in fifty separate chapters across the state. The Oregon Klan also printed its own newspaper and had a massive influence on state politics... Despite all its success, the central chapter of the Klan in Oregon dissolved by 1925 and its presence was erased from the state entirely by 1930... By July of 1921, the KKK began recruiting in Oregon's metropolitan center of Portland on a much larger scale. Exact numbers are impossible to verify, but within months Portland's Klan membership reached the thousands. National headquarters deemed the newly established Portland chapter as 'Klan Number One', the center of operations for the entire Oregon Klan. By winter, the rising Oregon Klan felt strong enough to emerge from the shadows and make its intentions known to the greater Oregon public. On December 22, 1921, local pastor and Klan organizer, Rueben H. Sawyer, gave a speech entitled 'The Truth About the Ku Klux Klan' at the Portland Municipal Auditorium in front of 6,000 people, including the mayor of Portland, George L. Baker..."

"According to its leaders, the Klan harshly persecuted individuals not because of religious intolerance, but because those individuals demonstrated disloyalty to American ideals. Catholics eventually became the Oregon Klan's primary target for this exact reason. The Klan did not intend to fight the Catholic Church, 'only to stop Catholics, or any church for that matter, from injecting itself into the state.'... By fall of 1923 the Portland chapter reached 15,000 strong. The Oregon Klan as a whole grew to include fifty plus chapters across the state, hosting over 35,000 total members. By then, Oregon had the highest Klan membership per

capita, second only to Indiana... But having a predominantly white, native-born population, Oregon did not host many racial minorities to draw the Klan's ire. As a result, the Oregon Klan was primarily anti-Catholic. Klan leaders preached that, by worshipping the Pope in Rome, Catholic Americans' loyalty to the United States government was secondary to that of their religion, and thus violated the Klan's devotion to '100 percent Americanism'..."

But then the Klan overplayed its hand:

"Despite all its success, the central chapter of the Klan in Oregon dissolved by 1925 and its presence was erased from the state entirely by 1930."

President McAleese would have done better to congratulate the Oregon Irish for weathering the storms of that dark period and later feeling free to establish their Cultural Institute in 1938.

Undoubtedly Portland's hostility to Dev's 1919 Armistice Week visit would have been further fuelled by the Address he had given on being made a Chief of the Native American Chippewa Nation a few weeks previously. When de Valera began his speech, he spoke in the Irish language, before telling the gathered crowd of thousands:

"I speak to you in Gaelic... because I want to show you that though I am white I am not of the English race. We, like you, are a people who have suffered and I feel for you with a sympathy that comes only from one who can understand as we Irishmen can. You say you are not free. Neither are we free and I sympathise with you because we are making a similar fight. As a boy I read and understood of your slavery and longed to become one of you."

In *'De Valera in America - The Rebel President's 1919 Campaign'* (2008), Dave Hannigan related:

"The party reached Portland, Oregon, on the night of 13 November... Upon arrival, de Valera was afforded the by-then customary parade from the train station to the Portland Hotel... The morning after he arrived, the car charged with ferrying de Valera around town was parked out front, with an Irish flag and an American flag billowing in unison, the same symbolic pairing that had been deployed at every turn in every state since June. It just so happened that this hotel was situated across from Liberty Temple, the local headquarters of the American Legion, and some of the former service men on duty there apparently took umbrage at the commingling of the two flags... in the account put forth by Ensign AT Kurtz, a veteran of seventeen months in

the Navy, he led a deputation of twenty-five Legion men which approached the individual guarding the vehicle and demanded he remove the Irish flag, because it was not an emblem officially recognised by the US Government. Before an answer could even be given, the Legionnaires ripped off the tricolour..."

"The matter might have ended there except Mayor George L. Baker - famous for once refusing to stop the KKK using public buildings for rallies (Hannigan missed the fact that one such Klan rally had been graced by the presence of Mayor Baker himself - MOR) - then issued an inflammatory statement declaring display of the Irish flag objectionable and prohibiting it from public use for the duration of de Valera's stay. As de Valera was leaving his hotel on the Saturday morning, his car and others in the convoy were decorated with the two flags again crossed on the front. The only difference was they were now surrounded by a cordon of Irish-Americans, standing sentry whilst a menacing group of Legionnaires stared on from across the street. When de Valera's car pulled away from the curb, it did so through a path created by two lines of burly men, each carrying Irish and American flags in their hand. Even still, the drama wasn't over. Out on the road, his car was immediately followed and chased by another vehicle. One wonders did de Valera fear for his life as the other driver tried to pull alongside, drawing parallel and closer and closer with each passing yard. Eventually, one of its passengers leaned out of the window but instead of brandishing a weapon, he angrily ripped off the tricolour and left the Stars and Stripes flapping alone in the wind. And presumably left de Valera and his fellow passengers suitably relieved that was all he did. 'The flag of the Irish Republic was torn from my car in Portland by British representatives, not by members of the American Legion', said de Valera. 'America is in a mesh of British propaganda. I am confident that the American Legion would vote unanimously for Irish independence if the opportunity were given.'" (pp 118-120).

If not fooling himself, Dev's attempts to fool others on that score were quite futile. The WASP (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant) tradition in the USA had its own inner dynamic and momentum. The response of the American Legion in Portland had the ground prepared for it by the American Legion's first Pennsylvania convention just five weeks previously. Under the heading of "100 Per Cent Americanism", and a sub-heading of "De Valera Called Traitor", the 'Philadelphia Inquirer' of 4th October 1919, reported:

"In a spirited session the 700 veterans of the world war... put themselves on record on a variety of subjects. Éamon de

Valera, 'president of the Irish Republic', who claims to be an American citizen, came in for vigorous scoring... (with a condemnatory resolution which began) 'Whereas Éamon de Valera, self-styled 'president of the Irish Republic', did during hostilities between the Central Powers and the Allies do all in his power to hinder and obstruct the government of the Allied nations in their prosecution of the war, did have traitorous dealings with the enemy, thereby increasing the danger to our soldiers and the difficulty of winning the war..."

Hannigan's narrative continued:

"Try as de Valera did to play down the controversy, it was gleefully reported and occasionally distorted by the 'Los Angeles Times', a paper which had been running a fervent anti-Irish campaign for weeks ahead of his scheduled arrival in that city on 19 November. The headline "Oregon is aroused by Insolent Display of 'Republic' Traitor Banners" offers a flavour of the 'Times's' attitude towards the representatives of the First Dáil. It also devoted several inches to listing the various prominent individuals and organisations through America who were against his visit to LA... 'Association of Naturepathic Physicians of California declared that de Valera is spreading insidious propaganda to stir up hatred between the Anglo-Saxon people.'... There was heavy advanced criticism from various Protestant pulpits around Los Angeles. Pastors at different Methodist and Presbyterian Churches had condemned him in sermons the previous Sunday, with Congregationalist Dr Thomas H. Harper describing him as somebody who wanted a 'Hun invasion' of America' ..." (pp 120-121).

In order to sum up how the American Legion on the US West Coast further marked its first Armistice Day celebrations on 11th November 1919, and continued on succeeding days, it is worth taking a closer look at that venom-filled front page of the 'Los Angeles Times' on 15th November 1919, with the lead item focussing on the IWW and the second lead on Dev.

"SERVICEMEN WRECK HEAD-QUARTERS OF I. W. W. HERE." "Reds Go to Hospital. Cyclone in Uniform Hits Rendezvous. Many Leap from Windows of Building to Escape Blows of Veterans."

"Twenty-five silent, stalwart men in full uniform of the United States Army and Navy raided the headquarters of the local I. W. W. while a 'defense' meeting of the reds was in progress and utterly wrecked the place shortly after 8 o'clock last night. They drove the terrified I. W. W. before them as leaves before a cyclone. Some of the reds jumped out the window to escape the flailing blows of the avengers, armed with table legs and stout pieces

of bannister broken from the stairway railing as they rushed up. Others flew from room to room, endeavouring to get away, which most of them did, much the worse for wear. When the smoke of battle finally cleared away and the police held the premises, four of the I. W. W. were in the Receiving Hospital and five were under arrest, charged with inciting a riot. They will be charged with criminal syndicalism later... No members of the raiding party were injured and none was arrested, as there is absolutely no clew (sic) to their identity or where they came from. A handful of citizens assisted them in the attacks, but no one knows who they were. Following are the arrested and injured: Mrs. Dale Anderson, a conspicuous figure in the Covina orange pickers' strike a year ago, when I. W. W.s were deported from the district. Dale Anderson, a well known I. W. W. He suffered a bruised back. John Shack ...slightly bruised about head and face. Nathan Altschuer... a Russian, wearing a (US Army) service pin. Lacerations of scalp and cuts on face. Nick Steelnick, an I. W. W. ringleader... He had a wrenched arm and slight bruises about head and face. Unknown man leaped through window onto roof of building and sustained broken leg..."

That front page was well illustrated, under the gleeful headline of "Direct Actionists Get Some Direct Action Themselves". There were mug shots of Mrs. Anderson, and the bruised and bloodied trio of Anderson, Shack and Altschuer—the latter in his US Army uniform. Chief of Police Home was shown at the smashed entrance to the I.W.W. office, and announcing a return to the use of police batons: "These sticks have a salutary effect on the I. W. W."

"Legion Veterans Tear the Irish Flag from De Valera Car. HOSTILE TO SINN FEIN." "Rebel Chief Given Portland Snub. Oregon is Aroused by Insolent Display of 'Republic' Traitor Banners. America's Colors Insulted by Second Place in Scanty Procession."

"Exclusive Dispatch. PORTLAND, Nov. 14 - Open hostility has been shown in Portland towards Éamon de Valera, self-styled president of the 'Irish Republic', and chief mouthpiece of the Sinn Feiners in America. From the time that De Valera arrived in this city last night for a three day visit until tonight, there has been nothing to cheer the Irish radicalist and his followers. Evidence of hatred is abundant. Although De Valera received a chilly reception in Portland from the start, the real attitude of Americans towards him was shown this morning when members of the American Legion tore Irish flag from an automobile in which de Valera was about to tour the city. Since then the flag issue has been to the front. It has been aggressively taken up by Mayor Baker and the City Commissioners, who

this afternoon informed De Valera that he would not be allowed to use the flag for decorative purposes at his meeting scheduled for the City Auditorium..."

"BISHOP JOINS PROTEST AT DE VALERA'S VISIT... Pasadena's Legion Members Call His Presence 'Offense'."
 "Rt. Rev. Joseph H. Johnson, bishop of the Episcopal diocese of Los Angeles, and a number of other prominent citizens of Pasadena ... yesterday joined in issuing a public statement protesting against the appearance of Edward de Valera in Southern California. The statement, which was signed by seven members of the Executive Committee of the Pasadena Post of the American Legion ... is as follows:

'Mr. De Valera, who claims to be President of the so-called Republic of Ireland, is announced soon to speak at a meeting in Los Angeles. During the war the party that De Valera represents was in secret league with Germany, plotting against the cause of the Allies, and doing everything in its power to defeat the objects for which the United States fought. If their ambitions had been realized, we would be living today in a German world... The peace of the world depends on the continued cooperation of the United States and Great Britain... It is essential to the preservation of Anglo-Saxon institutions and to the promotion of world democracy. A few months ago, the one purpose of Southern California was to contribute in every possible way to the overthrow of the Central Powers and those who plotted with them. Today, even before peace has been declared, we are asked to welcome and assist the avowed representative of the men who fought us in ambush behind the screen of Irish nationalism... We wish to protest emphatically against Mr. De Valera's appearance in Southern California. His pretence of being President of the Republic of Ireland will deceive no one, and attacks on England will be repudiated by those who know of the intrigues of his followers against the Allies. We consider his presence in the United States to be an offence against every American soldier and sailor who fought in the war, and we trust that loyal citizens will deny him support of any kind'."

In his Address in Los Angeles on November 23rd, Dev would give the Bishop his answer:

"it is said here that Ireland stabbed America in the back in the late war', he said, waving the 'Los Angeles Times' in his hand. 'We had our own war to fight, the war that was being waged by our nation against Britain before Christopher Columbus was born, before a Hohenzollern ever sat on the throne of Prussia. We have the same right to remain neutral as did Spain or Norway. Ireland was forced to pay to Britain last year 200 million dollars in tribute. They make us pay for

the ropes with which they try to strangle us. Again, I repeat, England never had any acknowledged right in Ireland. We are not an English colony and what is more, we never will be. We owe no loyalty to Britain'." (Hannigan, p 125).

Meanwhile back home in Dublin, or what neo-Redmondites might call the Western Front, how had the First World War been marked in the year following its ending? In the 'Irish Times' of 18th May 2016, the custodian of that paper's decade of centenaries narrative, Ronan McGreevy, had just this much to say of that particular year: "*Big crowds had turned out for a victory parade in Dublin in 1919, before independence.*" But two years previously, in a letter to that paper under the heading of "*Commemorating the dead of the First World War*", Brian Hanley had punctured a considerable hole in the 'Irish Times' version of "history", when he pointed out, on 4th August 2014:

"John Bowman ('Time for us to remember first World War fallen', Opinion & Analysis, August 2nd) restates the current orthodoxy with regard to the Great War. Despite widespread evidence to that contrary we are being asked to believe that nationalist Ireland somehow discarded all memory of that event for over 50 years. This simplistic notion is playing its part in turning what should be an opportunity for reflection on Ireland's role in the carnage of 1914-18 into a celebratory nostalgiafest... Your article was accompanied by a photograph of the victory parade in Dublin during July 1919. Earlier that month 2-3,000 members of the Irish Nationalist Veterans' Association gathered at the Mansion House in Dublin, where they voted to boycott that event. Speakers from the floor stated that they returned from service abroad to find in Ireland a 'larger army of occupation than Germany found necessary to keep down Belgium'. The veterans were addressed by Mary Kettle, whose husband, Tom, had died on the Somme in 1916. She

complained that 'soldiers were asked to march past College Green, their own House of Parliament, where their rights were bartered away, to salute Lord French (who) as Lord Lieutenant and head of the Irish Executive was responsible for the rule of coercion in this country and for the betrayal of every Irish nationalist soldier who fought and fell in the war ...' She hoped 'in honour of her husband's memory, not a single Dublin Fusilier would march in the procession. If it had brought about an Irish settlement they would march proudly; such was not the case; but, on the contrary, they were asked to join and unite with the army of occupation'. Tom Kettle's death is often held up as emblematic of Irish nationalist sacrifice in the war; his widow's words help remind up of why memory of this conflict remains so problematic."

Oh, I nearly forgot. Tucked further down on that front page of voluminous venom in the 'Los Angeles Times' of 15th November 1919, there had actually been one item of straightforward reporting:

"Paves Way For De Valera. Liam Mellows, advance representative of Éamon de Valera, who is due to arrive here next Wednesday, came to Los Angeles yesterday from San Francisco, and declared that all De Valera asks the people of this city is to give a fair hearing to the claims of the people of Ireland: 'Mr. de Valera is the accredited spokesman of a majority of the people of Ireland who, by self-determination, at a general election called by the British government, December 1918, elected as their representatives, out of 105 constituencies, seventy-three men who favoured an Irish republic. On January 21 these delegates, refusing to take their seats in the British Parliament, and to swear allegiance to Great Britain, met in Dublin as the real Irish Parliament and elected De Valera as president of the Irish republic.'"

Mellows had summed up that core of the issue to perfection.

Manus O'Riordan



England's Crisis of Democracy (1919)

Did the “*Great War for Democracy*” — which was nothing of the sort — result in a democracy that subverted the Peace in 1919? That is an awkward question that has been ignored by historians.

A very astute Frenchman, Andre Siegfried, wrote a number of books in the 1920s and 1930s about the character of England, in order to understand it and explain it to his countrymen, who were, at that very moment, extremely disorientated, because France, after shouldering the brunt of the Great War for 4 years against Germany, was suddenly becoming England’s Balance of Power opponent again.

In *England’s Crisis* Siegfried observed the ‘*Transformation of the Political System*’ which had occurred in Britain, almost unnoticed, from 1918. He noted that the “*political stability of England has always been the admiration of the world.*” However, “*behind this imposing facade, England has been more contaminated than any other Western community by the exigencies of democracy.*” (Andre Siegfried, *England’s Crisis*, p.148.)

Up until 1918, although the franchise had been gradually extended, Britain had been able to retain the same political institutions and the “*direction of affairs still remained in the hands of the so-called ruling classes.*” But: “*By creating an entirely different set of circumstances, the War aroused a new spirit and awakened new desires among the people.*”

Siegfried argued that the “*immense army of fighting men*” conscripted by Britain to win the War had fundamentally changed the character of the State. In the past the “*popular will*” was “*canalised or even diverted*” and usually remained “*docile in the hands of its leaders*” However, “*it is irresistible when roused.*” (Andre Siegfried, *England’s Crisis*, pp.149-153.)

Siegfried concluded:

“From a distance everything looks the same as before — the same morning coat, the same top hat, the same spats — but the spirit has changed. England is now a democracy in the full sense of the world... often inspired by the demagogue... In conclusion, we must emphasise that among the Western democracies, which are all suffering from the same evil, namely lack of responsibility on the part

of the people, England is particularly affected.” (Andre Siegfried, *England’s Crisis*, p.154.)

England’s industrial revolution of the 19th Century had produced a huge proletariat which was suddenly unleashed as a power in the land by the Representation of the People Act of 1918. And nothing was ever the same again in England.

A very important development occurred in February 1918, when the U.K. electorate was nearly tripled at a stroke by the Fourth Reform Act (from the 7.7 million at the time of the last election in 1910, to 21 million). The consequences of this only became apparent after the General Election in December 1918, when the Lloyd George Coalition won a landslide victory to dominate Parliament.

Before the Great War Britain was an oligarchic democracy in which the traditional elite held sway above a limited electorate which had, in 1914, reached about a third of the populace. The British system before the War was one of government by the ruling class eliciting consent of the governed masses. There was no recognition of abstract democratic right.

This is shown in a speech by F.E. Smith (Lord Birkenhead), made in July 1910 against a Bill to give some women the vote. Smith explained:

“For generations it has been recognised that no man has an abstract right to vote. The theory that there is such a thing in existence as a right to a vote is as dead as Rousseau. A vote is not a right. It never was a right. It is a capacity which is given on approved public ground to such sections of public citizens as, in the opinion of the whole State, are likely to exercise that quality with benefit to the community taken as a whole.” (Lord Birkenhead, *The Speeches of Lord Birkenhead*, p.55)

But in 1918 the oligarchic, ruling class that planned and organised the Great War in Britain, behind the scenes, gave way to the democracy which the Great War brought forth. “*The whole State*” conceded to the masses.

There had not be an election for 8 years in 1918 and Britain became a majority democracy as a result of the unprecedented mass mobilisation it found necessary to invoke — in defiance of the traditional

voluntary principle — in order to defeat Germany and the Ottomans. There was no need for conflict, as was usual in these great transformations, because the greatest of the Reform Acts, introduced under cover of the Great War, within the mass enthusiasm for the War, was done through an act of ruling class patronage, organised in secret conclave. Parliament was only shown the details when the deed was done.

With the sudden advent of adult majority participation in elections in Britain account had to be taken of the masses. They began to be pandered to by “*the men who won the war*”.

Here is a good description of it from a 1922 book by Alfred Zimmern of the Round Table/Chatham House:

“During the week after the armistice the moral thermometer of the British people went down some fifty degrees. During the subsequent month, right up to polling day in the middle of December, it continued to fall. The... sense of national and individual responsibility for the making of a better world... were dissipated in a riot of electioneering, thrown like chaff on the winds of demagogic claptrap and invective... After a few vain attempts at evasion the Premier yielded, and was then led on, floundering and uncomfortable, from one pitfall to another. Ignoring the state of Europe and the appeals which were already pressing in for the services of British troops in maintaining order... he pledged himself to rapid demobilisation... Meanwhile, what was happening in the wider world? The story of the first eight or ten weeks after the armistice can be summed up in three words — delay, confusion, and disillusionment.” (Alfred Zimmern, *Europe in Convalescence*, pp.106-109)

As Zimmern noted, the chief panderer to the masses was the Prime Minister, Lloyd George, the closest thing there was to “*the people*”. Lloyd George, coming from humble origins, had broken the unwritten rule that until then had debarred from the Premiership all but thorough gentlemen with first-class educations.

Lord Beaverbrook, the famous press baron, wrote the following about how Lloyd George secured his massive majority in the House of Commons from the new democracy:

“Lloyd George’s Government won the 1918 general election on two slogans — one, “Hang the Kaiser”; the other “Make Germany Pay”... At the December election, candidates made ample use of this vote-catching issue. Lloyd George’s huge majority was to a large extent founded on the popularity of the Hanging Craze.” (*Men and Power 1917-1918*, p.303)

After securing a great majority in the General Election with the “*Hang the Kaiser*” slogan the Prime Minister began his pandering to the masses by demobilising the massive conscript British Army that he had built up after the voluntary principle had been abandoned in 1916. It was reduced from 3.5 million at the Armistice to less than a million 9 months later and Defence/War spending was reduced from 600 to 200 million Sterling during 1920. Government spending on the military had risen from 7 per cent to account for nearly 60 per cent of GNP by the last year of the War and it was being paid for by a great increase in taxation, and loans that would be paid for by the post-War tax payers. There were no votes to be won in maintaining such spending and taxation, and far more tax-payers were present in the electorate in 1918 than there had been in 1910. (David French, *The British Way in Warfare 1688-2000*, p.179.)

This left much Imperial work undone and unable to be done in the areas the British Empire had won for itself. The old Imperial governing class looked on with regret when they saw the dissolution of the great forces that had been recruited, organised and trained and which could have been used to stabilise the world Britain had won through great sacrifice of blood and treasure. It was a once in history, moment. Before the Great War there had been a strong agitation from powerful sections of the ruling elite for Conscription to meet the needs of the Imperial State. It had been resisted by the Liberal Government who defended the Voluntary principle that had served the country in the past. At the moment when that principle had been breached and a massive popular army assembled for the first time in British history Lloyd George decided to throw it away, having the democracy behind him.

The great army recruited by Britain to defeat Germany had been enlisted through Millenarian propaganda before the voluntary principle finally gave way to compulsion. So, the unprecedented force assembled was not brought into existence for the purposes of Imperial work. It owed its existence to a call to defeat an unprecedented evil that had emerged in the world.

That evil having been defeated it was problematic for it to continue in existence after the event. If it had done so there would have been an undermining of the narrative of the War and suspicion that everything was not what it seemed to be. However,

Conscription, a real innovation in the policy of the British State, had brought on the necessity of democracy by arming the nation. In a situation where the masses had been brought into arms and politics and the Bolsheviks generated as a force in the world, and a potential influence on the masses, this was dangerous.

A functional settlement in Europe and beyond was therefore prevented in the process of this disbandment by the new British democracy and its “*wheeler-dealer*” Prime Minister.

Alfred Zimmern made this comment in early 1919 about the “*selfishness*” of the new emerging democracy, in which the new political strata might refuse to take up the necessary altruistic work of the Imperial State at a critical juncture:

“History will assess the full measure of the moral injury inflicted upon the world, and the British Empire, by Britain’s sudden swerve towards selfishness. For the moment, it would seem to mark the first step in a process of disintegration which later statesmen, even if, as they surely must, they acknowledge, and seek publicly to retrieve, the sins of their predecessors, will find it hard to arrest; for the accumulated moral capital of a wide-spreading commonwealth.” (Alfred Zimmern, *Europe in Convalescence*, p.122)

The British ruling class largely did what it pleased during the 18th and 19th Centuries, unhindered by those below, that served them. In the past the ruling strata in England acted effectively outside of any moral atmosphere. There had been some morality worked up during the war on Napoleon when things started to get desperate. But after the event, with Napoleon vanquished, there was no necessity to continue with it, and a functional European settlement was concluded by the statesmen at Vienna, without reference to the inconvenience of popular passions. The map of Europe could be rolled up for a generation, since it would not be needed. However, in August 1914 a strong element of morality had been introduced into the situation to unify the British nation against Germany and the democracy that came out of the conduct of the War then subverted the old and effective statesmanship.

Great passions had been worked up in Britain to wage its Great War and to win it. These popular passions ruled out the concluding of the Great War through a traditional Imperial peace, as was desired by Churchill and others. Dynastic/aristocratic war had given way to People’s/Democratic war, and not for the betterment of humanity. The appearance of a democracy at

the conclusion of the War enhanced the negative aspect of this.

The combination of British democracy and “*a wide-spreading commonwealth*” spelt disaster for the world after Britain had gained its primacy over the earth. The map of Europe had to be unfolded again and again to facilitate the new forces that were produced by the conduct of the War, its aftermath and settlement and as a result, it is safe to say, there was another great war, of even greater devastation, within a generation.

At the same time as admitting the masses to the franchise, to mitigate the effects of the new democracy,

“Lloyd George wanted the Coalition to continue in what was almost an attempt at one-party government. It was cleverly disguised dictatorship.” He “introduced methods that would have been more in keeping with a totalitarian state” (*The Mask of Merlin: A Critical Study of David Lloyd George*, pp.155-7)

The Prime Minister promised “*to demand the whole cost of the war from Germany at once*” and in 20 or more speeches he committed to “*hanging the Kaiser*”. With the use of issuing Coupons to reliable candidates Lloyd George achieved 526 MPs against a combined opposition of less than 90 in the House of Commons.

Lloyd George was the most powerful Prime Minister that had ever held office in the British system, because of a remarkable shift in power within the British Executive. As Andre Siegfried explained:

“It is natural for the power of a Government to increase in times of war, but it is unusual for it to shift its centre of gravity during its growth. The essentials of power were no longer vested in the Cabinet – considered as a collective body – but in the position of the Prime Minister, seconded by collaborators and technical experts. In this domain, as in every other in which he has exercised his abilities, the personality of Lloyd George acted as ferment. By the creation on his own initiative of the War Cabinet at the end of 1916, a new body, more exclusive and efficient, meeting daily and sometimes twice a day, was born in the very heart of Government... A new organisation known as the Secretariat of the Cabinet came into being as a result of... the need for centralizing the activities of the Government. Many ministers who had hitherto shared in the general direction of policy, now found their activities confined solely to the fulfilling of their departmental duties... Under the brilliant direction of Sir Maurice Hankey, the Cabinet Secretariat became, during the Premiership of Lloyd George, a vital part of the administrative machinery...”

Under Mr. Lloyd George the post of

Prime Minister thus became a semi-independent institution. He organised his own technical services in order to study various questions at first hand, and often withdrew technical problems from the competence of the various ministries. Thus, for example, all matters pertaining to the League of Nations and the preparation of international conferences passed from the direction of the Foreign Office to that of the Secretariat, which grew into a veritable ministerial department controlled by the head of Government.

From what has been written, it will be seen that Mr. Lloyd George in the last years of his power no longer governed with the spirit and traditions of his predecessors. Rendered independent of his colleagues on all technical matters by the remarkable service he had to hand, he also managed to liberate himself from the restrictive influence of the House of Commons. For the existing Coalition, by uniting men of different political opinions and making them work as a single body, had developed in place of open discussions in the House the practice of those combinations in which the Premier excelled... In short, he created for himself a pre-eminent and isolated position, akin to that of the president of a democracy who addresses himself directly to the people, and obtains his mandate from them." (Andre Siegfried, *Post-War Britain*, pp.198-201)

The man who was Prime Minister of Britain in 1918, Lloyd George, had made himself very powerful. But he still had to live by his wits in the company of his social superiors, within a rapidly changing situation, brought about by the sudden introduction of mass democracy, in which he had built himself his singular and predominant power base. He had to be fluid and like quicksilver. He was a man who had shown he had principles but who had largely abandoned them to rise up the greasy pole and stay at the top of it. And he had assumed the character of a weather vane, blowing one way or another, as events affected him, to stay at the top.

E.T. Raymond, wrote this informed character sketch of the Prime Minister, in 1918:

"Mr. Lloyd George belongs essentially to the empirical school of statesmanship. He does not look "before and after," but only about him. He stands in small awe of precedent, principle, and doctrine; he is always readier to experiment than to think. Intensely interested in the things of the moment, in himself and the people he likes, in the "causes" which appeal to him in his varying moods, no man has less sense of the continuity of human things. For him the present tick of the clock has all the dignity of the eternal." (E.T. Raymond, *Uncensored Celebrities*, pp.10-1)

The Occupied Territories Bill

In her letter of October 12th, Jackie Goodall makes a series of false assertions in dismissing the three legal opinions relied upon to demonstrate the compatibility of the Occupied Territories Bill ("the Bill") with EU law as having "no solid foundation". The first opinion she refers to was written by Prof James Crawford, now a judge of the International Court of Justice. The fact that his opinion addressed the general principle of banning trade with Israeli settlements rather than the Bill specifically is immaterial insofar as that is exactly what the Bill aims to do.

The same is true of the second opinion referred to, that of Irish senior counsel Michael Lynn, rendering meaningless Ms Goodall's reference to the fact that it was written "long before the Bill was ever conceived". In any event, Mr Lynn has since confirmed in an opinion he was requested to submit to the Oireachtas Committee on Foreign Affairs that the Bill is compatible with EU law.

The third opinion referred to was authored by Prof Takis Tridimas of King's College London, a leading authority on EU law who is cited frequently by both the Irish courts and the advocates general of the Court of Justice of the European Union. Ms Goodall's casual dismissal of Prof Tridimas's opinion – which unequivocally concludes that the Bill is compatible with EU law – as being based on "fundamental errors of fact" is risible.

The only facts he relied upon were those accepted by the International Court of Justice in 2004 as providing a basis for its finding that the settlements are illegal.

Ms Goodall also mischaracterises the position with regard to the potential of the Bill to expose Ireland to fines and damages claims. As outlined by Michael Lynn SC, if in the unlikely event that the Court of Justice of the European Union were to rule that the Bill is incompatible with EU law, Ireland would be exposed to fines and damages claims only if the Government (without need for the approval of the Oireachtas) subsequently refused to comply with that decision under the powers vested in it by the European Communities Act, 1972.

Finally, an opinion submitted to the Oireachtas Committee on Foreign Affairs by Sari Bashi of Yale Law School, an expert on US federal and state laws which prohibit boycotts of Israel, confirms that any fears about US companies pulling out of Ireland as a result of the Bill are unfounded. This is primarily because the Bill does not prescribe a boycott of Israel (indeed it does not even mention Israel) and because US multinationals do not tend to do business with the settlements – hardly surprising when the Department of Foreign Affairs has warned that to do so would "entail legal and economic risks" stemming from their illegality.

The reliability of the Ireland Israel Alliance's legal claims are perhaps best judged in light of Ms Goodall's final suggestion that the solution to Israel's illegal settlements is to facilitate dialogue between Israel and the Palestinian leadership.

Perhaps the Garda Síochána should now start tackling crime in Ireland by facilitating dialogue between criminals and their victims too?

Gerry Liston

Legal Officer, Sadaka – the
Ireland Palestine Alliance,
Irish Times (17.10.19)

The perfect man for the fleeting demands of holding on to power in the new democracy. However, what would be the result of such a personality on the great continuities of British Statesmanship, the Empire and geopolitics, and the world that Britain stood astride of through its Great War victory?

It was the character and power of this man, and the unprecedented situation that pertained in Britain at the end of the Great War, that needs to be understood if we are to understand what happened in relation to British policy from 1918 to 1922.

Lloyd George was a Liberal Prime Minister heading a Coalition with a largely Conservative Cabinet and Parliament. The Liberal Party had been devastated by Lloyd George's desertion and splitting of it and a Labour opposition was just developing. It was a moment of flux in the British system whereby a new political force, Labour, was being developed as the second party to replace the Liberal Party, which had bungled the War, in the British two-party system.

To page 30

Lest we forget. 1.

“A meeting I had in 1979 with a senior Army public relations officer provides anecdotal support for Murray Sayle’s argument in his piece about Bloody Sunday (LRB, 11th July 2002) that the Paras were carrying out a plan to ‘bring the enemy to battle’. I was producing a series of TV plays for the BBC, one of them written by Robert Holman about a 16 year–old boy from the North-East who joins the Army, serves in Northern Ireland and is shot. Naively I imagined that we might get help from the Army—that we might be able to film in a Recruitment Office, or use Army equipment—and so I fixed up a meeting. ‘What’, I asked the officer, ‘is the Army’s policy in Northern Ireland?’ ‘Well, if I had my way’, he said, ‘we’d line all the Catholics up against a wall and shoot the fucking lot of them’...”

Richard Eyre. London. Letters to “London Review of Books”, 22nd August 2002, under the heading “Bloody Sunday.”

(Sir Richard Eyre is a noted Film and Theatre Director and has won many awards—MS).

Lest we forget. 2.

“*The desperate state of the Irish in the 1590s—‘like anatomies of death’...*”—was a result, according to Malcolm Gaskill, of “*rain and snow of an intensity and duration unprecedented in living memory*”. (LRB, 19th July 2018.) The quotation regarding the condition of the Irish is from Edmund Spenser, but he was writing about the Second Desmond Rebellion of 1579-83 and the famine caused by the English scorched earth policy when quelling it.”

Dominic Carroll, Ardfield, Co. Cork. Letters to the *London Review of Books*, 13th September 2018 under the heading “*Anatomies of Death*”.

Martin Mansergh.

In his column in “*The Irish Catholic*”, 19th September 2019 titled “*Casement and the Amazon and the ‘lust of lucre’*”, Mansergh writes about two Exhibitions on the former at the Lexicon

in Dún Laoghaire, Dublin, which are co-sponsored by the Peruvian and the Polish Embassies respectively. What drew my eye were a few comments in the text of the article that caused me some pause. He accepts that Casement’s findings about the dire effects of rubber extraction on the Putumayo Tribe:

“which were ultimately the responsibility of a company quoted on the London Stock Exchange”

had me wondering about the effectiveness of the scholarship of the Exhibitions. Was not the company named? Why give it such anonymity? Was it because it was a British company and Mansergh came over all shy about naming it? Mansergh had no problem with naming King Leopold 11 of the Belgians about his terrible record in the Congo as Roger Casement attested to with such courage and empathy.

Then there is this further nugget: “*Casement’s idealism led him to seek succour from Germany as war broke out.*”

Doesn’t this sound as if Casement was acting the eejit here rather than acting with full knowledge that Germany was “*our gallant ally*”, who did indeed come to our aid with shipments of guns and ammunition? Even though the Aud was caught by the British Navy, it was scuttled by its brave crew rather than let the British have its cargo. But here is another observation from Mansergh that tells a lot about his own political viewpoint.

“The one element that *jars a little* is a photograph of the Casement champion Dr. Herbert Mackey with Captain Otto Walter who landed Casement on Banna Strand, but who was earlier said to be responsible for firing the torpedo that sank the Lusitania in 1915. What is not said is that there was a large loss of life, and that it *nearly* brought the US into the war at that point.” (Italics—MS)

What Mansergh says here in thoroughly ingenuous. The British had declared war on Germany in 1914 and the German Navy had put out public warnings that every ship within a radius of hostile territory of the UK was a target. Such was the fear of the Captain of the Lusitania that he—a man named Dow wouldn’t sail the ship and a new Captain—Turner was installed by the British Admiralty.

Otto Walter was not the Captain of the Aud—it was Captain Karl Spindler, though the former was one of the crew of the U 19 submarine which landed Casement on Banna Strand. America did not enter the war until nearly two years after it had

started, but its pro-War leaders did make useful propaganda, as did the British, of the sinking of the Lusitania. And, about that photograph that *jarred* Mansergh so much, isn’t it a pity he doesn’t go into the reasons for it: its purpose?

In 1966, on the 50th Anniversary of the Rising, the Irish State brought all the German gallant sailors who had helped us in that seismic event of our Independence battle to come to Ireland. They were taken to Banna Strand, where the statue of Roger Casement was unveiled.

And Martin Mansergh is not one to pass up on any slight, if there is one within reach—as I and others have noticed in his writings. So there is this final kick—this time to the then Soviet Union, which had lost so many million: some estimate around 20 million Russian people perished during the Second World War.

“The Warsaw ghetto uprising was brutally put down by the Germans, *without hindrance from advancing Soviet troops in 1944*” (Italics—MS).

This suggests that in Mansergh’s world view that the Soviets allowed the ethnic cleansing of the Holocaust—even though they were the first to alleviate the condition of the Jews in the huge death camps of Auschwitz on 27th January 1945 and Ravensbruck on 29th April 1945.

I find myself ever more agreeing with Ernst Toller who famously wrote:

“*History is the Propaganda of the Victors.*”

Michael Stack ©

England's Crisis

continued

It was an extraordinary phase in British politics, presided over by “*the government of all the talents*”, the “*first XI*” who were about to take some of the most important decisions in the history of the World and wreck what hadn’t been wrecked by the British conduct of its Great War.

If the traditional ruling class of England who planned the Great War had been able to conduct that war in an honest way and conclude the peace, unhindered by the democracy it brought into existence, would that have resulted in a worse outcome than what happened in 1919 and subsequently?

Pat Walsh

CONNOLLY continued

faith to the last, despite poverty, hunger and want, despite imprisonment, torture and exile, despite death by the bullet, the bayonet and the hangman. These men and women held to the creed that England has no right in Ireland, never had any right in Ireland, never can have any right in Ireland, and so holding they believed that whilst England so holds Ireland—whilst England is here at all—every enemy whose blows hurt England is a natural ally to Ireland, every blow which weakens England, loosens a link of the chain that binds Ireland in slavery.

These men and women, who were they? In what estimation are they held in Ireland today? They are the heroes and the heroines of the popular mind—the demigods of modern Irish history. Scarcely more than a century is gone and already they are enshrined in the memories of the Irish race, whilst all who fought for England are forgotten, or repudiated when remembered.

Did you ever hear an Irish man or woman say, "*my grandfather fought for England in '98 ?*" and expect to get popular approval or respect because of that fact? You did not. But if ever you met a man or woman who could say that their grandfather or great grandfather, fought against England in '98, were you not proud to meet them, and did not you and all your friends look upon them with

respect because of what their ancestor had done against England? You did. And you were quite right, too.

But some people in Ireland do honour the men who fought for England in '98, or pretend to honour them. Who are these people? They are the people whose ancestors were the greatest enemies of the Irish race, the evictors, the floggers the pitchcappers, the exterminators of the Irish people. The descendants of the landlords who "*enforced their rights with a rod of iron and renounced their duties with a front of brass*".

And some people there are who pretend to honour the men who fight for England in our day. Who are they who in press and on platform pour their praises on the heroism of our poor brothers whom they have driven or coaxed to the front?

Who are they? Why, they are the men who locked us out in 1913, the men who solemnly swore that they would starve three-fourths of the workers of Dublin in order to compel them to give up their civil rights—the right to organise. The recruiters in Dublin and in Ireland generally are the men who pledged themselves together in an unholy alliance to smash trade unionism, by bringing hunger, destitution and misery in fiercest guise into the homes of Dublin's poor.

On every recruiting platform in Dublin you will see the faces of the men who in 1913-14 met together day by day to tell of their plans to murder our women and

children by starvation, and are now appealing to the men of those women and children to fight in order to save the precious skins of the gangs that conspired to starve and outrage them.

Who are the recruiters in Dublin? Who is it that sits on every recruiting committee, that spouts for recruits from every recruiting platform?

Who are they? They are the men who set the police upon the unarmed people in O'Connell Street, who filled the jails with our young working class girls, who batoned and imprisoned hundreds of Dublin workers, who racked and pillaged the poor rooms of the poorest of our class, who plied policemen with drink, suborned and hired perjurers to give false evidence, murdered John Byrne and James Nolan and Alice Brady, and in the midst of a Dublin reeking with horror and reeling with suffering and pain publicly gloated over our misery and exulted in their power to get 'three square meals per day' for their own overfed stomachs.

These are the recruiters. Every Irish man or boy who joins at their call gives these carrion a fresh victory over the Dublin working class—over the working class of all Ireland.

The trenches safer than the Dublin slums! We may yet see the day that the trenches will be safer for these gentry than any part of Dublin.

BRITISH ROULETTE

It's the 50th anniversary of the Battle of the Bogside,
the anti-Catholic pogroms in Belfast,
and how did they commemorate it those 300,000
servicemen sent over four decades,
what did they, in today's media, hide?

Certainly their ignorance didn't provide
for the past.

Were they to know it was a problem
their government created back in 1921,
this unsolvable persona-non-gratis land
of British politics?

Blind Man's Bluff, intervention on a whim,

shoot some as an administrative massacre,
and it's done.

De-industrialise and cut back Protestant power,
prepare the area for the coming calls centres
and theme parks.

And how is it all being explained, well, with dour
talk that harks

back in colonial mind-set language.

They who served served in a vacuum

and are never to know their ignorance languishes
forever most dumb.



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 37 No. 11

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

James Connolly *The Slums and the Trenches* (1916)

Workers' Republic, 26 February 1916.

A speaker at a recent recruiting meeting in Flanders, and the same 'bright saying' has been repeated in a circular issued by the recruiting authorities.

It is the English idea of wit. Consider it, my friends, consider it well.

The trenches in Flanders have been the graves of scores of thousands of young Irishmen, scores of thousands of the physically strongest of the Irish race have met their death there in desperate battle with a brave enemy who bore them no malice and only wished well for their country.

A very large proportion of these young Irishmen were born and reared in the slums and tenement houses of Dublin. These same slums are notorious the world over for their disease-breeding unhealthy character. All the world over it is known that the poor of Dublin are housed under conditions worse than those of any civilised people on God's earth.

From out of those slums these poor misguided brothers of ours have been tricked and deluded into giving battle for England—into waging war upon the German nation which does not permit anywhere within its boundaries such slums and fever dens as the majority of Dublin's poor must live in.

When at last the common-sense of the people of Dublin reasserts itself, and men and women begin to protest against this suicidal destruction of the Irish race in a war that is not of their making, and for an Empire that they abhor, the cheap wits of the recruiters sneeringly tell them that there is more danger of death in a Dublin slum than in a trench in the line of battle.

But you can die honourably in a Dublin slum. If you die of fever, or even of want, because you preferred to face fever and

were more unhealthy than the trenches in want, rather than sell your soul to the enemies of your class and country, such death is an honourable death, a thousand times more honourable than if you won a V.C. committing murder at the bidding of your country's enemies.

These are war times. In times of war the value of the individual life is but little, but the estimate set upon honour is even higher than in times of peace. True, the conception of honour is often all wrong, but the community and the individual in time of war do esteem highly the individual who sets his own conception of honour higher than his regard for his own life.

The boy or man who has a soul strong enough to resist all blandishments to betray the cause of freedom as he sees it, who is strong enough in his own mind and purpose to face the prospect of long unemployment and its consequent misery and want, who can see day by day his strength wasting and his body shrinking for want of nourishment, who knows that that nourishment will be his for a time if he is prepared to sell himself into the service

of the age-long enemy, and who in face of all this is yet man enough to hold out to the last, should he die in his Dublin slum is nevertheless a hero and a martyr fit to be ranked with and honoured alongside of the greatest heroes and noblest martyrs this island has produced.

"The trenches healthier than the slums of Dublin." Ay, my masters, but death in a slum may be the noblest of all deaths if it is the death of a man who preferred to die rather than dirty his soul by accepting the gold of England, and death in the trenches fighting for the Empire is that kind of death spoken of by the poet who lashes with his scorn the recreant who

*"Doubly dying shall go down
To the vile dust from which he
sprung,
Unwept, unhonoured, and unsung."*

In the times of the wars at the end of the eighteenth century when all that was best in Ireland eagerly, passionately awaited the coming of the French, the armies of England were at least two-thirds composed of Irishmen. Are these poor deluded fools remembered or honoured today? Where in all Ireland could a popular demonstration be organised in their honour. Not in any one part of Ireland would any body of Irish men or women spontaneously turn out to do tribute to their memory. Nor yet could all the gold of the British Empire induce any popular body or trade union in nationalist Ireland to walk in a procession to pay the tribute of respect to their record.

But in the same period there were men and women in Ireland who with all the wealth, power, and influence of the country against them, took their stand on the side of England's enemies, and held by that

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

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

33 Athol Street, Belfast BT12 4GX or

2 Newington Green Mansions, London N16 9BT

or *Labour Comment*, TEL: 021-4676029

P. Maloney, 26 Church Avenue, Roman
Street, Cork City

Subscription by Post:

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

Electronic Subscription:

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

You can also order from:

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

continued on page 31