

## Tackling The Housing Crisis

John Martin  
page 19

## Capt. Kelly's Unknown Intelligence Reports

Angela Clifford  
page 28

## Irish Independence: DeV and Cuba

*Labour Comment*  
back page

# IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

April 2020

Vol.35, No.4 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.34 No.4 ISSN 954-5891

## Sinn Fein And The Fog Of Party Politics

The Treaty parties have run out of steam. They were rejected individually by the electorate, and they were rejected even as a pair. They were rejected because they became a pair. And they became a pair when Fianna Fail rejected its heritage as the anti-Treaty party and became a Treaty party.

Martin Mansergh, one-time adviser to Fianna Fail Taoiseachs, made the going in this development. Now, reviewing the outcome in his column in the *Irish Catholic*, he remembers that Fianna Fail came out of Sinn Fein and he envisages reunification. That would be entirely against the grain of the development which he helped to set in motion, and it is hard to see where in Fianna Fail the political capacity survives to attempt such a thing.

Fianna Fail leader Micheál Martin has given a firm understanding not to collaborate with Sinn Fein under any circumstances. *Irish Times* columnist Pat Leahy says “*there is no way that Martin can or will change his mind on this*”, and that his position has been bolstered by the statement “*from Garda Commissioner Drew Harris agreeing with the assessments of the PSNI and the British government that the Provisional IRA’s army council still oversees Sinn Fein*” (Feb. 22). Harris is, of

*continued on page 2*

## The UK sets out its post-Brexit stall

The UK’s lead post-Brexit negotiator with the EU, David Frost, introduced himself to his opposite numbers on 17th February 2020 by explaining why he is basing his, and the UK’s position, in the negotiations on terms that draw extensively on “*Edmund Burke, one of my country’s great political philosophers*”. And, in what can only be a provocation to the French, he called his talk “*Reflections on the Revolution in Europe*”.

Frost explained that he was a UK diplomat in Brussels in the 1990s and, while he was then a remainer, he gradually developed “*a form of cognitive dissonance, if you like, about the value of my work. It was this that eventually drove me out of the foreign service in 2013—and then back as an adviser to the now Prime Minister in 2016.*”

*continued on page 13*

## Some Chimps, Two Vipers, The Gript Goose And The Irish Times Gander: Reflections on a certain media targeting of two new TDs

My article in the March issue of *Irish Political Review* was written on the evening of February 16th, in response to the front page item in that day’s Ireland edition of the *Sunday Times*, entitled “*Mossad ended Jeremy Corbyn campaign tweets new Sinn Féin TD Réada Cronin*”, which item conveniently had

to hand denunciations of those tweets by the Israeli Embassy and former Fine Gael Minister and Zionist extremist Alan Shatter as “*hate driven*”, coupled with calls for Cronin’s disappearance from public life. Cronin had pointed to a very definite Israeli interference in Britain’s General Election, but had exaggerated its impact

on the actual results of what had become little else but a Brexit General Election. Those particular tweets, however, were in no way anti-Semitic.

Two days later, however, came notice of a couple of tweets that had been irresponsibly indulged in by Cronin eight years ago and which, as combined, did indeed reflect an anti-Semitic myth. As the conservative Catholic website *Gript* recorded on February 18th:

*continued on page 14*

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>Sinn Fein And The Fog Of War.</b> Editorial	1
<b>The UK Sets Out Its Post-Brexit Stall.</b> Jack Lane	1
<b>Some Chimps, Two Vipers, The Gript Goose And The Irish Times Gander.</b> Manus O'Riordan (Media Targeting Of Two New TDs)	1
<b>Readers' Letters: Roger Casement.</b> Jeffrey Dudgeon	3
<b>LEST WE FORGET (4).</b> Extracts from <i>Irish Bulletin</i> . This issue lists British Acts Of Aggression, 21st - 27th February 1920 (ed. Jack Lane)	6
<b>Es Ahora.</b> Julianne Herlihy (Elizabeth Bowen: A review of Patricia Lawrence's biography)	11
<b>Tackling The Housing Crisis.</b> John Martin (review of Eoin O Broin book)	19
<b>The World Outside The Socialist Oasis: The End Game!</b> Wilson John Haire	23
<b>The Fevered Brain.</b> Wilson John Haire (Poem: The Covid Virus)	23
<b>Significant 'Errors'.</b> Paul Hyde	24
<b>A Note On The Travails Of Syria.</b> Peter Brooke	25
<b>A Correspondence With Professor Emerita Patricia Lawrence.</b> Jack Lane	26
<b>Readers' Letters: "Roy Johnston: Some Stray Thoughts": A Reply</b> Anthony Coughlan	26
<b>Bloody Balfour!</b> Donal Kennedy	27
<b>Captain Kelly's Unknown Intelligence Reports.</b> Angela Clifford	28
<b>Trump's Vision For Palestine.</b> David Morrison (Part 2)	32
<b>Biteback: Eoin MacNeill, The 1916 Rising And The War Of Independence</b>	32
<b>Does It Stack Up?</b> Michael Stack (Covid—19)	33
<b>Corrections To March IPR.</b>	33

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

Irish Independence: The Cuban Parallel

James Connolly  
(back page)

Due to pressure of space, a number of items, including the  
INDEX for *Irish Political Review*, 2019  
have been held over to the next issue

course, a British political policeman, drawn from the PSNI, who was put in control of the police force of the Irish state. But Martin's intransigent stand had nothing to do with British influence. It was all his own idea.

Conor Brady, a former Editor of the *Irish Times*, writes in the *British Sunday Times* that "*Sinn Fein Can't Shrug Off Security Risk Fears*, and that

"Embedded links to the IRA and its violent past will continue to haunt the party's ambition to enter government in the Republic" (March 1st). And the *Irish Times* of March 7<sup>th</sup> has an editorial entitled, "*Sinn Fein: Getting Used To Scrutiny*".

Sinn Fein is the most scrutinised party there has ever been in Ireland. Its whole life has been lived under close police scrutiny, accompanied by a continuous propaganda barrage directed against it by all other parties and by the established media. That it was the war party in the North was known to everybody who voted

for it and made it the most popular party in the South. And the fact that it is part of the combination *Sinn Fein/IRA* has been rammed home every day for fifty years. There is no secret past to haunt it.

What must be haunting the Treaty parties is the mess they have made of the business of governing the country by undermining themselves as a viable party system.

If they persist in their present stance of refusing to phase Sinn Fein into the business of governing the South—or, as Leahy puts it in his hysterical way, if they "*will not crawl away leaving the stage to MacDonald*"—the outcome is likely to be another Election with a significant increase of Sinn Fein seats. And, if it wins a majority of the Dail seats, what then? It has been widely described as Fascist by members of the Establishment. Can a Fascist party be admitted to power in the state just because it wins an Election? Is that not said to be the great mistake made in Germany in 1933?

Conor Brady is an Appeaser. He assumes that Sinn Fein will be allowed to govern. But—

"The night before Sinn Fein ministers are given their seals of office... the night skies over the garda depot in the Phoenix Park would not glow with burning files—but only because the data systems are now computerised. It is certain that great volumes of sensitive data would be dumped, wiped or hidden away. By definition, the relationship between the government and the state's security agencies would be altered. Garda and military chiefs would have more than a little difficulty relating to new masters who insist on referring to the Republic of Ireland as 'the Free State' or 'the south' and to Northern Ireland as 'the six counties'."

This is with relation to 1932, when Fianna Fail—the Anti-Treaty Party—won the election against the Free State governing party, which had been directing a draconian "*law and order*" policy against it.

Fianna Fail was then regarded by Free Staters as being little more than a front for the IRA. And the IRA was seen as being Communist. It would have been a serious matter indeed if the Free State party had refused to concede state office to the Dail majority. The IRA had revived strongly since the defeat of 1922-3 and the electorate had freed itself from the spell of the Free State terror of that period. So, rather than revive the Civil War on unfavourable terms, the Free State party gave way to the Dail majority and relinquished office to Fianna Fail. But, before doing so, they destroyed the documentary evidence of what they had been up to for ten years.

Fianna Fail governed with the support of the Labour Party for a year. In 1933 it went to the country again and gained an outright majority. The Free State Party (called Cumann na nGaedheal) then re-made itself as a Fascist Party (Fine Gael), under the leadership of General O'Duffy, for the purpose of saving Ireland from Communism. Leading academics supported it with learned books about the imminent danger of Communism under Fianna Fail. But Fianna Fail stabilised the situation by winning every General Election until 1948.

Fintan O'Toole is made of sterner stuff than Conor Brady:

"What Sinn Fein has to confront, sooner rather than later, is that it can't continue to legitimise the 'armed struggle' of the Provisional IRA without giving exactly the same legitimacy to every other gang that puts a different adjective before those three sacred letters: continuity, real

and new. Shouting ‘Up the ‘Ra’ is not a performance by historical re-enactors — it is a live device, primed to explode into contemporary reality” (*Sinn Fein Has To Stop Legitimising Terror*. Irish Times, Feb 25).

To admit Sinn Fein to the legitimate politics of the South before it has somehow de-legitimised the means by which it brought about a functional settlement in the North confers a general right to make war on any group which cares to assert it. Is that not the meaning of O’Toole’s tortuous paragraph? And does it not follow that preservation of the legitimate order of the State requires that Sinn Fein be kept out of Office by whatever means are necessary?

Sinn Fein is in the Northern Government—insofar as there is Northern Government. It got there by making war on the State. That war was legitimised by the peace settlement which ended it. Northern Ireland is more settled under that settlement than it ever was before.

What is now demanded of Sinn Fein by the *Irish Times* is that it should de-legitimise itself as a successful war party in order to fit itself for admission to government in the South. How might it do this?

And there is another difficulty. The State on which the IRA made war, and with which it made an advantageous peace settlement, having established its credentials in a long war, was not a legitimate State in the view of the Constitution of the Irish state in which Sinn Fein has now become a major party.

We know that very well because we picketed the Department of External Affairs in Dublin, early in the Northern war, with a demand that the sovereignty claim over the Six Counties in the Irish Constitution should be repealed as a contribution to peacemaking in the North. No party in the Dail supported that demand, nor did any TD except Jim Kemmy, nor did any newspaper (including the *Irish Times*).

The only State the Provisional IRA has made war on is the British State in the Six Counties, which was illegitimate according to the Constitution of the Irish state.

During the War the Courts of the Irish State, in accordance with the Constitution that bound them, rejected extradition warrants from the illegitimate British regime in the North. And, when the Dublin Government, in 1973, signed an agreement with Britain which seemed to recognise the legitimacy of the British State in the Six Counties, it was taken to Court

## Roger Casement

Responding to Paul Hyde’s letter in the March 2020 edition, I do apologise for mis-titling his ‘Philadelphia Exercise’ article as ‘Philadelphia Experience’. He however asserts I have made a number of other mistakes some of which I must refute as briefly as I can.

He reminds us that Gavan Duffy did not say either what was in the three cases of Casement papers he inspected in 1915 or what happened to them. I made a reasonable deduction, something which Paul calls imagining. He will not engage as to the necessity of historical assessments and sticks instead to lawyering yet then brazenly asserts: “Most likely they were retained and later passed to Gertrude Parry”. However there isn’t a fragment of evidence for that speculation. Parry certainly did not mention it.

When writing I alone had drawn attention to a particular story, what I was referring to (perhaps unclearly) was not the Philadelphia interview itself but the fact of a document existing where Casement confirmed he had met Adler previously in South America, and not in July 1914 along New York’s Broadway. This meant he had lied to John Devoy about the matter for what I suggest is an obvious reason. The document I referenced, NLI 17,023, on the earlier meeting is one Hyde disingenuously quotes, as if his own discovery. He then tries to turn it against the police by stating they embellished the story by fabricating Montevideo as a location for the meeting. It is a mystery why they would want to pick that city. It is plain the mistake was Adler’s.

It is correct to say the Scotland Yard detective Ward reported seeing Adler Christensen once in Philadelphia not twice. In truth on his second visit the following day he only saw Consul Ford, and announced he would co-operate no further.

Inspector Ward in his report spelt the word as jewellery not jewelry, something one should follow. It remains the standard non-US spelling.

Ward was indeed killed in a Zeppelin raid in September 1916 not as I wrote 1917, eliding the year with that his ship, the SS Cameronia, was torpedoed.

Paul Hyde says “the Ward document is not a copy but is the *original* from DPP files”. However I am correct in that the item I quoted from, marked ‘copy’, is in MI5 file TNA KV2/9/3. There must be two archived copies.

I did mistakenly write Adler visited Casement at his rooms. It was of course Adler’s rooms which Casement frequently visited in South America, according to the Norwegian.

If as Paul says his research is “substantially based on HM Government documents in the UK National Archives (TNA)” then it is reasonable for me too to rely on them. In the case of my statement about “the failure to locate Casement’s possessions in London”, which Paul calls “demonstrably false”, the TNA files reveal that inspections of Casement’s papers in London all occurred after his 21 April 1916 arrest. Despite Scotland Yard knowing his various London addresses, the two landlords and the shipping agent Allisons confirm this non-inspection.

In the last case, his trunks, bags and a deck chair were provided to Scotland Yard on 27 April 1916 (TNA MEPO 3/2415). Mr Allison insisted on 12 May he was totally ignorant of their contents but could not say on what date they were delivered into his care except that it was previous to the outbreak of war (TNA KV 2/7). He also stated, somewhat plaintively, that there was “an account of fifteen shillings owing” in respect of the packages. Gavan Duffy declined to pay the bill.

**Jeffrey Dudgeon**

3.3.2020

for acting in breach of the Constitution. The responsible Ministers were Garret FitzGerald and Conor Cruise O’Brien. Their defence pleading in Court early in 1974 was that they had only made a *de facto* agreement with Britain which left the sovereignty claim over the Six Counties intact for any future Government to implement. The Court accepted this defence, but made it clear that recognition

of the Northern regime as legitimate would have been unconstitutional. And that was what undermined the first power-sharing arrangement in the North, the Sunningdale Agreement, which Ulster Unionists had entered into on the understanding that Dublin had withdrawn its sovereignty claim over them.

When a State de-legitimises another State that is a subversive act against the



other state, to put it mildly. When the British State declared that it did not regard the Syrian regime as legitimate, that was a deliberate act of subversion.

The Treaty regime recognised British sovereignty in the Six Counties, but it did so with a bade grace, and only because the British Government would not otherwise have established it in power in the 26 Counties. When the Anti-Treaty movement came to power ten years later it revoked that sullen submission to British sovereignty in the North and the Treatyites did not challenge it on that ground. The new Constitution, adopted by referendum a few years later, specifically asserted *de jure* sovereignty over the Six Counties. When Fine Gael eventually came to power in 1948 it launched a great propaganda offensive against the illegitimate British regime in the North.

The legitimacy of the State on which the new IRA declared war in 1970 was not recognised by the Irish State until the IRA had fought its way to a basic and orderly restructuring of the British system in the North in 1998. It was only then, and with the permission of the IRA, that the subversive sovereignty claim by the Irish State on the British State in the Six Counties was repealed.

Britain recognised as being legitimate in fact—as having been necessary—the party that had made war on it. It would have gone further in that direction if Dublin had entered into the spirit of the 1998 Agreement. But Dublin was more concerned with fig leaves than with political facts, and its Establishment has now suffered accordingly.

Sinn Fein was a war-party in the war against the British State in the Six Counties. The Constitution of the 26 County State declared that the British State in the Six Counties on which the IRA made war was illegitimate, and was a usurpation of Irish sovereignty. It held that position throughout the Northern War.

The IRA did not declare war on the 26 County State, and the 26 County Courts interpreted the Constitution as entitling IRA members who had been active in the North to take refuge in the South from the British justice system in the North.

The Provisional IRA did not make war on the Southern State. The Official IRA did so to some extent, and it contemplated revolution against the Southern State, and it condemned the Provisional IRA for being purely national in its outlook and basing

itself on the nationalist community in the North in its efforts to free itself from the stifling conditions the British State had imposed on it.

Official Sinn Fein never became a serious electoral force in the South but it was given major influence against the Provos in the Dublin propaganda apparatus.

There are no clear Constitutional grounds for the decision of the Dublin Government to treat the Provisional IRA as being in rebellion against it when it made war on the Constitutionally illegitimate British regime in the North.

It might be that its reasoning was that the assertion of *de jure* sovereignty over the Six Counties by Article 2 of the Constitution, though its implementation was suspended by Article 3, still gave it the authority to decide whether there should be war on the illegitimate British regime, and that the decision did not lie with the actual nationalist community in the North, which suffered from the illegitimate British rule.

No Dublin Government ever explained what it thought the combination of Articles 2 and 3 meant in practice. But the Courts decided that it meant something, and interpreted it in favour of the IRA.

The IRA was not in any ordinary sense a war party against the Southern State. It looked to the Southern State, in the light of its Constitution, to be a place of safe retreat, and the Courts upheld it in that view (until very recently when it extradited a republican to Northern Ireland in respect of action taken a generation ago).

But Sinn Fein is now being treated as having been a war party against the Southern State, and therefore being ineligible for taking part in Government. That is the current position of Fine Gael and Fianna Fail.

And that position seems intelligible to us only if the assumption is that the nationalist community in the North owed allegiance to Dublin and that the Northern decision to make war on the British regime, which the Constitution of the Southern State said was illegitimate, was an act of treason against Irish sovereignty, because Dublin Governments did not authorise it.

But we doubt that there was any reasoning at all on this question. Dublin Governments, in anything seriously involving Britain, have been afraid of their shadows.

And there is at any rate no serious comparison to be made between Sinn Fein and Fianna Fail in 1932. Fianna Fail had made war on the Free State and not at all on Britain. And the Free State Government had committed war crimes against the anti-Treaty movement if that term had any meaning at all. And nothing of that kind exists between FG/FF and Sinn Fein today. FG/FF are just lost in the ideological fog in which they concealed themselves during the Northern War.

Fintan O'Toole lives in a world of sensationalist journalist abstraction. So he writes about a newly-elected Sinn Fein TD, who won against all the odds: "*Shouting 'Up the Ra!'... is a live device, primed to explode into contemporary reality*"?

How can that be? Because the Provos—a hastily-formed group—asserted in 1970 the right to fight a war in the North, and they fought it to a negotiated settlement, and they took Government Office in the negotiated settlement, and they refuse in retrospect to brand themselves as murderers.

Therefore anybody who utters the magic slogan: "*Up the Ra!*" can do in the South what the Provos did in the North, make war?

This is the world of Ali Baba And The Forty Thieves. The slogan there, as far as we recall, was *Alka Shazam!*, which caused the rock to move.

This 'Up The Ra' magic is a "*toxic tradition*" O'Toole says.

Ferghal Keane (the one who is "*a senior foreign correspondent with the BBC*") describes it as "*the most toxic political word in the state*" (Irish Times, March 17). He says "*the IRA past is not history, at least not in the sense of something that has vanished into an unmarked grave*".

How could it be when the state itself is a product of it, as Keane acknowledges. And he looks hopefully to Mary Lou to exorcise the magic, to purge the poison: "*Her performance... has been surefooted, and she is surely in a strong position to set in motion a critical examination of the past.*"

There was a moment when Mary Lou seemed very willing to disown the past and treat the state brought about by IRA action as worthless, and open the way for a comprehensively bland and non-descript future, such as would meet with the approval of a Foreign Correspondent of the BBC. But that moment seems to have passed.

In case it hasn't, here is Keane's helpful advice to her:

"She could become the first republican leader in Irish history to say that we must speak all the truths of war and not just those that damn our enemies. This period of centenaries reminds us well of the absence of honesty in the wake of the War of Independence and the Civil War. Our new state groaned under the weight of suppressed trauma and buried lies..."

It seems to us that "our new state" dealt with its conflicts (most of which were imposed by Keane's State) openly and vigorously, first in war and later in politics, and, instead of being weighed down with an overstuffed unconscious filled with traumas, appears almost to have no unconscious but to exist entirely on the surface. Freud is reported as saying that the Irish could not be analysed for lack of a problematic Unconscious.

They could now do with a bit of history. And what history is there is the past half-millennium of resistance to British subjugation by the "Ra" is left out of it?

Keane's ideal of Irish normality is of course West Britain. He hails from Kerry but is by profession a British propagandist. The BBC is a British State institution. The issue was put to the test in the North when Vincent Hanna, then the presenter of *Newsnight*, got the notion that the BBC was an independent Guild of broadcasters and broadcast an interview with Martin McGuinness and Gregory Campbell, contrary to Government instruction, and was sacked—and the Board that authorised it was purged.

The rule that the BBC was obliged to be "impartial" but was forbidden to be "independent" was enforced on the dissident propagandists. The meaning of "impartial" was that it had to act within the parameters set by the Government and the Official Opposition, giving expression to their views but not going beyond them.

With a bizarre debating point, Keane OBE has aligned himself against the IRA that brought its war to an orderly conclusion, by citing the fragment of it that resigned in order to continue the war to a bitter end.

David Cullinane, on winning the Waterford seat, reminded us that a Northern Hunger Striker, Kevin Lynch, had contested it in 1981 and lost. Cullinane's victory demonstrated how opinion in the South had moved towards the IRA which had fought the war in the North to an orderly conclusion. He reflected that this may be

of some consolation to Lynch's family. So, *Up the Ra!*

Not at all!, says Keane OBE. The Hunger Strikers rejected the settlement made in 1998. The Provo leaders sold the Hunger Strikers down the river:

"Recalling the hunger strikes of 1981 and the memory of Bobby Sands, he [Cullinane] spoke of Sinn Fein's electoral triumph as a "fantastic moment" for Sands's family if they were watching. Not quite. The Sands family's most prominent voice is Bernadette Sands-McKevitt, who has publicly denounced Sinn Fein's pursuit of electoral politics. At Bobby Sands's mother's funeral in 2018 Sands-McKevitt turned on the Sinn Fein IRA leadership, accusing them of breaching the family's trust. To the bitter ends of the dissident movement, the sight of David Cullinane shouting 'Up the Ra' will have been obnoxious, for very different reasons than those felt by the victims of the IRA..."

In wars there are victims on all sides, and war is the most permanent and universal feature of all public human activities. And the State which Keane OBE serves as a propagandist has made more wars than any other in the last few hundred years. But the relevant matter is not the victims but the participants. The non-belligerent victims of Hiroshima were killed in order to exert pressure on the Japanese Government and save some American military lives. Their killers have never bothered their heads about them, but the killing at least had an identifiable purpose—unlike that of the Dresden fire-bombing when the War was all but over.

The opinion of participants are what are relevant to the matter under discussion. Adams and McGuinness persuaded most of the leaders of the IRA that a functional settlement could be made which would transfer the momentum of the War to politics, and this was carried through. A minority regarded this as treason. Many of them were induced by Official IRA member Lord Bew, and by journalist Ed Moloney, to take part in an exercise intended to discredit Adams and damage the Agreement. They were interviewed on record at Boston College. The tapes were supposed to remain secret until they became politically irrelevant, but Moloney could not contain himself and drew attention to them. The State prosecution then demanded access to them and got it. And the witnesses against Adams found themselves being prosecuted on the basis of what they said about themselves on the tapes.

What they said against Adams was

dismissed by the Courts, because it was said in response to leading questions by the interviewers and there was no devil's advocate.

Lord Bew's Boston College escapade at least had the merit of demonstrating the political acumen of the opposition.

O'Toole reflects sententiously:

"The most awesome acts—the irreversible annihilation of human beings—require a much lower standard of authority than the mundane day-to-day business of governmental administration. The mandate for murder is much more cheaply purchased than the mandate for fixing potholes."

And he gets paid good money for that!

There is no standard of authority for making wars. War is a lawless activity. Laws of war were supposedly established by the United Nations but they have only ever been applied by victors against vanquished.

On O'Toole's view the Provos were a murder gang. The nominal authority for killing in the Six Counties was the British Government. It did not commission the Provos to kill. It reserved the right of killing to itself. The Dublin Government, which asserted *de jure* authority, did not commission them either. The Provos did it on their own authority. And if they had the right to do that, then everybody has the right to do it, and therefore everybody can do it. And therefore things will fall apart in the world if Sinn Fein does not recant, and does not condemn the IRA as a murder gang, and thus repeal the anarchic right of everybody to make war, which they asserted fifty years ago!

\*

The regime under which the British State has been governed for a little over 300 years was founded by an act of war in breach of law. Edmund Burke, the most constitutional of British political philosophers, admitted that this was so, but he thought it was not a fact to be dwelt upon and extrapolated into a precedent. Revolutions do not result from precedents. And wars by a people against a regime are not caused by principles, good or bad. And if a people rebels against a powerful State, and the war is carried through to a successful outcome, that fact is of itself proof that there was sufficient reason for it. The particulars of situations are what matter.

(Continuing our series on the events of 1920 with the help of the daily newspaper of the First Dail, the *Irish Bulletin*.)

## **LEST WE FORGET (16)**

**The following are the Acts of Aggression committed in Ireland by the armed Military and Police of the Usurping English Government -  
As reported in the Daily Press for week ending:- FEBRUARY 21st, 1920.**

### S u m m a r y.

Date:-	16th	17th	18th	19th	20th	21st	Total.
Raids:-	504	360	3	38	330	20	1,255
Arrests:-	-	7	4	14	18	16	59
Sentences:-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2
Courtmartials:-	-	1	-	1	2	2	6
Proclamations & Suppressions:-	2	-	2	-	-	2	6
Armed Assault	1	2	2	-	3	-	8
Deportations:-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2
<u>Daily Totals:-</u>	509	371	11	53	353	41	1,338

The sentences passed for political offences during the above six days, totalled 5 months.

### MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16th, 1920

#### Raids:-

In the town of Ballytrain, Co. Monaghan and in the districts adjoining it military and police in a sudden "drive" raided and searched over 500 houses. At Cotehill, Co. Cavan, armed police raided the residence of Mr. F. McKeown, merchant. At Carrick-on-Suir, Co. Tipperary, armed police raided the residences of Messrs. Donegan, O'Keefe, and Reidy.

#### Sentences:-

At Portumna, Co. Galway, Mr. Ml. Martin was sentenced by courtmartial held on February 4th, 1920, to 3 months imprisonment with hard labour, on a charge of driving a motor car without a Permit from the British Military Authorities. Mr. Martin Mollow, of Hacketstown, Co. Carlow, was sentenced by a "Crimes" Court to two months imprisonment on a charge of having in his possession a leaflet "dealing with Dail Eireann Loan", and cloth "capable of being used as a mask".

#### Proclamations and Suppressions:-

At Magherafelt, Co. Derry, an Irish dance was proclaimed. Large forces of military and police were drafted into the town to suppress any effort to hold the dance. At Dundalk, Co. Louth, a Concert to be held in aid of the purchase of St. Enda's School, of which P. H. Pearse executed in 1916 - was Headmaster, was proclaimed by the British Military Authorities. Troops raided and occupied the Forrester's Hall in which the Concert was to have been held.

#### Armed Assault:-

When Mr. John Heaphy was leaving Ballylongford, Co. Kerry he was shot without warning or challenge by police. He was on the public highway at the time. His condition is precarious.

#### Murder:-

At the inquest held into the circumstances of the death of Mr. James O'Brien, of Rathdrum, Co. Wicklow, who was shot dead without challenge or warning by police, Constable Mulligan gave evidence that while the police were parading the Fair Green, Rathdrum, they heard what they believed to be shots. They immediately drew their revolvers and fired at young men who were standing in a doorway close by, killing James O'Brien. Constable Mulligan said he was fired at and wounded in the back before he himself fired, but when his tunic was shown to the Jury, no marks whatever were visible on it, and Dr. McDermot who attended Mulligan said the mark on his back might have been caused by a blow of a stick - which blow could have been purposely inflicted after Mulligan had killed O'Brien. The police were unable to produce any civilian evidence that there was any firing other than their own on the night in question. The Jury which was selected by the police themselves brought in the following verdict:- "That the deceased met his death from a bullet fired by the police; but, as they were not satisfied that the injuries one of the patrol received were caused by a bullet, they could not conclude that the police were justified in firing".

### TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17th, 1920

#### Raids:-

In Cork city, armed police raided ten private houses. At Ballagh, Co. Wexford, and neighbouring districts, armed police raided some score of private houses. At Aghern, Co. Cork, in a "drive" by large bodies of military and police upwards of 100 houses were forcibly entered and searched. The villages of Castlemartyr, Ladysbridge and Ballinascarty were invested by military and police who searched many houses. It is estimated that the total number of residences raided in the district is about 200. At Newtownbutler, Wattlebridge and Kilgarrow, Co. Fermanagh military and police raided approximately thirty houses.

#### Arrests:-

Messrs. F. Fitzpatrick, Matthew Fitzpatrick, Francis Sheridan and Thomas Huston, all of Co. Fermanagh, were arrested during the raids by military and police in that County. No charge had been preferred against them. Mr. J. O'Connell, Glengarriff, Co. Cork, was arrested by military and police, no charge has been preferred against him. Two arrests are reported as having taken place in the raid (above mentioned) at Ladysbridge; and three at Ballinascarty, Co. Cork.

#### Court martial:-

Mr. Jas. J. Redican, of St. Broc's Cottages, Donnybrook, Co. Dublin, was tried by court martial at Marlboro Barracks, Dublin, on a charge of not leaving the Province of Connaught, and the Counties of Fermanagh, Cavan, Longford and Westmeath, when ordered to do so by the British Military Authorities. Accused who refused to recognise the Court or to plead was found guilty. Sentence has not yet been promulgated.

#### Armed Assaults:-

At Glengarriff, Co. Cork, the townspeople who were showing sympathy with Mr. J. O'Connell, who had been arrested by military and police, were set upon and batoned by the police, several being seriously wounded. At Thurles, Co. Tipperary, military and police suddenly appeared upon the streets, and at the point of the bayonet held up, overpowered and searched many of the inhabitants of the town. Mr. J. McLoughney one of the recently elected members of the Thurles Urban District Council, who was one of those searched, said that property was taken from him, which the troops who held him up and went through his pockets did not return. Other prominent townspeople make a similar complaint.

#### Deportation:-

Mr. J. Snow recently arrested at Baltinglass, Co. Wicklow, was deported to England without trial or charge.

### WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18th, 1920

#### Raids:-

A party of 150 military in full war equipment, and 100 police armed with rifles and hand-grenades, raided the Thomas Ashe Sinn Fein Club, Cork. An Irish Class was in progress at the time. This the armed forces broke up, overpowering and searching all the members of the class, four of whom were subsequently arrested. Military and police raided the Town Hall, at Ballinagh, Co. Cavan, and took possession of it. Thirty armed police raided the business premises of the Misses Leonard, Earle Street, Mullingar.

### Arrests:-

Four young men, members of the Thomas Ashe Sinn Fein Club, Charles Street, Cork, were arrested on the Club premises when these were raided by a force of 250 military and police.

### Proclamations and Suppressions:-

An order has been issued in London stating that if Ald. T. Kelly, Lord Mayor Elect of Dublin – who has been released in broken health from Wormwood Scrubbs prison – attempts to return to Ireland, he will immediately be re-arrested.

At Ballinagh, Co. Cavan, a patriotic play entitled “O’Donoghue the Insurgent” which was to have been staged in the local Town Hall, was proclaimed by the Military Authorities and suppressed by a large body of military and police who raided and occupied the hall.

### Armed Assault:-

During the hearing of a charge against Messrs. T. Fenton and M. Fitzgerald of “unlawful assembly” at Waterville, Co. Tipperary, on January 6th, the police admitted that they charged a gathering of young men dispersing them with their batons and subsequently fired their revolvers at them. Military patrols in full war equipment suddenly appeared on many of the Dublin Streets. They took up positions in the main thoroughfares and held up, overpowered and searched pedestrians and cyclists. There were many people in the streets at the time, and the action of the military was, it seems, deliberately provocative in view of the tragedy which resulted from similar proceedings in Limerick two weeks ago. On this occasion also loss of life might easily have attended this military demonstration. While citizens were being held up and searched crowds of people gathered round and showed hostility to the troops. Immediately the order was given to the military to prepare to charge whereupon there occurred a stampede among the civilians and many women and children were bruised and hurt.

## THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19th, 1920

### Raids:-

At Youghal, Co. Cork, and at Knockmonlea in the same county, armed military and police raided twenty-two private houses. At Castletownbere and Queenstown, both in Co. Cork, armed military and police raided twelve private houses in the early morning. At Nenagh, Co. Tipperary, four private houses were raided by police.

### Arrests:-

Military and police arrested five men at and in the neighbourhood of Castletownbere, Co. Cork. The men arrested were Messrs. Jos. Foley, John and Jerh. O’Driscoll, C. O’Neill and P. O’Neill. No charge has been preferred against these men. Messrs. M. Burke and P. Sullivan were arrested in their beds at Queenstown, Co. Cork. At Nenagh, Co. Tipperary, four farmers were arrested on a charge of “unlawful assembly” which consisted of attending a fair which the military had decreed suppressed. The men’s names are T. Caplis, Rearchross, and T. Caplis, Jr., his son. John Carey and WM. Healy. Mr. J. F. Hedley was re-arrested at Rotterdam, England and handed over to the police in Ireland to complete a sentence of six months for a political offence. Mr. Hedley had been released after a hunger-strike for political treatment. Messrs. D. McGrath and E. Costello, Kilfinane, Co. Limerick, were arrested on a charge of endeavouring to obtain arms.

### Court martial:-

At Derry city, Mr. Anthony McGinley who was for nine weeks held without charge by the police was tried by court martial for having in his possession arms and ammunition. He was found not guilty.

### Treatment of Prisoners:-

One of the Doctors who examined Alderman T. Kelly, Lord Mayor elect of Dublin who had been deported from Ireland and imprisoned at Wormwood Scrubbs Prison, England for two months without trial or charge, declared that “it was a desperate brutality to keep a man suffering as Ald. Kelly was so long in prison”. Although they are uncharged and untried, seven of the young men arrested during the round-up of February 13th are in Mountjoy Prison, being kept in solitary confinement.

## FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 20th, 1920.

### Raids:-

In the city of Dublin in the early hours of the morning armed military and police raided many residences, - on this as on previous occasions battering down the door when it was not opened at the first knocking. In all over thirty houses were visited and searched. At Castlegregory, Co. Kerry, and throughout the adjacent districts large forces of

military and police took part in one of those “drives” which have now become such frequent features of militarism in Ireland. The armed forces raided upwards of 300 private houses herding the occupants into one room and ransacking the rest of the house.

### Arrests:-

In the raids in Dublin above mentioned, the military and police arrested sixteen men whom they carried off without stating any charge against them. In one instance when the military entered a house in Fitzroy Avenue, in order to arrest Messrs. John and Joseph Bracken, the father of these young men questioned the officer in charge as to the reason for the arrest. The reply was “I do not know”. The names of the sixteen men arrested are:- M. Kelly, Jas. O’Dea, John O’Dea, K. Kiely, M. Gleeson, A. Redmond, H. Houlihan, - O’Reilly, John Bracken, Jos. Bracken, J. Mallin, B. Mallin, R. Tobin, R. Purcell, - Bradshaw, and another man not named. Mr. A. McGinley of Dunglo, Co. Donegal who had been held for 9 weeks on a charge of collecting for the Irish Self-Determination Fund and subsequently handed over to the military on an entirely different charge, and courtmartialled for having firearms in his possession was acquitted by the military court and was re-arrested by the police for the previous “offence”. Mr. P. Byrne of Enniscorthy, Co. Wexford, was handed over to the military authorities on a charge of having 10 rounds of revolver ammunition in his possession.

### Court martial:-

Messrs. D. Leahy and J. Hartnett of Drumtrasna, Co. Limk., were tried by court martial on a charge of having arms and ammunition. Accused were members of a local vigilance Committee set up by farmers in the Abbeyfeale district of Limerick in order to protect life and property left unguarded by the police who are being used almost solely against the National Movement in Ireland. The accused who had been three weeks in custody were acquitted and released.

### Armed Assaults:-

Two British Soldiers who, because they had not the money to purchase, were refused a pack of cards at the business premises of Mr. M. J. Kelly at 10 Wellington Place, Dublin, returned after a few minutes to the shop and felled Mrs. M. J. Kelly with a blow. Mrs. Kelly who was only partially stunned rose and struggled with one of the troops and received many other blows. The soldiers then decamped having stolen the cards and other articles from the shop. Mrs. Kelly was taken seriously wounded to hospital. Armed patrols of military and police in great strength suddenly appeared on the streets of Tipperary Town, and at the point of the bayonet held up civilians of all classes and overpowering them searched them. The patrols held up all traffic, and turning the people from their cars, searched them. Two members of the Dublin Metropolitan police – Constable Patrick J. Hussey and Constable Patrick Flannery – were arrested on a charge of “demanding money and menacing a civilian with a revolver”. This is the official way of saying that these constables held up a civilian in the public streets, demanded his money from him, and when he refused to give it they fired at and endeavoured to kill him.

## SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 21st, 1920

### Raids:-

Military and police again raided many houses in Dublin. Greater numbers of troops were used on this occasion than on any previous raids and these strong bodies of soldiery were accompanied on their raids by armoured cars and tanks. Considerable destruction was done in the houses visited by the troops, floors being torn up in every room, and wall casings etc. removed. In all some twenty houses were raided in Dublin. Among the houses raided was the business premises of Messrs. Frank O’Hara, Aungier Street, where the military and police arrested the entire staff, including the Auditor who was preparing the yearly balance sheet.

### Arrests:-

In these raids ten arrests were made. In the majority of these cases the police have refused to give the names of the arrested men. At 27 Sullivan’s Street, Dublin, Messrs. John and Thomas Leddy were arrested it is supposed on a charge of having ammunition in their possession. Mr. M. Griffith, 54 Eccles Street, Dublin, was arrested at his residence on an unknown charge. Three young men whose names have not been published were surrounded by troops in Waterford Street, Dublin, and were arrested.



### Courtmartial:-

Mr. P. Dalton, Railway Clerk, 16 O'Brien Street, Waterford, was tried by courtmartial on a charge of having in his possession a revolver, ammunition, and seditious documents. He refused to recognise the Court and was found guilty. Mr. Ml. Dunne, Gurlacurra, Templemore, Co. Tipperary, was tried by the same courtmartial on a charge of having in his possession a "document which if published might cause disaffection". Mr. Dunne who similarly refused to recognise the right of the Court, was also found guilty. Sentences in these cases have not yet been pronounced.

### Provocation:-

Fully armed military patrols were again posted upon the Dublin Streets. Passers-by were held up at the point of the bayonets and questioned as to their business.

### Proclamations and Suppressions:-

A Proclamation has been issued from Dublin Castle decreeing the city of Dublin to be under martial law each night from the hours of

12 midnight to 5 a.m. The main portions of this Order read:- "Every person within the Dublin Metropolitan Police District shall remain within doors between the hours of 12 o'clock midnight and 5 o'clock a.m., unless provided with a permit in writing from the Competent Military Authority, or some person duly authorised by him. . . . . Every person abroad between the hours mentioned in the foregoing Order, when challenged by any policemen or by any officer, non-commissioned officer or soldier on duty, must immediately halt and obey orders given to him, and, if he fails to do so, it will be at his own peril". At Armagh, a demonstration of welcome to Mr. E. Donnelly, President of the local Sinn Fein Club, who had served a sentence in Belfast Jail of 5 months for seditious speaking was proclaimed by the military authorities. Large forces of military and police occupied the town in order to suppress any effort to hold the demonstration. Mr. T. Atkins, recently elected member of the Dublin Corporation who was arrested in a recent "round-up" was deported without trial to Wormwood Scrubbs Prison, England.

## **The following are Acts of Aggression committed in Ireland by the armed Military and Police of the usurping English Government as reported in the Daily Press for week ending February 28th, '20.**

### Summary

Date: February	23rd	24th	25th	26th	27th	28th	Total
Raids:-	17	67	516	1	307	289	1,197
Arrests:-	6	7	28	10	7	32	90
Sentences:-	2	-	3	-	-	3	8
Suppressions & Proclamations	1	-	1	-	-	7	9
Armed Assaults:-	-	3	3	-	-	-	6
Courtmartials:-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Deportations:-	1	-	-	3	-	4	8
<b>Totals:-</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>1,319</b>

The sentences passed for political offences during the above six days, totalled 7 years 4 months.

### **MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23rd, 1920**

#### Raids:-

Military and police raided the residence of Mr. Barlow at Shrough, Co. Tipperary. The houses of Messrs. J.Hynes and M. Lannigan of Templemore, Co. Tipperary, were forcibly entered by police and military and searched. The residence of Mr. P. J. O'Daly, Carrickmacross, Assistant Surveyor for Co. Monaghan was raided and searched by armed police. The houses at Corduff, Co. Monaghan, of Messrs. W. Ward, Thos. Hanratty and ex-Sergt Keelan of the Royal Irish Constabulary, were raided and searched by armed police. Four houses in the Glassborough district, in the same County, were similarly raided. Half-a-dozen news agencies were raided at Ranelagh, Co. Dublin, by armed police, who seized part of the stock on the plea that it was seditious.

#### Arrests:-

Miss Madeleine Ffrench-Mullen, recently elected a member of the Rathmines Urban Council, was arrested in Dublin on a charge of "obstructing the military in the discharge of their duties by cycling after them". Messrs. Arthur and Matthew Barbour of Shrough, Co. Tipperary, were arrested in bed by military and police. No charge has been brought against them. Messrs. J. Hynes and M. Lannigan of Templemore, in the same County, were similarly arrested on an unknown charge. Mr. John Quinlan of Kilshannig, Co. Cork, was arrested and handed over to the military authorities. Mr. Quinlan is not connected with any political party, but the police state that explosives were found buried in land owned by him.

#### Sentences:-

At Nenagh, Co. Tipperary, Mr. Thos. Caplis was sentenced to one month's imprisonment for "unlawful assembly". The unlawful assembly consisted in attending a cattle fair which had been decreed suppressed by the British military authorities. Mr. Robert C. Barton, Member of Parliament for West Wicklow, was sentenced at Dublin by General Courtmartial to three years' penal servitude on a charge of "doing acts calculated to cause sedition amongst the civilian population". The "acts" in question consisted of a speech by Mr. Barton to his constituents in which he threatened the military authorities with reprisals if political prisoners from the district were

tortured in prison as other political prisoners had been.

#### Proclamations & Suppressions:-

In the newsagents shops at Ranelagh, Co. Dublin, armed police seized all available copies of the current issue of "Old Ireland", a weekly Republican Journal.

#### Armed Assault:-

Mr. J. J. Kinsella, Upper Leeson St, Dublin, was fired upon by a military patrol while cycling through the city to his home. Mr. Kinsella had been called upon to halt by a man in civilian dress. Suspecting that the man's motive was robbery Mr. Kinsella increased his speed, whereupon the troops concealed nearby opened fire upon him. He fell from his bicycle, was surrounded by military and police and searched. It subsequently transpired that the man in civilian dress was a police officer. This incident occurred in the public streets of the city of Dublin

#### Deportations:-

Mr. R. C. Barton, M.P. , was deported from Kingstown to an unknown destination. Mr. Barton is on hunger strike as a protest against his being denied the status of a political prisoner.

#### Militarism:-

The latest military proclamation by which the citizens of Dublin are threatened that if they leave their homes between the hours of 12 midnight and 5 a.m. , they will do so "at their own peril" has resulted in new hardships being visited upon the poor. Under this proclamation Doctors and Nurses who receive sudden calls will answer them under the danger of being shot, and in the certainty of being challenged and stopped many times on their journey. Mr. O'Connell, Secretary of the Nurses Insurance Society of Ireland, in an interview with the Press says:- "These challenges, and the strain of watching for fear of being shot by mistake, are enough to shake the nerves of anybody. Knowing this, I cannot, in justice to my staff or my clients, allow any of my nurses to go out alone to a call during the prohibited hours".

### **TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24th, 1920**

#### Raids:-

Military and police raided and searched the residences of Messrs. P. J. MacMahon, recently elected Chairman of the Castleblayney (Co.



Monaghan) Urban District Council, Con Hanly and J. Daly, members of the same body, and Neil McShane, John Flanagan, James McAmeey and Mrs. Hardy. In the course of a military "drive" in the Clones district of Co. Monaghan, police and military searched the houses of the following:- Messrs. J. Connolly, W. McMahon, Frank Kane, J. McGluinn, Philip Curran, Hugh Mohan, and John Mulvaney. The town of Newtownbutler was occupied by large forces of military who raided and searched upwards of a score of houses. In the Cullyhanna district of Co. Armagh military and police raided thirty-three houses.

#### **Arrests:-**

Mr. Michael Kennedy was arrested by police and military while cycling to his work at the Golden Vale Hotel, Golden Vale, Co. Tipperary. Mr. Thos. O'Dwyer, Limerick, was arrested by armed police on a charge of having firearms in his possession. Five persons were arrested on the streets of Dublin for being "abroad" between the hours of 12 midnight and 5 a.m. without a permit from the British Military authorities.

#### **Armed Assaults:-**

Military and police in great numbers surrounded the town of Nenagh, Co. Tipperary and held up all people entering or leaving the town, overpowered them and searched their persons, making notes of their names, addresses and occupation. The private correspondence found on the persons thus held up was read by the Officers in charge of these troops. Military patrols posted at all approaches to the City of Limerick held up passers- by and similarly searched them. At Golden Vale, Co. Tipperary, troops arrived in motor lorries and lining the public road for a considerable distance held up passers-by, overpowered them and searched them. One young lad on his way to work was arrested.

#### **Treatment of Prisoners:-**

The Dublin Corporation having met for the purpose of installing the recently elected Lord Mayor, Alderman Kelly, M.P., had to postpone the ceremony owing to the action of the British Government who threaten Ald. Kelly with arrest if he attempts to leave England, whither

he was deported, without trial or charge, and kept in prison until his health absolutely gave way. He is still being treated in a Nursing Home in London.

### **WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25th, 1920**

#### **Raids:-**

In the course of a military "drive" in County Down, parties of soldiers and police in full war equipment entered and searched upwards of 500 houses in the district around Ballynahinch. The house of Mr. John Brennan, Athleague, Co. Westmeath, was forcibly entered and searched by police. Fourteen houses were raided by police in the neighbourhood of Ballymote, Co. Sligo. At Thurles, Co. Tipperary, armed police raided the residence of Mr. Joseph Loughrey, recently elected Member of the Thurles Urban District Council.

#### **Arrests:-**

Mr. James Staines, aged 17, a brother of Alderman Ml. Staines, M.P., was arrested at the gates of Mountjoy Prison where he had been detained as a result of a military hunt for his brother. He is charged with being in possession of "seditious" documents. Mr. Michael Ward was arrested at Boyle, Co. Roscommon, and handed over to the military authorities on a charge of having firearms in his possession. Fourteen men, whose names did not transpire, were arrested at their homes around Ballymote, Co. Sligo, on Twelve persons were arrested at Dublin by military patrols on a charge of being "abroad" between the hours of 12 and 5 a.m., without a permit from the British Military Authorities.

#### **Sentences:-**

Mr. Thos. Crimmins, 49 Upper Blessington St. Dublin, was sentenced by courtmartial at Dublin to one imprisonment for having firearms in his possession. Mr. Arthur Walton, St. Germain's, Harold's Cross, Dublin, was sentenced by the same courtmartial to six months' imprisonment on a similar charge. Mr. James Redican, Drum, Boyle, Co. Roscommon, was sentenced by courtmartial to two months' imprisonment on a charge of "committing a breach of an Order of the Competent Military Authority, under Regulation 14, D.R.R. prohibiting him from residing in the province of Connaught or the Counties of Fermanagh, Cavan, Longford, and Westmeath.

#### **Proclamations & Suppressions:-**

A sitting of the Industrial Commission instituted by the Irish Republican Parliament to inquire into the Industrial and mineral resources of Ireland was suppressed at Limerick by a force of 50 armed police, who raided and took possession of the Town Hall where the session was to have been held. The sitting had to be conducted secretly elsewhere.

#### **Court martial:-**

Mr. Matthew Holt, Ferrybank, Arklow, Co. Wicklow, was courtmartialled on a charge of having in his house an empty revolver, for which there was no ammunition. Sentence will be promulgated.

#### **Armed Assault:-**

Mr. Philip Maher, Turtulla, Co. Tipperary, was held up at night, by armed police, on his way home. Although he gave his name when asked, one of the police struck him full in the face with the butt of a rifle. He reeled and fell, and when he rose he was struck again. He was then ordered home. A railway employee named Kennedy was shot at by a military patrol whilst on his way to work at a railway pumping station, about a half a mile from Thurles. Mr. Kennedy says he did not see anyone, and was neither halted nor challenged. Three men - Messrs. Callanan, Burke, and McCarthy - whilst on their way to their homes at Lough, Thurles, Co. Tipperary, were fixed on by a police patrol. The men assert that they were not halted or challenged and did not see the police until they fired.

#### **Provocation:-**

"R.I.P." - an inscription well known in rural Ireland as a threat of drastic houses of prominent Republicans at Thurles Co. Tipperary, at a time when none but military and police were upon the streets. This action is taken locally to mean another visitation of police sabotage upon the houses so marked. Many of these houses were fired into and bombed by police on the night of January 20th, 1920. Great uneasiness prevails in the town.

#### **Militarism:-**

One of the most disastrous effects of the Curfew order is upon the trade in Dublin. Owing to it dockers are unable to work at night to berth ships which arrive in the Dublin quays. As well no unloading of cargoes can be carried on at night. Although the order is only three days in operation already, there is serious coal shortage in the city, traceable directly to the effect of the restrictions the Order imposes.

#### **Militarism:-**

Acting on s from the Military Authorities in Ireland, the Members of the Dublin Metropolitan Police Force have discarded their identity numbers worn on the cap and tunic. This leaves the men free to attack any citizen with impunity, and it is obvious that the order was intended to have that result. The special correspondent of the "Daily Chronicle" who had not obtained a permit from the British Military Authorities to be "abroad" in Dublin during the hours of 12 midnight and 5 a.m., was standing in the porch of his Hotel in Upper O'Connell St, with other visitors, when he was approached by a party of military who demanded permits. As none were forthcoming the visitors had to withdraw into the hotel and close the door.

### **THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26th, 1920**

#### **Raids:-**

Police raided the residence of Mr. M. McGuinness, Emyvale, Co. Monaghan, and dismantled his motor car.

#### **Arrests:-**

Messrs. Patrick, Nicholas and Jos. Hanna (brothers), P. Doran and James McAleagh, were arrested at Ballynahinch, Co. Down, no charge has been preferred against them. Messrs. P. O'Shea, T. Daly, and Alex O'Donnell, all of Co. Kerry, were arrested in their beds during a military "drive" through the district. No charge has been preferred against them. Two persons were arrested on the streets of Dublin on a charge of being "abroad" between the hours of 12 midnight and 5 a.m. without a permit from the British Military Authorities.

#### **Deportations:-**

Messrs. P. O'Shea, T. Daly, and Alex O'Donnell - were deported from Fenet, Co. Kerry. They were put aboard an English Government vessel and were taken to an unknown destination.

#### **Militarism:-**

Armed police held up motorists in many parts of Dublin to examine their permits. Those who had not got them at the moment were kept in custody until they were reproduced. The permits in question are

those now required before possession of a motor-car or motor cycle becomes legal. They can only be had by application to the British Military Authorities. The cars of owners who have not applied for, or, having applied, have not been granted, permits for them are confiscated by the police if any attempt is made to use them. In order to enforce the "Curfew Order" armoured cars and special lorries fitted with searchlights parade the Dublin streets all through the night. The noise of these war-vehicles and the constant tramp of numberless patrols of English troops will, it is hoped by the British Authorities, terrify the people into submission after some time.

#### **FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27th, 1920**

##### **Raids:-**

Strong raiding parties of fully equipped military went about Dublin streets after midnight and forced an entry into several houses. Among the houses raided and searched were the Sinn Fein Headquarters at No. 6 Harcourt Street, and the offices of Messrs. D. O'Connor & Co., Auditors and Chartered Accountants, 13 Westmoreland St. The residence of Mr. J. W. Kelly, 15 St. Joseph's Parade, Dublin, was similarly raided. At Mount Pleasant, Co. Cork, and in the surrounding districts, large forces of military and police raided upwards of 100 houses. The residences occupied by Mrs. Keogh, and Mr. Hoban at Nelson St. Dublin, were raided and searched by a strong force of military. At Castle Street, Tralee, Co. Kerry, armed police raided and searched the residence of Mr. J. Edwards. In the same town the residence of Mr. D. Jeffers, newly elected member of the Tralee Urban District Council, was raided in an effort to arrest Mr. Jeffers. The police who held the warrant for Mr. Jeffers' arrest stated he was wanted in connection with a Resolution he had proposed at the Urban Council. This is a fair sample of how much freedom of speech is permitted in Ireland. In the townlands adjacent to Newry large bodies of military and police raided extensively. Over 200 houses were forcibly entered and searched.

##### **Arrests:-**

Mr. R. Killeen of 14 St. Joseph's Parade, Dublin, was arrested during a military raid upon his premises. No charge has been brought against him. At Kilmalley, Co. Clare, military and police arrested a young man whose name or the charge upon which the arrest was made they refuse to state. Three persons were arrested on the streets of Dublin on a charge of being "abroad" between the hours of 12 midnight and 5 a.m., without a permit from the British Military authorities. Mr. P. McGrath was taken into military custody at Mercer's Hospital, Dublin, where he had been under treatment for bullet wounds inflicted by the police. He was removed to Mountjoy Jail although his condition is still critical. Mr. Jos. McGerrity of Ballymacdermott, Co. Armagh, was arrested on a charge of having fire-arms in his possession.

##### **Militarism:-**

The cattle trade of which Dublin is perhaps the most important centre in Ireland is being seriously injured by the "Curfew Order". Usually buyers attended the great weekly market Smithfield, Dublin, in the early morning and were able to ship their purchases to England by the morning boats and to other parts by early trains. The market is now unable to begin before 6 o'clock, and transhipment the same day has become impossible. As these markets are timed, specially to facilitate the transport of cattle purchased, the operation of the Curfew Order in this instance has been spoken of by traders as "disastrous". It is to be noted that Ireland's richest industry is its cattle-breeding.

#### **SATURDAY, February 28th, 1920**

##### **Raids:-**

Another of the military "drives" which have become a frequent occurrence in Irish country districts took place at Timoleague, Co. Cork, and in the neighbouring townlands. It is estimated that some 250 private houses were forcibly entered and searched. At Tipperary Town military and police raided ten houses. They held warrants for the arrest of the occupants, but then majority of these were not at home. At Golden, Co. Tipperary, fourteen houses were visited by armed police and searched. The residence of Mr. Sean Murphy at Dunmanway, Co. Cork, was raided by armed police. The residence of Mr. L. O'Sullivan of the same district was similarly raided and searched. The residence of Dr. Kathleen Lynn, F.R.C.S.I. of 9 Belgrave Rd., Rathmines, Dublin, was raided by military and police, who forcibly entered the house after dark, and turning Miss French-

Mullen, a guest of Dr. Lynn's, and a maid, out of their beds searched the house. Other raids took place in Dublin at the same time, three houses being searched at Percy Place and some six others elsewhere in the city. These latter raids have not been reported in the Press. Military raiding parties forcibly entered Nos. 3, 6, and 76 Harcourt Street, Dublin, and engaged in looting and destruction of the property. (See "Military Sabotage" below).

##### **Arrests:-**

Mr. Michael Crowley of Castletown, Co. Cork, who had just completed a term of imprisonment for unlawful assembly was re-arrested at Cork on an unknown charge. Nineteen persons were arrested in the streets of Dublin by armed military and police on a charge of being "abroad" between the hours of 12 midnight and 5 a.m. without the permission of the British Military Authorities. Mr. S. O'Dwyer of Lisbouran, Co. Tipperary, was arrested by the military on a charge which has not been stated. Messrs. Thos. Mavin, John Keating, W.M. Maher, Lawrence Bennett, Roger O'Donnell, Maurice Shine, John Dawney, Jos. Condon, and Patrick O'Connell, all of Golden, Co. Tipperary, were arrested in that district on a charge of "unlawful assembly". Mr. T. Duggan, Roshill, Co. Galway, was arrested by military and police on an unknown charge. Mr. L. O'Sullivan of Dunmanway, Co. Cork, was arrested. No charge has been preferred against him.

##### **Sentences:-**

Mr. P. Dalton of 15 O'Brien St. Waterford, was sentenced by District Courtmartial held at Cork on Feb. 19th, to two years' imprisonment, with hard labour, for having in his possession a revolver, ammunition and seditious documents. Mr. Michael Dunne, Gurtacurra, Co. Tipperary, tried by the same courtmartial, was sentenced to six months imprisonment, with hard labour, for having in his possession a "seditious" document. Mr. P. Landers recently elected member of the Listowel Urban District Council was sentenced at Listowel, Co. Kerry, to one month's imprisonment for "illegal drilling".

##### **Proclamations and Suppressions:-**

Seven proclamations have been published in the "Dublin Gazette" declaring that the following seven counties are "in a state of disturbance and require an additional establishment of police":- Dublin, Louth, Longford, Sligo, Wicklow, Westmeath and Waterford. By these proclamations extra drafts of police, with the full armament of troops, will now be quartered upon the people and will be used to repress still more savagely every evidence of sympathy with the National demand for independence.

##### **Deportations:-**

Messrs. Jos. and John Bracken, M. Griffin, and J. Mallin, arrested in one of the recent rounds-up in Dublin, were deported from Kingstown to an unknown destination.

##### **Military Sabotage:-**

On February 27th at 2 a.m., three raiding parties of military forcibly entered 76 Harcourt St. (recently Headquarters of the Republican Government), 6 Harcourt St. (recently the Headquarters of Sinn Fein organisation), and 3 Harcourt St., the premises at present occupied by the Sinn Fein Co-operative Bank, a purely business concern which - in spite of the contrary suggestion in its title - is non-political, being founded in 1908, to help in the industrial and economic revival in Ireland. Nos. 76 and 6 the military had six weeks ago raided and closed, and no business has since been transacted at either address. The military yesterday morning smashed their way into these three houses and set about wrecking every room in them. They uprooted and destroyed the floors; they wantonly broke into pieces with their rifle-butts and trench tools the furniture and pictures in each room. Windows and doors they demolished completely, and not even the electric bulbs in No. 76, or the ink-bottles and penholders in No. 3 escaped destruction. As well as thus wantonly destroying hundreds of pounds worth of valuable property, the military smashed open the safe in the Sinn Fein Bank and stole the £1,040 in cash and notes which it contained. These raids were not carried out by unorganised gangs of English rowdies, but by well-drilled English troops acting under regular officers and obeying the commands of their superiors.

**“Your sleep up there in the churchyard  
is no small thing to your friends;  
your life had not been fathomed  
when death pierced your side.**

**A Fitzgerald of the pride of the Badhbh  
this gentle innocent was anointed.  
She settled with the Dál gCais  
no mean match for this limb in earth.”**

Dáibhí O Bruadair. (c. 1625-1698.)

An Duanaire 1600-1900 Poems of the Dispossessed. Seán O Tuama with verse translations by Thomas Kinsella. The Dolmen Press. Ireland. 1981.

**“There was a true bigness, a sort of impersonality, in the manner in which the houses were conceived. After an era of greed, roughness and panic... these new settlers who had been imposed on Ireland began to wish to add something to life ... They began to feel, and exert, the European idea—to seek what was humanistic, classic and disciplined.”**  
The Big House, The Bell, 1940. (Blocking and italics –JH)

## Elizabeth Bowen: A review of Patricia Laurence’s biography.

There are two things I want to note before I start my article. The first is the typographical error that was in last month’s Irish Political Review article which read “British” when Laurence wrote as did I the word “Brirish” (Laurence conflates British and Irish and came up with this new word—which Ian dAlton in his Irish Times review thought to be a good thing.)

The other thing which I would like my readers to note is Bowen’s own take of her Cromwellian ancestors in her 1940 article for ‘The Bell’, as quoted above, the soldiers of Cromwell “had been imposed”, thereby having their agency taken from them, because this was a propagandistic piece and she had to make the Anglo-Irish—her “race”—look as good as possible. What she meant by “the European idea” is just pure bogus, even Yeats would have balked at that! In that same piece, Bowen made much of ‘the big house’ being a place of coming together—both of her people and the locals—well obviously she meant the more refined ones, or the suckers up like Sean O’Faolain.

There is that great quotation from Emmanuel Kehoe, Sunday Business Post, 27th June, 1999: “After Aughrim’s great disaster... Ireland settled into the long sleep of the 18th century. At least the exhausted Irish did. After two centuries of bloody war and conquest, triumphant magnates felt secure enough to lower their walls and build Palladian mansions, to create and overlay idealised English views on the

wild Irish landscape. As Dublin grew into elegance, the mass of embarrassing half naked peasantry seemed to fade from the view of the aristocrats... If the Americans and French hadn’t stirred the pot, Ireland might have slid into forehead-knuckling acquiescence.”

Here Kehoe takes on the coloniser’s view of the conquered people, using the word “peasantry” when those of whom he speaks were the great Gaelic race—aristocratic to its core with its great scholars, bards, filí and centres of monastic learning. Indeed as Brendan Clifford wrote in his article, ‘Some forgotten History’ in the March 2020 Irish Political Review:

“Irish” (Gaelic) “national life was abolished by comprehensive British military conquest in 1689-90 and the Penal Laws (of a kind with Hitler’s Nuremberg Laws) operated by the Protestant Colony based on the conquest. All that preceded 1691 was crushed. The Protestant Colony with its Parliament declared itself to be a nation—the Irish nation... It refused to act as the centre of a national development that embraced the Presbyterian Colony in the North and the large remnant of pre-1691 Ireland that refused to wither though deprived of property, the professions, education and any culture but what could survive without any of the above.”

And the Bowens were part of that Cromwellian army—the ap Owens from the Gower Peninsula in Wales where the poor land made Henry Bowen “take up arms for the King’s party in the Civil War, then switched sides and went to Ireland as a lieutenant colonel in Cromwell’s army”. He was well rewarded with the best land

in Ireland—what is still today called the ‘golden vale’ because of its world renowned butter and cheese.

Himself and I went on a voyage to Wales and went to the Gower Peninsula and saw only salty marsh boggy land and realised why Elizabeth Bowen herself never referred to her Welsh ancestry: it was all “*England made me*” and “*English history released me into the world on a vast scale*” after all the British Empire nearly covered the globe and that was a giddy notion for anybody never mind a young girl of impressionable age. “*English history was accessible, ‘dramatizable’ triumphalist mode - ... Good Queen Bess, Martello towers, pageants...*” But Bowen also noted in Bowen’s Court the history of another nation:

“If the greater part of the past had not been, mercifully, forgotten, the effect upon our modern sensibility would be unbearable; it would not be only injustice and bloodshed that we should have to remember but the dismay, the apathy, the brutalising humiliations of people for whom there was no break”.

But the Anglo-Irish had to do something about these people that would otherwise mar their idyllic Big Houses and they put them out of mind and, as Vera Kreilkamp (‘The Anglo-Irish Novel and the Big House’, Syracuse University Press, New York, 1998) noted when she visited Strokestown Park House, in the past: horses were stabled in good quarters but the servants were put underground, a fact which was visibly true of all Big Houses.

Kreilkamp scathingly wrote of—

“those cultural values of English Protestant colonialism that the Anglo-Irish landed gentry class unsuccessfully struggled to represent and sustain throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Edgeworth, Lever, and Somerville although occasionally invoking the nostalgic ideal of a semi-feudal relationship between tenant and landlord, created their most powerful fiction when they turned, on occasion with savage irony, to the inevitable decline of the Big House and to the instability of their own society.”

Did Bowen turn on her own society — there is that one novel, *The Last September*, where she shows how the Big House folk went on with their tea-parties with English soldiers (obviously officers — and even they were looked down upon by the lady of the house) and, while at the height of the War of Independence, the young heroine almost collided with a local young man on a mission in the woods — one is led to believe he is an IRA man but nothing was said as the young lady “*let him go past in contemptuous unawareness*”.

Roy Foster in *Paddy and Mr. Punch* says of the *The Last September*:

“that it is sometimes treated as historical evidence, though it was really written as a historical novel.”

Neither of these assertions are true. But he then goes on to state: “*The novel records Irish country-house life in 1920, as a guerrilla war rumbles around like thunder.*” Foster also attests: “*After Bowen’s Court the other text usually invoked to illustrate her Irishness is The Last September*” (1929).

But can there be anything more delicious than Patricia Laurence lambasting Foster as having: “*parodied the pair*” (Jack Lane and Brendan Clifford) “*in a novel, Paddy and Mr. Punch?*” Poor Laurence should note that *Paddy and Mr. Punch: Connections in Irish and English History* published by Allen Lane The Penguin Press, London, 1993) is intended to be a book of history. It really is not fiction, but then R. F. Foster’s oeuvre has that bent towards literary pretensions, so I would not be too harsh in condemning Laurence’s mistake. Foster himself in his ‘acknowledgments’ accepts that many of the essays on offer had been published elsewhere. And the cut and paste efforts show through in the book!

But back to Elizabeth Bowen who, from seven to twelve, lived with her mother in a series of rented villas on the Kent coast and it was this place that made Bowen the writer, which she went on to acknowledge in later years. And it was here, in Hythe,

that she later made her home in a small two-bedroom house after selling Bowen’s Court in 1959, but she had lived in various flats for a couple of years before Hythe. She just did not have the money to buy even such a modest little abode but her agent, Spencer Curtis Brown, sold some of her papers to the Humanities Research Center in Austin, Texas for a good price. Thus she paid £4,700 for the house she named ‘Carbery’ in memory of her mother’s long-lost Colley property.

She had played there as a child and, in a fitting acknowledgment of such ties, Victoria Glendinning in her 1977 biography entitled that chapter as *Coming Home*. Bowen was to write to Charles Ritchie twenty years before she had purchased her Hythe home thus:

“...Also I like Hythe out of a back of a back-to-the-wombishness, having been there as a child in the most amusing years of one’s childhood — 8-13. But I can’t see what’s wrong with the womb if one’s happy there, or comparatively happy there.”

All her biographers state that Elizabeth Bowen left Dublin with her mother at the age of seven. Bowen in *Seven Winters* her autobiography of her Dublin childhood, wrote:

“When I was seven years old, Herbert Place was given up; my father’s mental illness had to be fought alone, my mother and I were ordered to England”.

That awful expression “*fought alone*” would have echoes in Bowen’s own life when she became ill after the selling of Bowen’s Court — very few knew where she was living. Molly Keane told my husband and me in an interview we did with her shortly before her own death, that some thought Bowen to be living in Stratford-upon-Avon and others thought her to be in Italy. One who did see her claimed she looked as if she had attended an execution and in many ways she had as that Big House meant everything to her.

It is true that in one of her letters to Charles Ritchie she described Bowen’s Court as her “*child — her offspring*”. Victoria Glendinning acknowledges Bowen’s fraught state:

“Elizabeth because of her father was more afraid than most people of mental illness. In the crises over Bowen’s Court she drew as near to it herself as she was ever to get.”

Patricia Laurence’s biography of Bowen shows ‘the Atlantic distance’, if I may so characterise it, with her many mistakes, and that is putting it mildly.

Going back to my previous article in the February edition of the Irish Political Review, I had concluded with the *‘Off the Shelf’* RTE programme — with its two contributors ‘The Irish Times’ critic John Boland and the UCD academic Professor Declan Kiberd trashing the Aubane Historical Society for denying an Irish nationality to Elizabeth Bowen. Laurence writes that they:

“denied her status as a North Cork resident (though born in Cork) or even an Irish author, asserting her themes and characters were drawn from English culture. The absent ‘trace’ of Bowen’s past as an English spy in Ireland is present in their reading though their gesture is now discredited.”

But Laurence herself then goes on to write: “*How do we incorporate local complexity into the transnational and rethink and breathe new life into this debate?*”

Clifford and Lane have always accepted that Elizabeth Bowen resided in a North Cork Big House, but that it was within that locus that she wrote about the land, woods and mountains that surrounded her demesne. *The Last September* written in Oxford a decade after the tumultuous events of ‘The War of Independence’ has all the action or rather ennui written from within the Big House where the only time the outside world intrudes is when the young heroine Lois almost collides amid the trees with a young man in a hurry. Irish society is in the throes of a revolution but the tennis/tea parties continue within; with the only regard being for fellow big houses being “*torched*”.

Can anything be more clear about the values and politics of Bowen’s Big House as she wrote it herself — why must biographers shoehorn her into an other position regarding her nationality? In that RTE *‘Off the Shelf’* programme, Professor Declan Kiberd, of Literature and Drama, UCD stressed how he himself was against Foster’s “*recklessness*” in mixing literary/historical modes... stressing that he himself was “*against Foster’s revisionism*”. But then he went on to say that he was sick of “*debates about Irishness*” because:

“I can’t feel as excited about those debates as Roy Foster manages to get. Here in Ireland, there’s one or two nutters — he (Foster) quotes someone from the Aubane Historical Society denying that Elizabeth Bowen was Irish and that she might actually have been spying ... I find these debates increasingly old-fashioned now and that we’d still be putting labels on writers in that way. I don’t find Irishness of Bowen or Yeats problematic.”



In the Aubane book, *'Envoi, Taking Leave of Roy Foster'* (2006), I wrote about the surrealness of people who seemed to think "nationality and identity didn't matter anymore". But it mattered very much to that critic John Boland in March 1997, specifically in his 'Bookworm' column in *The Irish Times*, when he traduced the Aubane Historical Society on this issue, and accused members of the Aubane Historical Society of racism and Anglophobia.

Professor Kiberd himself had written himself of "*how tangled the questions of identity have become*" in his quite massive book *Inventing Ireland. The Literature of the Modern Nation*, (1995).

But, going back to that RTE Radio 1 broadcast, the following Sunday *'Off the Shelf'* broadcast a fulsome apology on behalf of RTE and Professor Declan Kiberd to the Aubane Historical Society. The announcer stated that the Society had produced a: "*wide range of material on national and local history, including material on major historical figures like Parnell and Thomas Davis, and the writers Canon Sheehan and Elizabeth Bowen*".

Such was the effect of a proposed legal letter if there was not such a resolution.

Patricia Laurence found to her astonishment that—

"the contretemps persisted, and in 2007 a debate about Bowen's wartime activities surfaced again in the *Irish Examiner* as English and Irish writers and politicians took sides."

Laurence gets mixed up and wrote that, after Foster's "*novel*", 'Paddy and Mr. Punch', "*Clifford and Lane struck back in a pamphlet, 'Aubane v. Oxford' in which they pitted academics against 'the little men' of Ireland like themselves*". Laurence states: "*The Aubane group's nationalism went far*":

"The part of the world that made her buzz was Kent."

On the other side, Nicholson (sic Martin Mansergh) "*claimed her as "Irish" mitigating her MOI activity by labelling her as 'unofficial' ...*".

But this is a step too far for the American academic, for she intervenes with this statement: "In fact, she was paid as an 'official' agent of the British. Yet, according to one prescient historian, 'had Britain re-invaded the South, a substantial amount of Bowen's information would have been of use'."

Unfortunately, Laurence does not name just who this "*prescient historian*" might be—but to fall into the trap that Bowen's

Reports might have been of use to the Irish State in the case of an English invasion is just pure nonsense.

Laurence misreads wilfully Bowen's careful Reports as "*just reporting the public mood*", but again lurches on to ascertain that the Reports were marked "*secret*" and were not available for researchers until after her death, "*a signal that they contained classified information that was thought significant*".

But even now in 2020, as historical researchers, we know for a fact, that many of Bowen's Reports are not available, that is if they still exist and were not destroyed by the British State. But we still keep a 'witching watch'!

Laurence sees the debate as illustrative of—

"both the doubleness and insufficiency of language to pin down a stable meaning of the concept of nation and who belongs. For Bowen, as a woman and a writer she eludes borders ..."

"While Bowen's kaleidoscopic self and actions would escape nationalists such as Clifford and Lane who demanded fixed selves and stable positions from Irish authors, Bowen was 'unstuck', as she said from a particular country or place."

But here Laurence does a huge injustice to Bowen, Clifford and Lane!

There is no evidence of the latter ever seeking to extract "*fixed selves*" for any author. If Laurence can produce it—then she must, if she is to salvage a reputation for accuracy.

With regard to Elizabeth Bowen—her famous statement at the end of World War 2 pins her position down as Victoria Glendinning states in her biography:

"But already in that first post-war summer at Bowen's Court in 1945, she had given her opinion of the new England to William Plomer" (an English writer and critic) 'with a trenchancy that defies comment':

"Selfishly speaking, I'd rather live my life here (i.e., at Bowen's Court). I've been coming gradually unstuck from England for a long time. I have adored England since 1940 because of the stylishness Mr. Churchill gave it, but I've always felt, 'when Mr. Churchill goes, I go'. I can't stick all these little middle-class Labour wets with their Old London School of Economic ties and their women. Scratch any of those cuties and you find the governess. Or so I have always found."

Even Glendinning finds the above a tad too much as she adds: "*Patrician hysteria over Attlee's victory had its unattractive side.*"

But about Bowen's Patricianness she

has no doubt. And she is right—just listen to any recordings of Bowen, and her posh accent will blow you away. She makes the current Queen of England sound—well, common by comparison. I know that Queen Elizabeth II has had to take elocution lessons to downgrade her accent—otherwise her subjects wouldn't understand her speeches—and in fairness She asked for this intervention. She has shown what She'll do to keep her monarchical show on the road in these most perilous of times.

In the next issue of the *Irish Political Review*, I will continue with reviewing Patricia Laurence's biography as she goes on to 'Propaganda', again a block-heading in her book.

I will also look more closely at those who provided information via books, email or conversations because sometimes it feels on reading her book that she is quite conflicted over her sources but nevertheless she goes with them, except in regard to Aubane though the latter must now reflect on how best to respond to her—in effect—accusations. ©

## UK Post-Brexit

continued

He then describes how Burke's views explain what had happened to him and the UK's relationship with the UK:

"I want to begin my explanation by turning back to Burke. He had a very particular attitude to government. In 'Reflections' he wrote:

'The state ought not to be considered as nothing better than a partnership agreement in a trade of pepper and coffee, calico or tobacco, or some other such low concern, It is to be looked on with reverence... It is a partnership in all science; a partnership in all art; a partnership in every virtue, and in all perfection.'

This is of course exactly how the EU began in a way – 'a partnership agreement in a trade ... or some other such low concern', not of pepper and coffee, but coal and steel, and then much more.

The question is—did it make that shift, did the EU make that shift to being "*looked on with reverence... a partnership in every virtue, and in all perfection*"?

Well, I think in much of Europe it arguably did, in a way. Coal and steel were the engines of war; and the sources of power and resource. Managing them collectively meant that, on the European continent, doing this had more profound political implications straight away. It was a noble project.

And post-war British leaders such as Attlee and Churchill certainly understood this but didn't feel the same moral

force behind it as people in France and Germany.

But in Britain, I think the answer is different—it didn't, like the EU for most, make that shift. I think Burke understood why. Burke's argument was essentially that the abstract foundations of the French Revolution ignored the complexities of human nature and of human society. The state, to Burke, was more of an organic creation, entwined with custom, of tradition and spirit."

All this is undoubtedly true. It is the essential explanation for Brexit.

The question it poses for Europe is: can it develop the necessary *reverence* among its peoples to ensure that it becomes "a partnership in every virtue, and in all perfection"? This is a tall order but a necessary one if the EU is to thrive and ensure no more Brexits by other names.

Burke, like many others from Ireland, becomes a great Brit when convenient—though he learned his approach to life in his most formative five years from living with his Catholic relatives, the Nagles, in North Cork and attending the local O'Halloran Irish-speaking hedge school. He was a 'delicate child' and the fresh air there did him no end of good, as was the intention. It also left him with an Irish accent that had 'local cadences' as it was delicately described.

But, more significantly, he experienced two societies living there cheek by jowl: though never the twain could meet. And they would not meet because, as Burke accurately and exquisitely explained: one was operating a system that "was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement, in them, of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man."

That experience guided his later thoughts on the management of relationships between peoples concerning America, India and Ireland itself.

It so happens that there is another Irishman whom Irish diplomats might utilise to counter Frost's lauding of Burke. There is a person who they might remind their colleagues about: a person who made a contribution to Europe that might help create a *reverence* for it: Roger Casement.

Casement will not be lauded by any British diplomat, and his publication *The*

*Crime against Europe* will not be quoted from. But in Europe it should be at least as well known as Burke's pamphlet. Irish diplomats in Europe, who are regularly praised for punching above their weight, have an opportunity to show their mettle and bring home to their European colleagues that familiarity with the case that Casement made is an essential requirement, a starting point, to explain why in the 20th century Europe was reduced to the state it was in. This happened as a result of the many crimes committed against it by Britain.

Studying Casement might help Europe to counter that continuing crime against it, otherwise known as the balance of power, and thereby help the EU realise its *raison d'être* as a political entity. And maybe even to acquire the necessary *reverence* from its peoples.

There was never a more appropriate time to embark on such a study.

Jack Lane

## Chimps . . .

continued

"On Hitler, Deputy Cronin tweeted (on August 30, 2012) that European wars were 'instigated and funded by banks' before retweeting (on August 31, 2012) a message saying that Hitler was a pawn of the Jewish-founded Rothschild bank and that France, Germany, and England were all funded by banks owned by the, prominently Jewish, Rothschild family."

That combination of tweets had indeed constituted the very opposite of the historical facts of the outbreak of the First World War, which the Rothschilds had actually struggled to avert. In his 1998 history, *The Pity of War*, Niall Ferguson twice highlighted how the banker Nathaniel Rothschild had been viciously denounced by the London *Times* for his opposition to British Imperialism's impending declaration of War on Germany in 1914:

"The Rothschilds strove vainly to avert an Anglo-German conflict, and for their pains were accused by the foreign editor of *The Times*, Henry Wickham Stead, of 'a dirty German-Jewish international financial attempt to bully us into advocating neutrality'..." (p 32).

And again:

"On 31 July Rothschild implored *The Times* to tone down its leading articles, which were 'hounding the country into war'; but both the foreign editor Henry Wickham Stead and his proprietor Lord Northcliffe regarded this as 'a dirty

*German-Jewish international financial attempt to bully us into advocating neutrality'* and concluded that 'the proper answer would be a still stiffer leading article tomorrow'. 'We dare not stand aside', Saturday's leader duly thundered..." (p 195).

On the evening of February 18th, under the heading of "Sinn Féin TD Réada Cronin apologises for 'off the cuff' old tweets linking Israel to Nazism", Hugh O'Connell reported for the *Irish Independent* online:

"The Irish news website Gript, which launched last year with funding from the anti-abortion lobby, also reported on a number of Ms Cronin's tweets in 2014, the year she was elected as a councillor, where she said Israel 'have taken Nazism to a new level' and responded to a picture of monkeys at computers by suggesting it was the Israeli embassy... In response to queries from the *Independent* on Tuesday, Ms Cronin said in a statement: 'Some old tweets, most from before joining Sinn Féin and entering politics, have come to my attention. I apologise unreservedly and wholeheartedly to people I have offended because of these glib, off the cuff tweets that I sent in the past. I never intended to cause hurt or distress to anyone. I will assist and work with everybody, without qualification. I abhor racism and bigotry of any shade.'"

On February 19th Sinn Féin frontbencher and chief negotiator Pearse Doherty declared such tweets to have been unacceptable:

"She has unreservedly withdrawn those comments and apologised for them, and I think that's the right thing to do. What is important is that if it comes to our attention that there are comments that are inappropriate that they are withdrawn, that they are apologised for, and that it is clear that they are not in keeping with Sinn Féin's policy."

I myself regard Cronin's six-year-old "off the cuff" reference to Nazism as both unacceptable and inappropriate. She should have avoided the temptation to follow any way downwards in the direction of the depths plunged by the Israeli Embassy itself, as reported by the Israeli newspaper *Haaretz* on 3rd August 2013: "The Israeli embassy in Ireland suggested on Tuesday in Facebook and Twitter posts that Adolf Hitler would be happy with the United Nations, which it described as 'a tool against Israel'." The precise wording of what had been retweeted by the Israeli Embassy in 2013 read: "It's from 2011: The UN has itself become a tool against Israel. Hitler couldn't have been made happier".

That Embassy had form. On 17th



December 2012, *Haaretz* had previously reported:

“Israel’s embassy in Dublin has been in the headlines many times over the last few years, not only because of the tense relations between Jerusalem and Dublin, but also because of embarrassing provocations by Israel’s envoys at the mission (Ambassador Boaz Modai and his wife, Deputy Ambassador Nurit Tinari-Modai), who try to think creatively when it comes to public relations. On Monday, ahead of the Christmas holiday, the embassy posted an image of the Virgin Mary and Jesus Christ to its Facebook page, accompanied by the following caption: ‘A thought for Christmas... If Jesus and mother Mary were alive today, they would, as Jews without security, probably end up being lynched in Bethlehem by hostile Palestinians. Just a thought...’ The image was taken down within a few hours of being posted, following responses the embassy received... The embassy’s apology read: ‘To whom it may concern: An image of Jesus and Mary with a derogatory comment about Palestinians was posted without the consent of the administrator of the Facebook page. We have removed the post in question immediately. Apologies to anyone who may have been offended. Merry Christmas!’ Aside from the simplistic and base claim accompanying the image, the use of an image of what is holy to Christians for political ends is damaging. If an image of something holy to Jews was used by a foreign embassy for similar ends, it would certainly cause anger—not only among Israelis but among Jews around the whole world, who would claim that it was anti-Semitic.”

In my March article I commented on how, in the ‘Atticus’ column of the Ireland edition of the *Sunday Times* this January 26th, John Burns made himself a *de facto* mouthpiece for the Israeli Embassy with an attack on the President under the sensationalist headline of “*Higgins risks unholy row by not going to Jerusalem*”. Back in 2013, however, there was an ‘Atticus’ columnist who was prepared to call out the behaviour of the Israeli Embassy for precisely what it was. In that column on 10th August 2013, under the heading of “*Israelis dump diplomatic niceties with Hitler jibe*”, Colin Coyle wrote:

“Some social media etiquette lessons are needed at the Israeli embassy in Dublin, home to perhaps the world’s zaniest diplomats. On Tuesday the operator of the embassy’s Facebook and Twitter accounts posted that Adolf Hitler would be happy with the United Nations, describing it as a ‘tool against Israel’. Last Christmas the embassy also quipped that Mary and Jesus would be lynched in modern-day Bethlehem for being Jews, while in another post they shared a mocked-up photograph of Fr Jack with a caption reading: ‘Feck

off Hamas’. Has someone been putting something in the Ferrero Rocher?”

“The ambassador, Boaz Modai, and his wife, Nurit Tinari-Modai, have been in trouble before, notably when a leaked email by Tinari-Modai suggested attacking anti-Israeli activists in the Irish media by exposing secrets about their private lives. The UN/Hitler posts were removed but not before they were noticed by *Haaretz*, an Israeli newspaper. The left-of-centre daily suggested a solution for the gaffe-prone embassy: removing all its keyboards.”

The new role of the *Sunday Times*, however, in currently servicing the needs of the Israeli Embassy with its ‘exposure’ of Cronin’s tweets on Israeli interference in December’s UK General Election, which were in no way anti-Semitic, would have quickly fizzled out to no lasting effect, were it not that the Gript news agency galloped to the aid of the Israeli Embassy two days later, and would keep the pot boiling for a further eight days. As reported by Hugh O’Connell for the *Irish Independent*, the morning of February 18th had seen Gript correspondent Gary Kavanagh produce some tweets from Cronin in 2012 and 2014 which had indeed been inappropriate. In his own post later that day, Gript Editor John McGuirk made a point of rolling two inappropriate tweets from eight years ago into Cronin’s quite appropriate tweets from last December, a muddying of the waters that was grist to the mill of the Israeli Embassy:

“Gript’s Gary Kavanagh reported this morning that Deputy Cronin had shared content suggesting that Adolf Hitler was simply a pawn for the Jewish-owned Rothschild Bank, and that ‘international finance’ was behind many European wars. Both statements are generally accepted to be anti-semitic tropes... She had previously made the news this past weekend when the Sunday Times reported that she had accused Israeli intelligence of interfering in the recent UK election to prevent the election of Jeremy Corbyn as Prime Minister. Mr. Corbyn himself had been accused of anti-semitism in the run-in to that election.”

McGuirk kept the pot boiling with his follow up post on February 21st:

“Reada Cronin is not Ireland’s only politician to have engaged in anti-Semitic rhetoric. Just last year, Fianna Fáil’s Niall Collins had to apologise after this website and others reported that he had said that “right across corporate America, and right across America at every level, there’s a huge Jewish lobby who have helped to create the problem that we’re now discussing”. The “problem”, in this case, was Israel. (The problem, being referred to by Collins was, to be specific, Israel’s

annexationist behaviour, in complete violation of international law, in the Occupied Territories - MO’R)... What was the world’s response to the Nazis? It was, as we know, to wage total war against Hitler and wipe Nazi Germany out of existence. Is Cronin, or anyone else who makes that comparison, suggesting that the same thing should be done to Israel? And if not, why not?”

On February 24th, the *Irish Times* Religious Affairs Correspondent, Patsy McGarry, would draw on both the *Sunday Times* and Gript trawls to report:

“In a number of now-deleted tweets, Ms Cronin claimed that Israel’s foreign intelligence agency was responsible for Labour’s defeat in the UK general election. Responding to a tweet which dismissed her view as conspiratorial, she said: ‘When the Nazis come back, and they’re on the march, it’ll be Jeremy Corbyn will stand with you. You are a disgrace to your forefathers.’ Other tweets of hers asserted that Mossad’s alleged actions were ‘blatant as f\*\*\*’ and that Mr. Corbyn was a ‘principled man’ who was a victim of ‘lies, deceit, fake news, and the sinister activities of the Mossad Secret Service’. Ms Cronin described her tweets as ‘throwaway remarks’ and apologised ‘unreservedly and wholeheartedly’ for them. Sinn Féin finance spokesman Pearse Doherty said the comments were ‘not acceptable’, while party president Mary Lou McDonald said she hoped to meet the Irish Jewish representatives. She added Sinn Féin ‘condemned all racism and bigotry’.”

On February 26th, Gript’s pot completely boiled over when McGuirk hosted Mary Ellen Synon as a guest columnist. Synon ranted and raved, as is her wont, and made false accusations against Cronin in respect of that 2014 cartoon:

“How did Mary Lou McDonald respond to these Tweets by Cronin? She said that people had to be careful about being ‘hurtful’, and that since Cronin had withdrawn them and apologised, that’s fine... No destruction of Cronin’s career... There is Reada Cronin tweeting a picture of monkeys as Jews in a way that would have her prosecuted in the UK if she tried it as monkeys as black football players. And there is no damage to their reputation. I blame Fine Gael, and I blame Fianna Fail. By giving Sinn Fein a pass on this anti-Semitism, they, too, are collaborators... Trump is a president who has given the Pentagon everything it wants, because Trump loves the US military... and hates its enemies—current or historical. Trump stood at the beach at Normandy at the 75th anniversary of the Allied landings and spoke with a degree of emotion that is nearly unknown in a President who usually appears to have iced water in his veins. Trump, bless him,

hates the memory of every murderous move by the wartime Germans, hates the memory of every German who tore apart American soldiers on Omaha Beach.

Which is to say that inviting a Nazi-collaborator-loving Provo-front politico—that would be you, McDonald—to the Trump Oval Office would be unlikely, no matter whether she makes it into government or not.”

But what, then, is the truth about Cronin and the 2014 monkeys cartoon? How accurately, for example, has it been reported by the stridently Zionist *Jewish Chronicle*? On February 20th the *Jewish Chronicle* revealed that it had been compelled to pay compensation and issue a public apology to a Liverpool Labour Party member it had libelled:

“In February and March 2019, we published articles which made allegations about Mrs. Audrey White, some of which were untrue. We have already published [the IPSO adjudication](#) in relation to these articles and have agreed to pay a sum in damages to Mrs. White and her legal costs. We apologise for the distress caused.”

This March 4th, Jacob Judah ‘reported’ in the *Jewish Chronicle*:

“Sinn Féin’s meeting with the Jewish Representative Council had been planned in the aftermath of an antisemitism scandal involving one of the Irish republican party’s newly-elected members of the Dáil, Réada Cronin. Ms Cronin had wrote (sic) a number of social media posts between 2012 and 2015 including comparing Israelis to monkeys...”

But Cronin had NOT pronounced either monkeys and Jews, as alleged by Synon, or monkeys and Israelis, as alleged by Judah, to be one and the same thing, which, if she had, would indeed have been deplorable racism. It is remarkable that NONE of the press commentators on Cronin’s 2014 tweets have bothered to outline the context in which they had been made. It was the seven week long Israeli War on Gaza, that lasted from July 8th to 24th August 2014. In that War, Israeli military casualties were limited to 67, while 5 civilians were killed as a result of Palestinian rocket fire on Israel. But, according to the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, that pulverising Israeli War on Gaza succeeded in killing 2,200 Palestinians, of whom as many as 1,492 were civilians, including 551 children and 299 women. 742 fatalities came from 142 Palestinian families, who suffered the loss of 3 or more family members in individual bombing incidents on residential buildings. The UN reported that 520,000

Palestinians in the Gaza Strip (approximately 30 percent. of its population) had been displaced, of whom 485,000 needed emergency food assistance. ‘Gaza under attack’ was the hash tag for Cronin’s tweet on July 13, 2014, that “Israel have taken Nazism to new level, by showing they can get away with it”.

The context explains but does not, of course, excuse the inappropriate “*Nazism*” tweet, for which she has unreservedly and wholeheartedly apologised, as well as for any hurt or distressed caused. Such an apology should, in turn, be unreservedly accepted by all decent commentators, coming from this new TD whose statement on February 18th unequivocally declared her opposition to all forms of racism, including anti-Semitism.

But what, then, needs to be said about the monkeys cartoon? In my view it was a flippant tweet, but it was no more anti-Semitic than it was anti-Catholic. It is remarkable how none of the ‘commentators’ ever bothered to comment on its provenance. Cronin had reposted a tweet from “the burke interpreter @voodoo\_criminol” - the twitter account of “*Voodoo Criminology—Critical reflections on crime and public policy in Ireland*”. This showed a library full of chimpanzees operating desk top computers, and carried the caption “*Meanwhile, at Iona HQ*”, referring to the Iona Institute, the conservative Catholic lobbying group headed up by journalist David Quinn. But neither Quinn, nor the Iona Institute itself, jumped up and down screaming about the “*anti-Catholic scandal*” represented by that cartoon.

Cronin reposted that tweet on the same day, 14th August 2014, adding as her reply: “*and there was I thinking it was the Israeli embassy*”. Now, during Israel’s war on Gaza, its Dublin Embassy was indeed churning out vile hate propaganda. But I would not have tarred all that Embassy’s employees with the same brush. As for the *Haaretz*, suggestion of “*removing all the Embassy’s keyboard*”, a more appropriate cartoon might have shown just two venomous vipers hovering over those same keyboards, Mr. and Mrs. Modai.

See [www.newsweek.com/israeli-embassy-tweets-images-jihadist-mona-lisa-and-michaelangelos-david-261943](http://www.newsweek.com/israeli-embassy-tweets-images-jihadist-mona-lisa-and-michaelangelos-david-261943) to view the worst of the Israeli Embassy’s Islamophobic and racist posts in July 2014. Under the heading of “*Israel embassy Tweets images of Molly Malone in a burka*”, *The Herald* as well as the *Irish*

*Independent* reported on July 28th:

“The embassy of Israel in Ireland has been slammed for posting a series of doctored images online including one of Molly Malone in a burka. Staff at the embassy used the official Twitter feed to issue a series of images over the weekend. The images related to different European countries including Mona Lisa in a hijab and holding a large rocket, while another showed Michelangelo’s statue of David wearing an Arab headscarf and with an explosive belt wrapped round its torso. The slogan accompanying the images said: ‘Israel is the last frontier of the free world.’ The one about Ireland showed Dublin’s famous Molly Malone statue covered by a full-length black niqab. An Israeli embassy spokesman confirmed that the images were sent from the official Facebook and Twitter accounts. The representative said he didn’t know why they were subsequently deleted. The posts sparked a furious backlash online with many criticising the message. Israel’s ambassador to Ireland, Boaz Modai, told the *Daily Telegraph* in London that he could not comment because ‘we are now in the middle of a war and I have other things to deal with’.”

On 7th September 2014, the Ireland edition of *The Times* (UK) reported on an appearance of that poisonous Modai duo before an Oireachtas Committee:

“The Israeli ambassador to Ireland, Boaz Modai, appeared with his wife and deputy chief of mission Nurit Tinari-Modai at the Oireachtas Committee on Foreign Affairs last week... Tinari-Modai sat beside her husband. She did not address the committee but spoke to Modai during his presentation. Tinari-Modai generated international controversy in 2012 when an Israeli television channel published a document where she proposed publicly naming Israelis who supported the Palestinian cause in an effort to ‘embarrass their friends and relatives, and hopefully the local [Palestinian] activists will think that they work for the Mossad’. Senator David Norris asked the ambassador about some of his wife’s public remarks: he noted that she had described Irish protesters as ‘ignorant, anti-semitic, with an intensely rooted hatred of Jews’ and asked about her comment that ‘people’s sexual orientation should be used to embarrass them if they were pro-Palestinian’. Norris continued: ‘She also referred to people who defend Israel as ‘the righteous among the nations in modern terminology’ which is an oblique reference to the Holocaust and in my view inappropriate. She referred to heathen hordes, agitated, anti-semitic, with a deeply rooted hatred of Jews. I wonder if the ambassador considers them appropriate for diplomatic personnel?’ Eric Byrne, a Labour TD, urged Modai to rebuild trust in the Israeli embassy in Dublin by instructing his staff



to ‘stop posting silly, childish posts [on Facebook] of the Molly Malone statue dressed in a burqa’. ‘When it comes to Molly Malone . . . we took that down after a few hours’, said Modai, when a ‘friend of the embassy’ called to say it was not appropriate. ‘What we were trying to say . . . was [the Islamic State] is here. Within a month, it will get to Europe; within another, the United States’.”

Readers might wonder why I might have preferred an image of just two venomous vipers on desk top computers at the Israeli Embassy. Why would I not add in a third, Dermot Meleady, Redmondite biographer of John Redmond, who was employed by the Israeli Embassy as its Information Officer from 2010 to 2015, if not for longer? Indeed, venomous viper Nurit had been to the fore strutting her stuff in support of her Embassy colleague Meleady on 6th November 2013, as Kevin Myers launched the second volume of his biography of Redmond.

Now, Israeli Embassy Information Officer Meleady did indeed regularly appear in the letters columns of the *Irish Independent*, *Irish Times*, *Irish Examiner*, and elsewhere, with crass anti-Palestinian propaganda during the War on Gaza, on behalf of the State he chose to canonise with the description of Israel as a “*tiny oasis of democracy*”. But Meleady was astute enough to realise that the doctored photograph of “*Molly Malone in a burqa*” was so crude an incitement to hatred that it would immediately backfire with Irish public opinion. In July 2014 an Israeli Embassy spokesman was baffled as to why that photo had subsequently been deleted, and Ambassador Modai professed himself too busy with Israel’s War on Gaza to comment on the dirty tricks campaign of his missus. But, five weeks later, he could explain that the post had been taken down at the request of “*a friend of the embassy*”. Might it actually have been “*a friend in the embassy*”? For it had been a vile incitement to hatred and prejudice against Ireland’s Islamic community. And, even as Modai “*explained*” the taking down of the post, he tried to keep the fires burning by warning Ireland that “*the Islamic State is here*”.

I have personally witnessed an Israeli working up of such Islamophobic prejudices in action. On 22nd March 2016, ISIS terrorists had murdered 32 civilians when they bombed both Brussels airport and Maalbeek metro station, adjacent to the European Economic & Social Committee of which I was a member. Needless to say, for months thereafter, getting through rigorous security at the airport

could involve queuing for 1 to 2 hours. On one such occasion, I heard a disgruntled Israeli passenger proclaim, for the benefit of “*us Europeans*”, and directed against the many Moslems who were also queuing, that “*while all Moslems may not be terrorists, all terrorists are Moslems!*”.

I would think Meleady would have taken no less a dim view of the Israeli Embassy’s “*Jesus and Mary lynched by the Palestinians*” post as “*not appropriate*”. But there was a world of difference in how the December 2012 and July 2014 posts were each taken down. In the former case the Israeli Embassy issued an actual apology for the Christian susceptibilities that had been offended, accompanied by a “*Merry Christmas!*”

But when it came to the “*Molly Malone in a burqa*” post, not a single word of apology was issued to Ireland’s Islamic citizens for having been subjected to such hate propaganda. So I would add this comment. Those out there, whoever they may be, who do not accept the genuineness of Cronin’s apology and her commitment to oppose all forms of racism, and who insist on never-ending resurrection of what indeed were her unacceptable tweets in 2012, plus another in 2014, should be directly asked: *Are You Yourselves prepared to unequivocally condemn the Israeli Embassy’s refusal to apologise to Ireland’s Islamic community for the incitement to hatred of its “Molly Malone in a burqa” post in 2014?*

There was, of course, an unholy triple alliance between the Israeli Embassy, Patsy McGarry of the *Irish Times*, and Gript, to keep the “*anti-semitism*” allegations pot boiling—each for their own reasons. In the case of the Israeli Embassy, it is because of the wholehearted support of Sinn Féin for Senator Frances Black’s *Occupied Territories Bill*. In the case of McGarry, it is because of his loathing of Sinn Féin *per se*—**any** Sinn Féin—not just today’s Sinn Féin, but the Sinn Féin that triumphed at the ballot box in the 1918 General Election. Religious Affairs Correspondent McGarry fancies himself as a self-made theologian, and in the *Irish Times* on 7th May 2019, he had a “*Rite & Reason*” rant, headlined “*State must end practice of commemorating 1916 Rising: Blasphemy of 1916 leaders hijacking the execution of Christ left unquestioned*”. McGarry “*rote & reasoned*”:

“The 1916 Rising was a criminal act perpetrated by a self-selected few who took up arms against a British state from

which Ireland was then disengaging by parliamentary means... The State must stop legitimising 1916 retrospectively.”

But the retrospective legitimising of the 1916 Rising has, in fact, begun as early as Sinn Féin’s 1918 General Election victory, and it was legitimised by parliamentary means on 21st January 1919, when the First Dáil Éireann, at its very first session, ratified the Republic that had proclaimed by that Rising.

McGarry would not normally rely on Gript as a source, and he did not acknowledge that it was Gript’s trawl of Cronin’s old tweets that he had been reliant on, in stark contrast with the straightforward reporting by Hugh O’Connell for the *Irish Independent*. Gript was established last year by militant anti-abortion campaigner John McGuirk as a conservative news, opinion, and commentary website, of which he is the Editor. McGuirk had been spokesman for the *Save the 8th Amendment Campaign*, which refers to the constitutional prohibition of abortion under any circumstances, adopted by a 2 to 1 majority in the 1983 referendum, but which, 35 years later, was repealed by a rather different 2 to 1 majority in the 2018 referendum. It should not, then, come as a surprise that Gript would set out to target those parties that had supported the *Repeal the 8th Campaign*, not least Sinn Féin.

But there was a new TD from another party who was also targeted. On February 17th, the *Southern Star* reported on the surprise win for the Social Democrats scored by West Cork farmer Holly Cairns:

“*Monumental*” is how Holly Cairns described her election in Cork South West where she dramatically unseated FG for the first time in 63 years... Just over 3,000 transfers from SF’s Paul Hayes saw Holly surge past FG Tim Lombard to take the last seat... Heading to Dublin to meet with the five other newly-elected Social Democrats, the 30-year-old didn’t rule out going into government with Sinn Féin. She said it was their responsibility to be open to discussions, and that it was more helpful to see what can be achieved through collaboration rather than focussing on a party’s history. Holly admitted the past nine months had been a ‘whirlwind’ since she was elected by a single vote to Cork County Council last May... Making the trip to Dublin with her is her boyfriend and fellow new TD, Christopher O’Sullivan. Their relationship has—not surprisingly—attracted plenty of interest, when Christopher was added to the Fianna Fáil ticket...”

But on February 24th, Gript had a new

postheadlined “*Cork TD: I’ll get an abortion ‘for every minute of air time’ given to papal conclave*”. On February 26th, under the heading of “*TD Holly Cairns ‘regrets offence’ over tweet saying Pope was leader of paedophile ring*”, Hugh O’Connell once again conscientiously reported for the *Irish Independent* on that latest Gript tweets trawl:

“A newly elected Social Democrats TD has said she regrets any offence caused by a number of old Twitter posts, including one where she called Pope Francis the leader of a paedophile ring. Cork South-West TD Holly Cairns also posted a tweet seven years ago where she said she would get an abortion ‘for every minute of air time taken up on the papal conclave’. The tweets were posted in March 2013 after Pope Francis was elected and before she became involved in politics. The tweets were uncovered by the Irish news website Gript which launched last year with funding from the anti-abortion lobby. Several of her tweets date back to 2012 and 2013. In one tweet posted on March 13, 2013, the day Pope Francis was elected, Ms Cairns wrote: ‘For every minute of air time taken up on the papal conclave I’m gonna get an abortion #pope.’ Three days later Ms Cairns wrote: ‘New paedophile-ring-leader’ ... Contacted for comment yesterday, Ms Cairns said she had deleted many of the tweets in question. ‘I was much younger and they weren’t the best-advised tweets’, she told the *Irish Independent* online. ‘I regret any offence caused. I took them down for that reason. I am really sorry for any offence caused.’ A spokeswoman for the Social Democrats said: ‘It was seven years ago, Holly was much younger and clearly they weren’t the best-advised tweets. She sincerely regrets any offence she may have caused.’ Ms Cairns, a farmer and small business owner, won the third and final seat in the Dáil constituency of Cork South-West in the General Election earlier this month. Her partner, Fianna Fáil’s Christopher O’Sullivan, was also elected to the Dáil for the same constituency... She is another newly elected TD who has had to contend with controversy over old social media posts since the election. Last week, Sinn Féin’s Réada Cronin apologised ‘unreservedly and wholeheartedly’ to those offended by a number of tweets...”

The Cork *Echo* reported in a similar vein. But what had been sauce for the Gript gander, as it lined up both Cronin and Cairns for exposure and denunciation — as well as being sauce for the *Indo* in reporting on both TDs — was not at all sauce for the *Irish Times* gander. Religious Affairs Correspondent McGarry, more than willing to report on true or false charges of anti-Semitism, was demonstrably and

unconscionably unwilling to provide any report on these parallel charges of anti-Catholicism. We might call it the McGander reflex. Cairns’s tweets had not only been grossly offensive in the religious sense, they had actually been grotesque in being so flippant about abortion decisions that I personally hold had been the right of so many women to make, but which had been no less hard and often painful decisions for all that.

Cairn’s then younger years have been advanced as an excuse for those tweets. I myself was somewhat younger than Cairns when I began publicly challenging the Catholic Church’s control over so many aspects of Irish social life. But, although a convinced atheist from the age of 20, I never stooped to mockery of the genuine religious beliefs of others. Deputy Cairns has so far had a charmed existence in being on the winning side in both referenda and elections. My championing of the Repeal the 8th Amendment in 2018 was very much informed by my experience of being on the losing side in the bitter and bruising campaign of 1981-83, the failed attempt to prevent that amendment being carried in first place. And in that campaign my experience of Irish Social Democracy had been a two-headed Hydra. On the one hand, the then Labour Party TD for Galway West, Michael D Higgins, played a courageous role in the Anti-Amendment Campaign and was punished as a result by losing his seat in the November 1982 General Election.

An even more courageous stand was taken by the Democratic Socialist TD for Limerick East, but in his case the Labour Party set out to unseat him, and it succeeded. The victorious Labour Party candidate, Frank Prendergast, declared himself opposed to abortion under any circumstances whatsoever, and ran a successful campaign against Jim Kemmy, backed by the Bishop of Limerick, and fuelled by Church pulpit denunciations of Kemmy as “*baby killer*” and “*agent of Satan*”. That, of course, was in an Ireland of which Holly Cairns had no experience, several years before she was even born.

But back to Cairns herself. While I believe it necessary to record all that was wrong with her tweets those seven or eight years ago, I should also record my belief that her expression of regret is wholly genuine, and that it is indeed time to move on. No doubt her own moving on has also been greatly encouraged by the warmth of the Christian response her election victory evoked from a Catholic parish priest.

As *Cork Beo* reported on February 17th:

“After a gruelling general election campaign that saw Holly Cairns gain the last seat in the Cork South-West constituency, the Social Democrat TD has revealed what her ‘favourite piece’ of the General Election coverage was — the Aughadown parish newsletter! ... The heartwarming tale in the newsletter recounts how Cairns voted last week in her old primary school, where she learned to ‘always follow your dream’. The piece was penned by Aughadown Parish Priest Fr. Donal Cahill who says that the small parish outside Skibbereen ‘can proudly claim to have our own TD’. The story on the newsletter starts by bringing the reader back in time.

‘On a misty September morning back in the early nineties, a smiling little girl clutched her mother’s hand and walked through the doors of Lisheen School for the first time. Last Saturday she was there again, this time to vote. Nothing unusual about that except she was voting for herself, 12 months before she was there too putting herself forward for a seat in the council chamber and against all the odds she made it over the line by one vote. But this time — a seat at the table of the highest office in the land — a bit ambitious perhaps?’ Fr. Cahill continued.

He then writes, ‘but then, from that very same room she will have often heard her teacher Catriona O’Driscoll say ‘always follow your dream’. Dare she dream too?’ He continues that the community can now ‘proudly claim to have our own TD, the smiling little girl from Turk Head who walked through the doors of Lisheen School on those far back days and now still smiling is our own TD’. Fr. Cahill finishes the piece by saying: ‘May God bless and direct Holly in her high office and bring success to her endeavours and may nothing befall her that might cause her to lose heart, her youthful enthusiasm and sense of enterprise, and remain forever smiling.’”

On the evening of February 17th Cairns tweeted a photo of that generous tribute, adding her own comment, accompanied by a heart: “My favourite piece of #GE2020 coverage — the Aughadown parish newsletter”. Holly Cairns has long ceased to give voice to the type anti-Catholic bigotry she had expressed in 2012 and 2013, and has made her peace with such Christian-minded Catholic clergy. So it is a story with a happy ending, but a story nonetheless. The refusal of the McGander school of religious affairs reportage to report a single word of that story is yet another example of how the *Irish Times* cannot be relied upon as a self-styled “*paper of record*”!

**Manus O’Riordan**



## Tackling The Housing Crisis

In the course of the recent General Election there was a perception that Sinn Fein might just be capable of solving the housing crisis. It was said by that party's politicians that their housing spokesperson was not only knowledgeable about his subject but had written *the* book on Irish housing.

Eoin O Broin begins with the lyrics of a song about the “Diggers”, a group in 1640s England who believed that the land should be held in common. It continues with a reproduction of the *Democratic Programme* which was adopted by the Dail in 1919. He doesn't comment on it or explain the reason for its insertion but in this reviewer's opinion it is to show how the Irish State failed to live up to the aspirations of one of its founding documents.

After the acknowledgments section there is a paragraph titled “*Deficiencies and Terminology*” in which the author says:

“Throughout the book the term South of Ireland refers to the entity officially known as the Republic of Ireland. Given that I am a Sinn Fein TD and committed Irish republican I doubt you need me to explain the rationale for this.”

Perhaps he does need to explain it. In the absence of an explanation, this reviewer can only assume that O Broin does not believe that the “entity” known as the Republic of Ireland (or “Ireland” per Bunreacht na hEireann) is a legitimate state (if it is indeed a state at all). It can only redeem itself by uniting with the six counties of Northern Ireland.

The Preface is written by Paul Mason, the left-wing English journalist who extols the virtues of Aneurin Bevan. The author then begins the main body of the book with a chapter titled “*Overture*” in which he meditates on the failure of the State's housing policy. After considering various words such as “*scandal*”, “*catastrophe*”, “*crisis*”, “*disaster*”, he finally arrives at the word “*dysfunctional*” to describe our housing system.

He has certainly presented his theme from the outset. Housing policy has been “*dysfunctional*” and, if we are to find a solution, it cannot be from Irish experience. We must look to the British Left for inspiration.

He then gives a brief history of housing policy from the struggles of the Land League up until 1970s. He admits that the Land League succeeded in transforming land ownership in Ireland but then goes on to say:

“Landless Labourers benefited little if at all from this massive redistribution”.

It does not seem to occur to him that many of the new owners were formerly “*landless labourers*”. There is no mention of the *Land and Labour Leagues*, nor—if one is seeking a radical inspiration—does he mention that the founder of the Land League, Michael Davitt, believed the Land should be nationalised.

The author criticizes the fiscal conservatism of the Cumann na nGaedhail Governments and then refers to “*Fianna Fáil's entry to Government in 1931*”.

This reviewer finds it very surprising that he thinks Fianna Fáil entered government in 1931. Most people with even a casual knowledge of 20th Irish history know that it was in 1932. It was a significant event because the anti-Treaty side acceded to power in a peaceful transition. It might be thought that such an event would have resonances for present day Sinn Fein. But apparently not!

He goes on to quote historian J.J. Lee's carping comment on Fianna Fáil:

“The housing programme naturally provided grist to the pockets of the contractors. Fortunes were made in the field more easily than manufacturing. The building industry soon came to be widely regarded as an extension of the Fianna Fáil patronage system.”

Nevertheless, the author grudgingly acknowledges:

“...output of Government funded housing significantly increased during the 1930s. In the decade from 1932 an average of 12,000 houses were built annually of which half were Council homes, compared to an average of just 2,000 per year under the previous administration.”

But, unbelievably, in the next paragraph he says:

“Nevertheless, even with the increased output the new Government's policy was remarkably similar to their predecessor's.

Private homeownership was prioritised over public housing while the latter predominantly favoured better-off workers and the middle class”.

It is difficult to know where to start. A six-fold increase in Government funded housing sustained over a decade does not represent a change in policy between the Fianna Fáil-led Governments in the decade from 1932 and the previous decade!?

The fact that 50% of those houses were Council houses indicates the Government favoured private ownership over “*public housing*”!?

And the latter (i.e public housing) “*pre-dominantly favoured better-off workers and the middle class*”!?

The kindest thing that can be said about this is that the author is not allowing the facts get in the way of his ideological preconceptions. Later he says that Fianna Fáil's “*failure*” to tackle the housing crisis had the following consequence:

“The emerging electoral threat of the new left republican party Clann na Poblachta was grounded in a growing disenchantment at the failure of the Free State (sic) after twenty five years to improve the standard of living of a significant number of the urban and rural working class”.

The author trumpets the achievements of the first Coalition Government of 1948. It “*brought some of the post-war State interventionism gathering pace in Britain and Europe to bear on areas of policy including health and housing*”. As an example of its achievements, he says that in the 1950s the State built 52,500 social houses. However, he forgets to remind us that this is less than the 60,000 social houses built during Fianna Fáil Governments in the decade following 1932.

In any case why give credit to Clann na Poblachta? It was part of the first coalition in 1948, which collapsed when its leader failed to support his colleague Noel Browne in 1951. It did not participate in the second Coalition Government of 1954-1957. For half of the 1950s decade Fianna Fáil was in power.

Regarding the second Coalition Government he says:

“However, with the return of the coalition Government in 1954 the expansion of house building was resumed well into the 1960s.”

But the Coalition Government left Office in 1957!

Curiously, later in the paragraph he says:

“...Fianna Fáil who were back in Government from 1957 for a straight eleven year run”.

But, of course, they were in power for almost sixteen years from 1957.

One of the most significant elements of that period in Government was the 1958 Economic Programme. But the author only sees more failure because public expenditure was shifted “*from social to productive sectors of the economy*”. He goes on to say:

“...this prioritising of ‘productive’ over ‘social’ investment and the negative social costs that come with it was to have a profound impact on Government thinking for decades to come”.

By 1971, 70% of the housing stock was home-owned and 18.4% was Council housing. Another 61,953 Council houses were built in the 1970s. The new State had inherited some of the worst slums in Europe and these had been cleared. It is difficult to see how its record could be described as “*dysfunctional*”.

The author thinks that the 1980s marked “*both a turning point and significant decline*” but then adds:

“While this change did not affect the shape of our dysfunctional housing system it dramatically altered the way in which that system is financed”.

The author is like the boy who cried “*wolf*”. Since the system was always “*dysfunctional*”, it is difficult for the reader to attach any significance to any new development that could make matters worse. How can a system be worse than “*dysfunctional*”?

Before the 1980s credit for homeownership was largely provided by the Building Societies. These accumulated savings from Irish depositors. The savings could only be used by the Societies to finance home ownership. The banks were not allowed compete with them, so the amount of credit provided was limited by the amount of Building Society deposits which in turn constrained demand and therefore price inflation. In the 1980s banks were allowed compete with Building Societies; and Building Societies, in turn, were allowed access to inter-bank lending. So credit was no longer constrained by the amount of Building Society deposits. However, these innovations did not have a dramatic effect on house prices until the mid 1990s, when greater financial integration within the EU allowed EU savings to inflate Irish development land prices, as well as

residential property prices, with disastrous consequences.

In the 1980s the inflationary effect caused by liberalisation of the credit market was mitigated in part by the reduction of State supports for homeownership (such as grants and tax reliefs). But, interestingly, borrowing still increased. The author says new mortgages increased from 27,632 in 1986 to 38,580 in 1989. This was at a time when the Irish economy was in the doldrums.

The author does not give figures for the 1980s, but says that in 1991 the home ownership figure was 79% and the percentage of social housing was 12%. Remember the corresponding figures 20 years earlier were 70% and 18.4%. So, in an era of economic crisis (in some ways more severe than the 2008 crisis), home ownership had increased and social ownership had diminished. While the policy objective of homeownership had progressed, the diminishing proportion of social housing meant that the State was constrained in providing housing for those most in need.

This brings us to the subject of the “*Surrender Grant*” or what became known as the “*notorious*” Surrender Grant (1984—1988).

The author says it was a FG policy but this reviewer, who was a member of the Labour Party at the time, remembers it as the latter party’s policy. During the 1987 General Election the Labour Party was in a similar position to that which it faced in the 2016 election. It had been in Government during a severe economic crisis which it had inherited. It might seem risible in retrospect, but many Labour activists thought at the time that the Surrender Grant was a selling point.

At the time it was thought that Thatcherism had been successful because it had helped working class people aspire to home ownership. In particular the Tory policy of giving grants to council tenants to buy their own home was seen as an election winner. Irish Governments had been pursuing similar policies for many years.

But the Irish Labour Party’s Surrender Grant involved giving £5,000 to council tenants to buy a property in the private housing market (i.e. not their council house). The idea was to satisfy the aspiration for home ownership while preserving the existing social housing stock.

This 1987 canvasser was given short shrift from Council House voters. It

seemed that every door had the same complaint: The new tenants were all unmarried mothers. It is interesting that all these years later the author more or less confirms the substance of the complaint. Referring to a 1987 study by the housing charity *Threshold* he says:

“...allocation practices in many Councils shifted considerably during this period with a greater number of single-parent families and people transitioning from homelessness securing allocations by the end of the surrender grant’s operation.”

The number of households that availed of the scheme was 8,000 or about 6% of the social housing stock. Not a lot, but enough to be noticed.

But was the Labour Party wrong? There was a new demand placed on the system by single parent families. In a previous era the women would have been institutionalised. Now in a more ‘enlightened’ age they had to be housed. It is interesting that elsewhere in the book it is noted that currently “*60% of homeless families are lone parent families*”. (The definition of “*homeless*” is “*all adults and children in Department of Housing funded emergency and temporary accommodation*”).

Back in 1987 the Labour Party was attempting to preserve the existing social housing stock in a situation of greater need. It would have been better if more social houses could have been built but that solution may not have been available. As the author remarks, the Government debt was 150% of GDP.

The problem that the author identifies is “*residualisation*”. Council houses were no longer supplied to people in the workforce with low incomes but had become the preserve of those on welfare. It is not essential that some people should own their own homes (mixed tenure) within Council estates, but it is necessary for there to be mixed incomes. In order for communities to thrive there must be a substantial proportion in paid employment.

So what proportion of the total housing stock should be owned by the State? It is an obvious question, which the author doesn’t ask never mind answer, even though he does have an answer for the private rental market (he thinks about 10%).

He doesn’t give the current percentage, but in 2002 about 10% of the total stock was social. Assuming it hasn’t changed much in recent years, the current level of social housing stock is too low. A consequence



of the low level of social housing is that the State has been subsidising landlords to house tenants that can't afford market rents. This practice was initially intended as a temporary measure but now has become part of the system. It represents about 3% of the housing stock. These tenants should be housed in socially-owned residences.

So, if the State built houses for the 3% currently in subsidised private accommodation, this would represent an amount equal to about one sixth of the private rental housing stock. By taking such tenants out of the private rental market, the increase in the available properties to rent would have the benefit of putting downward pressure on rents.

An increase in the social housing stock from 10% to 13% of the total housing stock is desirable but probably would not alter the balance between income earners and welfare dependents availing of public housing. A much higher level of housing stock is required. But how high? As we saw earlier, in 1971 the percentage of social housing stock was 18.4%. Rounding up that figure to 20% does not seem excessive.

This increase in the level of social housing needed would involve building an extra 200,000 social houses. That represents an ambitious social programme. However, it doesn't allow for an increase in the population. Realistically it would take at least ten years for such a programme to be implemented. But it should be borne in mind that, as the number of social houses increases, the net long-term unit costs to the State diminishes, since the new tenants will have higher incomes and council rents are based on a percentage of household income.

The extra number of social houses will put downward pressure on the private housing market which, in this reviewer's opinion, is a desirable social objective. It will also enable the State to withdraw some of the generous tax reliefs it gives for homeownership.

One of the weak points of the book is there is no coherent analysis of housing need. At one point he has a rather tortuous analysis based on the Council House waiting lists and the Rent Subsidy lists. But he then abandons any attempt to make sense of these figures, going off on a different tack by quoting a Housing Agency report to the effect that at least 100,000 social houses will be needed over the next ten years. O Broin then rather arbitrarily suggests:

"It is possible that the State may need as many as 70,000 over the next five years and as many as 140,000 over the course of the decade".

The Government's *National Development Plan* is then quoted, suggesting that the total new housing stock required in the next ten years will be between 250,000 and 300,000, which means that the author's estimate of 140,000 new social houses will be about 50% of the total new build. This ratio is the same as that provided by the Fianna Fáil Governments of the 1930s.

But the author's estimates of housing needs are not much more than guesses. While the book is peppered with various statistics, there are some obvious statistics that are absent from the book. There are no figures on population, or on average household size. There is also very little information on housing stock. Such data would help us to understand not only current need but also to evaluate the past performance.

For example, O Broin says the 1970s were a high point of social housing. In that decade 61,953 social houses were built. But, as we've seen, he also said there was about 60,000 social houses built in the 10 years from 1932. Apparently this was not a high point. And yet the population of the State was just under 3 million throughout the 1930s. It was still under 3 million in 1970 but rose by another 400,000 by the end of the decade. So housing need was much greater in the 1970s.

It is possible that housing need was also greater in the 1980s, even though the population didn't increase much. The smaller size households would have placed greater demands on the housing stock. (According to the *Central Statistics Office* average household size was 4.01 persons in 1966; 3.53 in 1986; 3.34 in 1991. In recent years it has been stable at about 2.75.)

Later O Broin remarks that total house building increased from an annual build of 19,000 in 1991 to 34,000 in 1996 and then 93,000 in 2006. But again there is no context. He doesn't tell us the population of the Republic increased by over 700,000 in that period.

It was widely believed that, prior to the crash, the Irish economy was imbalanced, with a too great proportion of the workforce employed in the building industry. In retrospect this may not have been the case. But there is no discussion of this by the author.

He notes without comment that in 2006 there were 270,000 people employed in the

building industry. This fell dramatically to 100,000 in 2012.

Following the crash the merchants of gloom thought that the economy would stagnate for a decade and mass emigration would return. But the author does not tell us that the population of the Republic was 4.2 million in 2006; 4.6 million in 2012; and continued to increase to over 4.8 million in 2018 — an increase of over 0.6 million or nearly 15% over 12 years.

In short, in terms of housing need, the State faced a perfect storm of rising population; a reduced capacity in the construction sector; and a historically low household size.

In the years following the crash, house building was reduced to a trickle but in recent years has revived. The CSO figures for the last three years are:

2017	14,368
2018	17,9951
2019	21,241

This is still short of the 25,000 to 30,000 houses needed, but appears to be heading in the right direction. However, the figures mask an underlying structural problem which the author only touches on.

As we have seen earlier, the damaging effects of liberalisation of the credit market in the 1980s only became obvious 30 years later. The access that Irish Banks were given to EU savings inflated the property market in two ways: firstly, the price of development land, which is a key determinant of the final price of residential and commercial property, was inflated; secondly, lending to the purchasers of the property inflated the final price of the property even further. When the borrowing became unsustainable the property market crashed.

Fine Gael's solution to the problem which was created by liberalisation was to introduce more liberalisation. It reasoned that, in order for the property market to revive, there needed to be a new source of funds and not State funds.

Secondly it perceived that the sudden dramatic number of new landlords that entered the market in the last ten years had created a dysfunctional private rental market. The landlords tended to be part-time with only one property to let. In many cases they were incapable of managing even a single property. Also, the tenant was at the mercy of the circumstances of the landlord (e.g. landlord going bankrupt; landlord requiring property for relative; landlord forced to sell).

The Government thought that the creation of property investment funds would solve the problem of a deflated property market and the proliferation of amateur landlords. It was not wrong but the cure might have been worse than the disease!

The author hardly deals with this issue at all. He thinks that ordinary landlords are discriminated against compared to investment funds. He then advocates that rental income be treated “*as turnover rather than taxable revenue*”. But rental income is already treated as “*turnover*”. Landlords can deduct maintenance, repair and upgrade costs in calculating taxable income.

Elsewhere it is said:

“There are also very significant variances in the tax treatment of landlords with accidental and semi-professional landlords often paying high effective rates of tax while larger institutional investors pay zero tax on their rent role (sic) or capital gains; investors also only have to pay a 20 percent dividend tax if resident in the State.”

This is a little misleading if not wrong. It is very common for Investment Funds not to have their profits taxed until they are distributed to their shareholders. This is to avoid double taxation. Also, it is not true to say: “*investors also only have to pay a 20 percent dividend tax if resident in the State*”.

20% of dividends are withheld and paid to the State by the Investment Fund. But the Irish investor is liable for tax at his normal marginal tax rate and can use the 20% as a tax credit.

But all of this is missing the point. The property Investment Funds were in a position to buy property and to borrow at low interest rates. This was at a time when the Central Bank was putting restrictions on the credit available to potential homeowners.

These prospective homeowners were priced out of the market by the Investment Funds. And it was precisely their inability to step on even the lowest rung of the property ladder that forced them to remain in the rental market. The increased demand in the private rental market inflated rents, which more than compensated the Investment Funds for the inflated house prices. The financier Dermot Desmond says that, of the 21,000 new dwellings built in 2019, only 8,000 were available for sale. The remainder were purchased by Investment Funds: 95% of new apartments are purchased by investment funds (*The Irish Times*, 7.3.20).

In these circumstances it doesn't make sense to quibble about equal treatment between individual landlords and property investment funds. The issue is an imbalance in economic power between aspiring homeowners and property Investment Funds.

Desmond advocates, among other measures, a 50% Withholding Tax on all apartment rental income above €500,000. This, he thinks, will encourage property Investment Funds to sell their property in order to come in under the €500,000 threshold. On the demand side, he recognises that aspiring homeowners are trapped in the private rental market and therefore not in a position to save. He suggests that the Government should give an interest-free loan of between €10,000 and €50,000 to help such people obtain a mortgage. Curiously he thinks public servants, such as teachers, gardaí and hospital workers, should be given preferential treatment.

One could argue about some of these measures but at least Desmond recognises the problem and is prepared to propose practical solutions. And his support for homeownership does not preclude investment in Social Housing. His plans in this sphere are at least as ambitious as O'Broin's.

The author, like this reviewer, is sceptical of subsidising homeownership but, in the specific circumstances outlined by Dermot Desmond, such a policy seems appropriate.

Elsewhere, O Broin discusses some novel forms of homeownership. Some of these forms entered public discourse during the financial crash when homeowners couldn't pay their mortgage. Since many of them were in negative equity, they had no incentive to make *any* repayments. The idea was to encourage some level of repayments by guaranteeing that they would retain some form of ownership falling short of full ownership. But why make a general virtue out of a necessity devised to solve a very specific problem?

O Broin is sympathetic towards the *O'Cualann Co-Housing Alliance*. Land is given to the cooperative at a nominal fee from the local Council. The local Council also waives development fees. The cooperative then builds on the land. The houses sell at about €200k (half the market price). The houses are allocated to owners with specified income limits. The new owners are free to sell their property after ten years with no claw back.

It must have occurred to the author that

this looks suspiciously like subsidised home ownership: something which he has spent most of the book railing against. Perhaps as a way of jumping through this ideological hoop, he suggests that the Council should retain ownership of the land element of the house and charge a nominal rent. Also he thinks the Council should also retain the right to prevent the property from ever being sold into the private market.

In this reviewer's opinion that is inviting a legal quagmire. Why not keep things simple? Social housing is for people who can't afford to buy their own home. Homeownership should not be subsidised except in the specific case of houses in the private market that have been bought up by property investment funds.

If it is agreed that a massive social housing programme is required, how will it be implemented? The author says the Labour Party and the Trade Union think tank NERI believe a semi State Agency should be set up. But the author thinks:

“There is also a strong argument for ensuring that housing delivery is subject to democratic approval and oversight at a local level, which is best achieved by well-functioning Local Authorities.”

In this reviewer's opinion this is the last thing that is needed. There needs to be an entity outside the Local Authorities to drive the programme, whether a Semi-State Agency or some other body. There are vast tracts of land, owned by Local Authorities that have not been developed. The Local Authorities are notorious for NIMBYism (Not In My Back Yard). In the 1990s some of the resistance was overcome by corruption. But this was developer-led. It doesn't seem that the State ever takes the initiative. This must change.

The author finishes his book much as he started. There is an extensive extract from the *Democratic Programme*—this time with a commentary from President Michael D. Higgins. He extols again the virtues of Aneurin Bevan and suggests a thirteen-storey social housing development in the Netherlands as an example Ireland could follow.

There are numerous errors in this book, which give the impression that it was hastily put together. Nevertheless, it is an interesting contribution to the housing debate. But it is very far from being *the* book on the subject.

**John Martin**

## The World Outside The Socialist Oasis (The End Game)

In the end the BBC didn't go through with the film project which was to be filmed on the streets of Belfast in both Catholic and Protestant areas. A simple enough story involving young people during the war situation. I thought at first they had lost their nerve about filming in the war-torn streets of Belfast. The truth was much more logical.

In order to film in PIRA-controlled and UDA/UVF areas, I suggested there had to be negotiations with the people running them. So a small team was set up to do that. BBC Belfast agreed to this, though we had critics within that organisation and bigger critics within BBC London. The British Army had demanded a copy of the script and that had to be handed over to a major in British Army Intelligence in a meeting at the Europa Hotel. It seemed to be a lot of fuss about nothing. It was my first venture into Television, and the last, for there was no way they were going to let you express your true feelings about the war situation in Northern Ireland. But you always hoped the hints you wrote into the script would be picked up. I thought later that a better film could be made about attempting to film under what was war conditions.

At the Europa there were all sorts of things going on, all sorts of people up to all sorts of things. There were, for example, a couple of girls, with cars waiting outside, to take US and foreign journalists into PIRA areas to show them the damage the RUC and British Army were doing and to interview the inhabitants. No doubt there were loyalists also lurking there, plus MI5/MI6 agents. It was a kind of Casablanca, as depicted in the Humphrey Bogart/Ingrid Bergman film, where all kinds of foe meet on agreed neutral ground—though PIRA did attack the hotel over thirty times.

There were the sudden evacuations from the Europa Hotel due to PIRA bombs that were mostly made safe, due to warnings. Though one did explode outside and had the glass cascading down its twelve floors like a waterfall. Another internal bomb in the roof space, where the water tanks were positioned, had a river coming down the stairs. A US journalist said that if the girls who carted them to the Republican areas were missing for a few days it was wise not

to be there so they evacuated to local B&Bs. Maybe the Europa represented the 'haves' to some extent and loomed over Catholic West Belfast and became an irritant to the militants. No one was killed or injured.

It seemed to be a game between PIRA and the British Army Bomb Disposal Squad.

During the Ulster Worker's strike you could look from the 12th floor of the Europa Hotel and see a city without lights. Inside the emergency lighting was gloomy, with a lot of the hotel blacked out. There was fear among those staff who were Catholic because of the Ulster Worker's Strike. They were more concerned about the loyalists than worried by PIRA bombs that could put them out of work.

One young waiter I was talking to had an encyclopaedic memory of guns and home-made mortars. He knew all about the making of bombs, and their ingredients, the timers, the non-handling devices that used a steel tube and a single ball-bearing to trigger if it was moved. He claimed not to be active in any organisation, that his knowledge was the knowledge of the streets in Ballymurphy and other Catholic areas. Not to know made you illiterate I would think. I certainly felt like that after this conversation.

The Loyalist Tartan Gangs of young people was one of the greatest dangers I came across. They would march through the streets looking for taigs to kick to death with their heavy boots. British Army and RUC patrols mostly ignored them. The gangs felt they had the knack of identifying the Catholic by looks. To be scrutinised by them was obviously fearful. 'Looks like one' were the three words that could have you making a dash for it, or pretending you didn't hear and walking on. Even in a crowded street it was doubtful if anyone was going to come to your aid. I had written about them in the film we were trying to get made and here they were in person, not the actors but the real thing. A lorry with ROI licence plates diverted their attention. One threw a stone and hit the driver's-side window, smashing it. The driver didn't even glance in the direction the stone came but looked ahead and drove on. Just ignoring whatever was happening seemed to be the best way for most.

Sitting in a cafe, opposite the Europa Hotel, with the Director, who had still not mentioned the episode in Short Strand where we might have been gunned down. Then a fire brigade engine arrived outside the cafe. The firemen got out and began dragging fire hoses into the cafe. It seemed that the kitchen was on fire. People there just went on drinking their tea and eating their food. Nobody told us to leave.

We just sat there with the rest of the customers while the fire was being battled. With the floor now flooding from the fire hoses, the firemen left without a word.

The customers began to leave, paying their bills, without a word. They sloped off like zombies. The Director's reaction was to get this episode into the script. Belfast to him was a film set. So I wrote that scene in.

Passes, in the meantime, had been issued to the film crew and some members of BBC Belfast, allowing them to enter Republican and Loyalist areas. I remember the head of BBC Belfast proudly showing his two passes to Catholic and Protestant Belfast.

Somehow this probably became too much for some higher authorities in BBC London and maybe the British Army. It was a recognition that the British and RUC authorities had lost control of these areas. Filming was stopped in Belfast and we all left for London. The story was made in a studio in London. Media critics said it needed to be made on the streets of Belfast. Little did they know. Later I learned the BBC was having a clear-out, erasing the film reels and TV tapes in order to re-use them. My work was gone. Light entertainment they kept.

But there was something more valuable happening in Northern Ireland, the uplifting of the Catholic spirit to fight oppression. Last month I described the difference between the timid Short Strand children of my youth and those we encountered when the Director wanted to see around the area. Those kids would never run away ever again!

**Wilson John Haire**  
7.3.20.

### THE FEVERED BRAIN

Then came the coronavirus,  
one of the direst.  
It takes over the economy,  
it's of a kind that eats countries,  
the world,  
and worse,  
it takes over the mind.

**Wilson John Haire.** 18.3.20



## Significant ‘Errors’

For many decades Roger Sawyer has been a leading proponent for the authenticity of the Black Diaries. He is the author of two books, a biography *Casement, The Flawed Hero*, 1984 and a study of the two 1910 diaries, *The Black and the White*, 1997 along with several articles and broadcasts.

Clement King Shorter (1857-1926) was founder and editor of the influential illustrated weekly newspaper *The Sphere* to which he contributed literary articles. He was a noted collector of literary memorabilia and was on good terms with prominent literary people of the period. When Casement was sentenced to death on 29th June, 1916, Shorter, along with Conan Doyle, set about organising one of the many petitions for his reprieve. In July 1916 Shorter was invited to Scotland Yard by CID chief Basil Thomson who showed him unidentified handwritten matter purportedly by Casement with hopes of convincing him that the condemned man did not deserve a reprieve. Shorter was unconvinced by what Thomson showed him and continued with the petition which by 21st July had gathered 48 prominent signatories.

In his 1984 biography Roger Sawyer comments on this event in Scotland Yard as follows:

“Among these was Clement Shorter who, as editor of *The Sphere*, was present when Hall first showed photographs of selected pages to a number of English and American journalists whom he invited to the Admiralty. At a later date, Shorter was shown the originals at Scotland Yard by Basil Thomson and was prompted to declare that the handwriting bore not the faintest resemblance to Casement’s” (pp 140).

Sawyer gives no source for his claim that Shorter was shown “the originals”, or for any such declaration. Since these assertions do not appear anywhere else in Casement literature, they are perhaps ‘errors’.

Some years after this event in Scotland Yard, Shorter prepared a pamphlet for private printing with the co-operation of Bernard Shaw. In February 1922, a collectors’ edition of 25 copies was printed with the title ‘*A Discarded Defence of Roger Casement*’. The pamphlet contained the text of Shaw’s proposed defence—with which Casement had agreed, but which

his defence lawyer A.M. Sullivan had rejected out of hand.

### §

On 20th June 1956 the following letter appeared in *The Irish Times*. The original punctuation is here retained:

“Sir. – In the British Museum there is a pamphlet, privately printed in February, 1922, and entitled “A Discarded Defence of Roger Casement.”

This was the draft defence against the charge of treason which George Bernard Shaw sent to Roger Casement in 1916, and on which Casement wrote his own comments. These comments are printed in the appendix of the pamphlet and a footnote to them says: “These notes are in Roger Casement’s handwriting, which does not tally with the handwriting of the notorious ‘diaries’ shown to me at Scotland Yard by Sir Basil Thomson.”

Presumably this footnote was supplied either by Shaw himself, who contributed an introduction to the pamphlet, or by Clement Shorter, who prepared it for publication. Yours, etc.,

Roger McHugh  
Seanad Eireann  
June 20th, 1956”

Only two days later, on 22nd June 1956, a brief article appeared in *The Spectator* under the pseudonym *Pharos* (1). This reported the content of McHugh’s letter and cited the following sentence which is reproduced below as punctuated in *The Spectator*: “These notes are in Roger Casement’s handwriting, which does not tally with the handwriting of the notorious diaries shown to me at Scotland Yard by Sir Basil Thomson.”

Shorter’s 1922 pamphlet in the British Library contains that sentence printed thus, as punctuated in the pamphlet: “These notes are in Roger Casement’s handwriting, which does not tally with the handwriting of the notorious “diaries” shown to me at Scotland Yard by Sir Basil Thomson.”

In the 1922 pamphlet the word *diaries* is enclosed in double inverted commas. In McHugh’s letter in *The Irish Times* that word is enclosed in single inverted commas. In *The Spectator* article that word is printed *without* inverted commas.

What has to be first determined is the reason why Sawyer fails to cite a source for his assertion that Shorter was shown ‘the originals’. The source can only be

any or all of the three publications which had been seen by tens of thousands of readers: *The Irish Times*, *The Spectator* and the 1922 pamphlet. It is therefore strange that Sawyer does not cite a source which is already in the public domain. This failure must be counted as a very significant ‘error’.

*The Spectator*’s apparently innocuous elimination of the inverted commas printed in the original pamphlet might help to throw some light on why Sawyer failed to cite a source for his assertion. *The Spectator* article cites the 1922 pamphlet, where Shorter printed the word *diaries* in inverted commas to indicate a reserved meaning for that word (2). It is obvious that, by citing *The Spectator* as his source, Sawyer would also have led his readers to the 1922 pamphlet where astute readers would have noted that the word “diaries” carried a reserved meaning. Since *The Spectator* was not cited as a source, readers could not know of the reserved meaning in the original pamphlet.

It is unthinkable that Sawyer failed to inspect the original 1922 pamphlet in the British Library. And it is unthinkable that he failed to note the inverted commas which indicate a reserved meaning. Such failures would be serious ‘errors’ indeed.

In the sentence immediately following his claim that Shorter saw the originals in Scotland Yard, Sawyer writes: “*The original rolled manuscript shown to the Associated Press representative ... was later found to have been twenty-two pages torn out of the 1903 diary.*” This is strange and Sawyer is the only author to make this claim (3). He does not say when this was discovered or who discovered it or how *he alone* learned of this. But perhaps this was an oversight, yet another ‘error’.

It is even stranger since both the rolled manuscript and the twenty-two pages have long disappeared and Sawyer has never seen them.

Here Sawyer has made a very significant ‘error’ because his claim is demonstrably false, as noted on page 153 of *Anatomy of a Lie*. As confirmed in *The Giles Report of 2002*, the pages of the 1903 diary measure 90mm x 150 mm; journalist Ben Allen testified that the pages shown to him by Hall were of almost legal size, 216mm x 356 mm, were buff coloured and torn at the top. The latter pages were around 5.7 times larger than the diary pages. It is unthinkable that Sawyer failed to ever personally examine the 1903 Black Diary. It is equally unthinkable that he failed



to ever read the sworn statement made by Ben Allen, which is now in the NLI. Such failures would yet again be serious 'errors' indeed.

It is a fact that Sawyer bonded this unverifiable claim about the pages to his Shorter account. This might be a remarkable 'coincidence' but that coincidental proximity makes the unverifiable claim an essential part of a single claim, which acts to offset any suspicion that Shorter was shown the same roll of papers which Allen saw in May. Despite the offer being repeated several times by Hall, Allen was never offered the bound volumes now at Kew. No doubt Allen was not the only journalist to see these papers although it seems that Hall wished to favour him with an exclusive. It cannot be excluded that this roll of handwritten papers was the diary materials shown to Shorter in July and which caused him to enclose the word diaries in double inverted commas.

There are good reasons for excluding that the roll of handwritten papers shown to Allen in May 1916 was a genuine Casement diary. The main reason is that Allen was not allowed to verify the pages with Casement, which procedure was a standard condition for publication. Another reason is that these unidentified pages have never been seen since 1916; they are presumed destroyed. Therefore, the authorities first produced and showed this evidence against Casement and then the authorities destroyed their own evidence. Such destruction of evidence is only explicable if the papers were not written by Casement. No other rational motive can be proposed. A third reason is that this mysterious roll of papers does not appear in any of the police lists of possessions allegedly found in Casement's luggage.

Whatever Shorter was shown purported to be the notorious diaries and he naturally expected to see conventional diaries of the type purchased and used by the vast majority of people. The use of inverted commas indicates that his expectation was not satisfied and he did not see conventional diaries. But the diaries at Kew are indeed conventional diaries mass produced for consumers.

There are strong grounds for interpreting the inverted commas as a signal that the materials seen were improvised diaries in some form rather than bound volumes. And most probably Shorter was shown the mysterious roll of papers. This is the most credible explanation of his motive for using inverted commas for the word diaries.

This event represents yet another occasion when the bound diaries might have been shown to an independent witness but were not shown.

In this instance the non-showing was performed by Thomson himself and in Scotland Yard where he allegedly held the bound diaries. Rather than show the volumes allegedly in his custody, Thomson showed something else to Shorter whom *he had invited*. There can be only one explanation for Thomson's failure to produce the bound diaries, only one explanation which satisfies reason and common sense. The compromising diaries which are now held in the UK National Archives could not be shown on the day of Shorter's visit in July 1916 because they did not exist.

The published claim that Shorter was shown the bound diaries at Scotland Yard rests upon a cluster of 'errors' which, by definition, cannot constitute evidence. Therefore there is no evidence that Shorter was shown the bound diaries. This fact adds to the absence of witness evidence for the existence of the Black Diaries in 1916.

The multiple 'errors' made by Sawyer must be considered as significant 'errors'. Such 'errors' are by definition unintentional only when caused by a cognitive bias of which one is unconscious. It follows that if the 'errors' are intentional, they are not true errors and therefore they belong to a distinct category. Readers can determine for themselves the significance of these 'errors'.

#### §

1 - There are grounds for believing that *Pharos* was a pseudonym used by René MacColl who published a hostile biography in 1956 called *Roger Casement: A New Judgment*.

2 - Reserved meaning: inverted commas used to indicate the word does not carry its usual meaning. Example; Not surprised he couldn't find it in his "filing system".

3 - Inglis claims (*Roger Casement*, 1974, p.66) that the 1903 diary pages were torn out in 1916 and shown to journalists. No source is given. He does not mention the rolled manuscript pages shown to Ben Allen.

Paul Hyde

## A Note On The Travails Of Syria

The basic opposition to Assad in Syria is religious. The Assad family are Alawites. Like the mainstream 'twelver' Shi'ism of Iran the Alawites recognised eleven Imams, legitimate rulers of Islam in the succession of Muhammad's cousin Ali, but they separated on the question of what happened when the twelfth Imam, while still a child, disappeared. Sunni Islam does not recognise them as Muslims, yet only a Muslim has the right to rule a Muslim country. When Bashir Assad's father, Hafez al-Assad, became President of Syria in 1971, many Sunni Muslims refused to recognise him. The Muslim Brothers in particular rose against him resulting in 1982 in a very brutal suppression, including, notoriously a massacre of the citizens of town of Hama. The Alawites were however recognised as Muslim through a fatwa issued in 1974 by Musa al-Sadr, one of the radical group of Shi'i clerics based in Najaf in Iraq who were developing a distinctively Shi'i political theory largely in reaction against the success of the Iraqi Communist Party. Musa al-Sadr was particularly active in Lebanon where he helped found Amal, the main Shi'i political movement in Lebanon prior to the rise of Hezbollah. He disappeared mysteriously in the course of a visit to Libya.

The Muslim Brothers were the militant heart of the rising that started the present 'troubles' (to coin a phrase). They had the backing of Turkey and Qatar (and USUK and France, pretending that it was a secular democratic revolt). They also had a wave of popular discontent to work with since Bashir al-Assad had been won over to neo-liberal economic policy and was failing to help people who had been flooding into the towns from the country following several years of drought. At the time it looked as if the Muslim Brothers were also going to get Egypt and Tunisia so a Turkey-Qatar-Syria-Egypt-Tunisia-Hamas network was on the cards - one can see that it would have been a tempting prospect but it was sabotaged by Saudi Arabia and the UAE who hate the Brothers (especially the UAE, hence complications in the anti-Houthi alliance in Yemen). They helped to feed the more militant Islamists into the equation. It became a proxy war between Turkey/Qatar and Saudi/UAE. Football fans wearing Fly Emirates shirts should take note.

As a result of the failure of the revolt Turkey now has a major problem of a large number of refugees in its own borders, as well as a large number of rebels concen-

trated in Idlib. Having been encouraged by Turkey to rise in revolt, they look to Erdogan to defend them, but they are also mixed up with the more radical elements encouraged, but now apparently entirely abandoned by the Saudis and the Emirates. It is a real problem. The solution envisaged by Erdogan is to take a slice of Syria as a Turkish protectorate populated by a substantially anti-Assad population. This would also have the advantage of weakening the Kurds in Northern Syria whose sympathies are very much with the Kurds in revolt in Turkey. It would however pose a grave threat to the stability of a united Syria.

President Putin of Russia wishes to maintain good relations with both Turkey and Syria (and Israel and Saudi Arabia and the Palestinians). He has with some skill been attempting to balance their

conflicting interests. Under the Sochi-Astana agreement the Turkish presence in Idlib was allowed to continue but they were supposed to disarm the militant jihadi element and open the M4 and M5 highways to Syrian civilian traffic. As a result of their failure to do any of this, the Syrians and Russians lost patience and decided to do it themselves, resulting in a major confrontation between Syria and its allies (chiefly Hezbollah), and the Turkish army. The end result seems to be a substantial pro-Syrian advance into Idlib and the opening of the M4 motorway. But the Turks still control much of Northern Syria and for the moment at least it seems that their presence there is still accepted by Russia, even though it cuts Assad off from the Kurdish areas which are also Syria's breadbasket, not to mention the oil areas, currently 'protected' by the US . . .

Peter Brooke

(Continuation)

## A correspondence with Professor Emerita Patricia Laurence, City College of New York

13/3/2020

Dear Mr. Lane:

I have examined your letter of February 4, 2020, and appreciate your drawing my attention to the discrepancies between Eibhear Walshe's publication of Bowen's wartime MOI reports in *Selected Irish Writings* and the Aubane Society's three separate editions of her reports. I noted some of the discrepancies myself in my chapter, Art and Intelligence, and I cannot account for Walshe's selections. I personally and conscientiously pursued the wartime reports everywhere: the National Archives in Kew, the Foreign Office, Irish libraries, consultation with librarians and scholars in England and Ireland. My chapter recounts

some of the difficulties and irresolution about the reports (when, where and if they were all or in part destroyed): the "missing dimension." I, therefore, appreciated your publications and want to note, first, that it was difficult to get your Aubane Society reports and when I was researching, I found a copy of the 1995 edition in the Boston College Library (where my son teaches). They cannot be found in most libraries, and when you sent me the 2009 culminating third edition (that included additional reports), my ms. had already been submitted to the press (my book was published December 2019). Hence, not all reports were accounted for and I apologize for my inaccurate statements. However, I

had from the beginning acknowledged the difficulty in finding and aligning the reports with a statement in my book.

"The differences in the number of letters in these two editions... suggest the need for further study."

I now understand that the Aubane Society editions were assembled quickly on a small budget, and apologize for commenting on the editing, and *mea culpa*, the lapse in my own editing in using an incorrect name instead of "Frank." I was balancing an enormous amount of information, facts, conjectures and interpretations of Bowen's life and writing, and I don't doubt there are lapses. I'm only sorry my editors did not pick them up, including the statement that Bowen was "born" in Cork (in passing) when it should have been "resided."

My editor informs me that a second edition will be considered in 24 months, and corrections can be made at that time. At this point, the books are published "print on demand" and changes cannot be made. I wish to emphasize that your early signaling of Bowen's "Irish errand," as she euphemistically named it, was important to my book as were Fisk's 1979 revelations. My chapter, "Art and Intelligence" benefitted from the your research and editions, Clifford and Lane, and for that, I am grateful. I hope this letter addresses your concerns and future discussion of my biography of Bowen.

Sincerely,

Patricia Laurence  
Professor Emerita  
City University of New York

\*

Dear Patricia,

Thanks for your gracious response to my comments on your book. The book added to my knowledge of Elizabeth Bowen and I am sure it will do so for many others. She remains a most interesting person and writer.

Yours sincerely  
Jack Lane  
13/3/2020

## Letter To The Editor

### "Roy Johnston: Some Stray Thoughts" : A Reply.

In an article on the late Dr Roy Johnston (1929-2019) in the February issue of the *Irish Political Review* Brendan Clifford makes some inaccurate statements about him, about myself, about Desmond Greaves and about the Connolly Association, which I would like to correct.

Having stated that "The Connolly Association was a Front organization of the Communist Party of Great Britain", Brendan writes that Roy Johnston "was sent to Dublin to work on a connection which Greaves had established with the leadership of the IRA, which was looking for a new orientation after the utter failure of the 1956 invasion of the North. He was accompanied by Anthony Coughlan, who was a member of the Connolly Association . . . The understanding in the circles from which I picked up information

was that Johnston and Coughlan were re-making the Republican movement on socialist lines through the liaison established by Greaves with Cathal Goulding."

These statements or allegations, which have been made by various others in the past, are either untrue or misleading. Here are the facts:

I was full-time organizer for the Connolly Association in London in 1960-61, but did not belong to any political party. When I applied for and secured an appointment

as a lecturer in Trinity College, Dublin, Desmond Greaves did his best to persuade me not to take it up. The last thing he wanted was that I should go back to Ireland at that time. Roy Johnston, who also lived in London for a while, returned to Ireland a year or so after I did. As Johnston's autobiography, *Century of Endeavour*, makes clear—a book which Brendan Clifford states in his article that he has not read but which is still for sale in bookshops—he was not “sent” on any political mission by Greaves or anyone else. Indeed the account Roy gives in his book of the brush-off Greaves gave him when he went to him looking for advice on what he might do in Irish politics when he returned to Dublin is highly amusing and worth looking up. When back in Dublin Roy Johnston joined the IRA and Sinn Féin around 1963 on the invitation of Cathal Goulding, without either Desmond Greaves or myself being aware of it. Greaves's general injunction to Connolly Association political activists returning home was that what was needed in Ireland was to try and make the Irish Labour Movement Republican, not try to make the Republican Movement political. If that advice had been followed by various people, maybe some important things might be different today.

As regards Desmond Greaves and the IRA, Greaves used come to Ireland from time to time during the 1960s for purposes of research on his book “*Liam Mellows and the Irish Revolution*”, which was published in 1971. It was Cathal Goulding, Sean Garland and Seamus Costello who approached Greaves, not he them. Their initial meeting was facilitated by the fact that Cathal MacLiam, at whose house Greaves regularly stayed while in Dublin, was a cousin of Goulding's, although they had not previously met until Goulding initiated the contact. As regards Greaves's attitude to the Republicans, while he welcomed their moving away from militarism during the 1960s he deplored their insertion of “socialism” as an objective in their Constitution, something that was primarily due to the influence of Seamus Costello. I shared Greaves's disquiet at that. It was “changing the label on the bottle”, Greaves remarked, and would lead to endless political confusion, as in due course it did, and may indeed be doing still.

As for the Connolly Association being “a front organization of the Communist Party of Great Britain”, that is an old canard which does not do justice to the history of an organisation that was founded in 1938 and which is still in existence some 30 years after the CPGB dissolved itself. The Connolly Association is an organiza-

tion run by its members whose policy is decided by its annual conference. In the 1940s and early 1950s there were divisions in its ranks as to the appropriate policy of an organisation of Irish immigrants on the relation of national independence and socialism. In its modern Constitution, which was adopted in 1955, largely under Greaves's influence, the Association adopted the twin objectives of (1) defending the interests of Irish people in Britain, something that was best done by urging them to join a trade union where that was appropriate, and (2) seeking to win support in Britain, and particularly in the British Labour movement, for the cause of Irish reunification and independence. It was this clarification of aims and policy that enabled the Association to make such subsequent signal contributions to the 1960s Northern Civil Rights Movement, to opposing European integration on democratic and internationalist grounds and to counteracting what Greaves termed “anti-national brainwashing” in Irish history-writing and general politics. Although Desmond Greaves was a member of the CPGB all his adult life, he was never on its Executive so far as I know, contrary to what Brendan Clifford states. He was not a “front” man for anyone. His sole source of income was a modest wage as editor of the Connolly Association's monthly paper, “*The Irish Democrat*”, from the time he took on that job full-time in 1951 until his death in 1988. He was totally committed to the independence of the Association and would not have tolerated any attempt from outside to push policy positions that its members were not happy with. Although a CPGB member, he had quite an independent attitude to that party and was often deeply critical of it, while recognizing that it was the only political party in Britain that was opposed to the Partition of Ireland.

The truth of these points will be evidenced when Desmond Greaves's two-million-word *Journal* is published on the internet at [www.desmondgreavesarchive.com](http://www.desmondgreavesarchive.com), together with his *Table-Talk*. Greaves's “*Life and Times of James Connolly*” and some of his more important articles and pamphlets are already on this site. As Greaves's literary executor I aim to have the first few volumes of his “*Journal*” placed on the site by end-May. I am currently working on an Index to the full 38 volumes of this and expect to have them all up there over the coming two years. The Greaves *Journal* will be an important historical document and will scatter the many myths and untruths that have been spread by various parties over the years about a truly remarkable man.

**Anthony Coughlan**

## Bloody Balfour!

Readers of *History Ireland* may have read a long article by Dennis Kennedy and the dispute in its Letters Page between himself and myself about one of his contentions—that we Irish should be so grateful to the late Lord Fitzalan, the British Viceroy for gifting Dublin Castle to Michael Collins in 1922. Another Noble Lord at the time, Birkenhead, aka Galloper Smith, Carson's 1912 Henchman, exulted that the transaction *kept Ireland in the Empire with an economy of English lives*.

Dennis Kennedy is a native of Belfast, who studied History at Queen's University under J C Beckett in the 1950s and is a former Deputy Editor of the *Irish Times*. His *Curriculum Vitae* looks impressive, much more than his journalistic offerings have ever seemed to me. He is no relation of mine—*Buiochas Mor Le Dia!*

Dennis Kennedy quotes his mentor, Beckett or Beckett, who quoted approvingly “a sneer” by Arthur Balfour made in 1922. Sneering at anything Irish appears at the heart of everything. Dennis Kennedy writes. (I remember the late Flann Campbell. Historian son of the poet Joseph (My Lagan Love), remarking on Dennis Kennedy's *Irish Times* pieces with distaste.)

Anyhow, Arthur Balfour was the nephew of Robert Cecil, Lord Salisbury, who when Prime Minister, appointed him as Chief Secretary in Ireland. In England the appointment gave rise to the expression “*Bob's your Uncle*” and in Ireland “*Remember Mitchelstown*”. He was promptly named “*Bloody Balfour*” in Ireland, and should really be remembered thus globally.

One wacky member of Bloody Balfour's Fan Club was David Gray, a relation of Eleanor Roosevelt, who, as American Minister in Dublin in the 1940s occupied the former residence of the Chief Secretary. Gray was pathologically anti-Irish, and would ask Balfour's advice in how to handle Eamon de Valera.

Balfour had been dead and buried since 1930. No problem for Yankee Know-How. Gray arranged Seances. Imagine how Evelyn Waugh or Graham Greene would have described the scene, were it set in Abyssinia or Haiti and the Minister were a Darker Shade Than Grey!

Balfour was no stickler for democracy, nor even constitutional propriety. He was Prime Minister from 1902 to 1905 and when the Liberals won a landslide victory lost his own Commons seat. Unruffled, he declared that the Conservative Party, in or out of office, must continue to direct the affairs of “*this Great Empire*”.

Not long after this Lloyd George was to describe the House of Lords “*Mr Balfour's Poodle*”.



Before leaving Office, the Unionist, Balfour, had established a Committee for Imperial Defence, including Liberal Imperialists, and had cemented the *Entente Cordiale* with France. The former Liberal Imperialist Prime Minister, Lord Rosebery, had told the young Lloyd George that there would be war with Germany. That was in 1904.

Balfour had also shocked an American friend telling him that Germany, as a trading rival, would be crushed.

He never wavered from that intention. He was a, if not THE, Prime Mover in the Great War, the bloody consequences of which may yet consume us all.

Even his fans.

Donal Kennedy

## Captain Kelly's Unknown Intelligence Reports

Captain Kelly was one of several Intelligence Officers who produced reports for the Irish Government on what was happening in the North in August 1969 and for some months after that. However, he is the only one who has come in for sustained criticism. There seems to be very little known about the half dozen or so others deployed by the Government.

When the Northern Ireland situation became live in August 1969, the Government required reliable accounts of events, political developments and political tendencies as affecting the Catholic community. Captain Kelly, a member of the Intelligence Branch of the Irish Army, was on holiday in Belfast at the time and submitted his impressions of what had transpired to his superior officer, Colonel Hefferon. Subsequently the Government asked him to continue to act for it in the North.

Captain Kelly thereupon acted on Government instructions until April/May 1970, when Lynch carried out a *coup* within his Cabinet, criminalised scapegoats, including selected Ministers, and prosecuted some of those involved in the Arms Importation under the authority of the Minister of Defence and using money supplied by the Government.

In the course of his work Captain Kelly made verbal and written Reports, some of which have survived.

Thomas Hennessy, in his heavily-referenced work, *The Origin Of The Troubles In Northern Ireland*, suggests that the Captain submitted no Reports to the Government, saying: "*No reports from him [Capt. Kelly] were on record in the Intelligence Security Sub-Section*" (p371). Presumably he is here relying on the slanted documents prepared on behalf of the Prosecution case for the Arms Conspiracy Trials. Certainly Colonel Delaney, Hefferon's successor in Army Intelligence, was heavily committed to building a damaging case by any means

possible. But the fact is, Captain Kelly did make written Reports to his superiors, some of which have survived.

These Reports were written mainly in August-October 1969, but there was also one from January 1970, responding to Taoiseach Lynch's speech to the Fianna Fail Ard Fheis. In fact these documents survived purely by accident. As the late Mrs. Sheila Kelly told me, after Taoiseach Lynch changed his policy towards Northern Catholic defence, the Captain was phoned by an Intelligence colleague who had overheard talk in the office to the effect that the Intelligence Reports were to be destroyed. The Captain managed to get some of them smuggled out.

Mrs. Kelly left it up to me whether I included them in the Arms Trial book.

I took the view that these Reports were a separate matter to the charge of conspiracy to import arms illegally, which was tested in the Arms Trials.

A serious charge was made by the State, which could have resulted in decades of penal servitude for those found guilty. The evidence submitted in court, and the testimony of the witnesses for the Defence and Prosecution had to be considered on its own merits, along with Government archive material on the affair. People were entitled to know whether the Government did have a policy of arming the Catholics in the North, or whether this was a scheme hatched by an element of Fianna Fail opposed to Government policy, as has been widely asserted. Or even whether this was all part of a plot by Ministerial rivals to mount a coup against the moderate nationalist, Honest Jack Lynch, which is another common allegation!

It seemed to me that, after this matter had been laid to rest, attention could be directed to the issues raised by Captain Kelly's Reports. They were a separate matter, albeit also relating to Government policy as regards the Northern minority in 1969-70.

\*

Captain Kelly's work went beyond simple transmission of facts. Basing himself on what he was encountering in Catholic areas, James Kelly was assessing the Catholic mood, the various tendencies in play, and envisaging how the situation might develop. He was trusted by the leaders improvising a defence in August 1969 and they enlightened him on the various intricacies of the local scene. And subsequently they spoke to him about how they saw the situation developing, some of them visiting him at home to do so. Thus in a report dated mid-August we read:

"On 17 August, 2 MPs, Paddy Kennedy and Paddy Devlin, called to my home in company with a Mr. Young, a civilian. They said they wanted arms for purely defensive action by the Catholic population in Belfast, whom they see as being systematically eliminated or forced to become refugees despite the presence of British troops. Their suggestion was that they might be given arms secretly and surreptitiously by authorities here. Requested my assistance.

Later in the evening of the 17th I again met the group and spoke to Mr. Kennedy. I told him that as MPs they should make every effort to contact a member of the government. He agreed to this but at the same time it was clear and Mr. Kennedy stated that the position was such that he was going to get arms by any means possible, if approach to government failed. As I left him at approx. 19.30 hrs on 17th, he was making arrangements for the collection of arms by any means, illegal or otherwise."

(Significantly, when Captain Kelly recommended the MPs to appeal to "*a member of the government*" for help, he did *not* mean—and nor was he understood to mean—a member of the Government and the political system of which they were a part. It was not the British, but the Irish Government that was expected to protect citizens in an area regarded as being a part of Ireland and over which the State asserted sovereignty *de jure*.)

\*

It is important to understand that the conflagration of August 1969 was not created by the republican movement. Given the fundamental constitutional change that has been brought about by the Provisional Republican leadership over the last generation, it would be a natural assumption that the republican movement stimulated the protests which produced that very rare moment in history, that in which anything might happen.

The guns required by the Catholic elected representatives were for purely defensive purposes. But, once guns become part of a situation, possibilities open up.

But there was more to it than that.



At that time Republicanism had its focus and its base in Dublin. And the Dublin leadership had brought in Roy Johnson of the Communist Party of Great Britain to divert the movement from simple anti-partitionism and give it a socialist agenda. In pursuit of this objective it had demilitarised (selling much of its arsenal to the Free Wales Army, it is said), although it continued using military-type operations in pursuit of its aims. For instance, some German farms had buildings burned and multi-nationals had property attacked in the course of industrial disputes. The object was to politicise the working class and small farmers.

All this was very well in the South, but it left Northern Catholic areas without resources in case of trouble. And that caused disaffection amongst Republicans, to whom Catholics naturally turned to defend their areas. This was before the British Army had been deployed to Northern Ireland in strength and when the Catholics were confronted with an armed police force and a widely organised part-time militia in the form of the B-Specials.

That was bad enough in normal times but the 1960s were not normal times. There was agitation and militancy all around the world. In America the emotive campaign for black rights was taking off. And all around Europe student demonstrations were challenging the *status quo*. Michael Farrell has described the frustration felt, as a member of the Belfast Young Socialists, to be living in a dead situation. However, the events of October 1968 onwards were to change that. A banned Civil Rights march was attacked by the RUC in Derry: television viewers in the Republic and all around the world could see Gerry Fitt MP, and other leaders of a peaceful march, being battered by police thugs; the Young Socialist supporters were hammered; and soon afterwards the People's Democracy was formed in Queen's University, Belfast.

In the months that followed, PD ramped up the social temperature with its marches and demonstrations—events which were to be physically challenged by counter-demonstrations and assaults by Protestant groupings. As the months went by, the tensions rose to such an extent that everyone knew that the Apprentice Boys march, due on the second Saturday of August 1969, was going to be a flash-point, with extra Bands and contingents attending. The Irish Government made a desperate attempt to persuade the British Government to intervene to get the march postponed, or reduced—only to be brushed off with the old excuse that this was a *devolved matter*.

The result was the *Siege Of Derry*, which happened when Bogside's sealed off their area, preventing the forces of the State from entering in pitched battles over several days—events which were to change the course of history.

Other nationalist areas around Northern Ireland mounted demonstrations so that all police resources could not be focussed on Derry and that brought the mass attacks from Protestants which Captain Kelly was witnessing in Belfast.

The strange thing about all of this is that the People's Democracy, which had weaponised Civil Rights, certainly was not interested in nationalism, national rights or a United Ireland! Its activity was to alienate much of the initial moderate Protestant support which Civil Rights had attracted. Nevertheless it continued attempting to pursue the civil rights demands in militant ways and then trying to divert the civil rights ferment into socialist channels. Its Young Socialist core was hard-line Trotskyist. It wanted Workers' Councils and the October Revolution of 1917 Russia.

The other major element in the situation was the revamped republican movement. It also wanted a Socialist Republic—but a People's Democracy on East European lines. It differed from the PDs in that, if a United Ireland seemed on the cards, it would pursue that and then strive to bring about its ideal. Unlike the PDs, it had no problem with the Irish national flag: as was pointed out in the *United Irishman*, it was the flag for which James Connolly fought.

*Tories Out, North And South* was a slogan supported by both the PDs and the Dublin-based Republicans. But the Republicans were happy to go for unity first and take on the bourgeoisie after unity. And, of course, if the IRA had been instrumental in achieving a United Ireland, Sinn Fein would have carried a lot of weight in Irish society after that. The social profile of the bourgeois Republic could have been revolutionised.

\*

Apart from those two major tendencies, there was a minor—less ambitious—grouping. That was those who, in the first place, wanted to defend Catholic areas and to see conditions of life improved for the Catholic community. They wanted proper organisation focussed on defence, along with a change in Northern Ireland structures to restrict the repression of Catholics, and to ensure proper housing and access to employment. However, it was generally considered that the Stormont Government

would either be prevented from making the required changes by its hinterland, or that there would be attacks on Catholic areas to bring about a return to quiescence. And, in the months after August 1969, it was not clear which of these two courses events were to take.

The old-style republicans wanted a capacity to mount a proper defence of Catholic areas while political advances were being made. And, in the longer term, there was also a desire to use the current opportunity to bring about a United Ireland, pure and simple. The political system of the united country was of no immediate consequence: the North would be joining the South.

Captain Kelly in Belfast, at the heart of the ferment, could see the different tendencies at play. Thus, on 23rd August, he produced a most acute report, "*Northern Ireland vis-à-vis Irish Republic An Appreciation of the situation*". This essentially warned that the Government ignored this historical moment at its peril: inaction could bring about political developments which the Government would be powerless to control and cause undesired change. As will be remembered, official Irish policy was to achieve 'Unity by Consent', and the *de jure* claim to Northern Ireland was part of the Constitution. Taoiseach Lynch had re-iterated that position during his Address to the Nation at the height of the Derry crisis, not long before.

Kelly was building on that official statement of policy in his report:

"The unification of the country as seen by the Irish Government is the final solution to the present problems. It is fair to state that this assertion has struck an emotive chord in the generality of Irishmen..."

It is hoped to achieve this ideal of unity by peaceful means but assuming that it is thwarted despite political and other action short of war, the question must be posed if such an outcome will be acceptable to the Irish People. The answer could well be that it would be acceptable to the majority, but in a situation such as that currently existing in Ireland, a certain minority is of importance, the minority which Jacques Maritain refers to as 'the Prophetic shock-minority'..."

In other words, as happened in 1916, a *shock minority* might energise the majority into action.

The Captain quotes two priests, the Frenchman Jacques Maritain, and the Dublin-based F.X. Martin, who had

“referred to the revolutionaries of 1916 as a ‘prophetic shock-minority’...”. And he suggests:

“The self-appointed prophets, who have given expression to the ideal of nationalism by violent means, were later shown to have given expression to the consciousness of the people as a whole. To relate 1916 to the present day, it is fair to state that nationalism is still a major inspiring force for at least a substantial minority. Therefore, it is fair to put the proposition that if Irish unity is not seen as the end result to the present debacle, a minority may, rightly or wrongly, take upon itself the mantle of the “prophetic shock-minority.” History, and not alone Irish history, only confirms this interpretation of events, which forces one to the conclusion that if the unification of Ireland is not achieved by other means, the nation may be forced into the position of taking military action.”

The “*other means*” here is presumably an allusion to the Irish Cabinet policy of achieving a Federal Ireland by consent. However, this scheme faced many obstacles: the extreme reluctance of the British Government to upset existing constitutional arrangements; the violent opposition of the Unionists to constitutional change of any kind, however mild; and the condemnation from such as the Republicans, who constantly warned in the *United Irishman* of the Lynch plot to bring Ireland back into a *federation* under Westminster tutelage.

The Captain warns that simply suppressing those intent on bringing about a United Ireland by means of an armed campaign brought its own dangers:

“It may sound a contradiction, but it [sic] one wishes to be objective about such as nationalism [sic] one must be subjective also, at least to the extent that one appreciates its emotive content working on the people. To be objective in such a situation one must also be subjective enough to be in touch with the temper of the people. Then, the question that must be asked and answered correctly is what is the possibility of the extreme republican minority becoming the modern prophetic shock-minority in Ireland. An affirmative answer could be correct if the Government found itself in the position of having to take action against extremists, leading to the possible situation where the authority would find itself taking coercive action against an increasing minority. If such a development were to take place it could only lead to a state of anarchy with the consequent discrediting of the country as a whole.”

To avoid this situation, Kelly recommends that the Government take the initiative and keep control of nationalist forces by giving a strong positive lead—

“To avoid such a catastrophe, it would seem to be necessary to harness all opinion in the state in a concerted drive towards achieving the aim of unification. Unfortunately, this would mean accepting the possibility of armed action of some sort as the ultimate solution, but if civil war embracing this area, and civil war is not too strong a term, was to result because of unwillingness to accept that war is a continuation of politics by other means, it would be far the greater evil for the Irish nation.

The “*civil war*” which Captain Kelly is presumably alluding to here is between the Government and the republicans, which could result if the Government took a strong stance against their campaign. (And it might be noted here that this message was taken on board by subsequent Irish Governments of every complexion. It was a constant British complaint that the IRA found a safe haven in the South. And it was no accident that the Irish Courts ruled that people could not be extradited for political offences—even if those offences were acts of physical force.)

The argument being made is that, if the Government did not take the lead by promoting political initiatives and by overseeing military efforts to achieve a United Ireland, it could find itself in an invidious position: The Government could be faced with the very unpopular policy of forcibly curbing those seeking to implement the first national aim.

The Captain adds that “*there is some indication that extreme republicanism is willing to cooperate in achieving the unity ideal*”, but that, if the Government did not cooperate, they “*are likely to take unilateral action*”.

It should be said that, if Lynch had not suddenly changed course in April/May 1970, the “*unilateral action*” could have been avoided. Having criminalised those involved in Arms Importation, the Government set about promoting the formation of a political party. In this way it divided what was initially a continuum between military and political activists. The result was a weak political party in the North and a, perhaps necessarily, unrestrained military campaign. But a political party with a military wing under control, and an Irish Government input into policy, would have led to a very different course of action, and would probably have brought about substantial internal reform in the North quicker and without all-out war. What the radical rejection of Captain Kelly’s advice by Taoiseach Lynch led to was the emergence of a powerful army which neither state could control and which pursued its own cause effectively

over thirty years.

In 1969-70 the situation was very fluid and could have gone in any direction. And Captain Kelly’s Reports have to be read in that context. And an effort has to be made to set aside the perspective created by the Provos’ Long War.

It is not possible to feature all the arguments and subtleties of this and other Intelligence Reports submitted by Captain Kelly to the Government in the space of an article, but the extracts given indicate the depth of the analysis—which is absolutely in keeping with the Government’s own strategy, as expressed by Taoiseach Lynch’s speech of August 13th, a speech in which there is an implied threat of intervention. And the speech was not mere idle talk: the Irish Army was deployed to the Border, and the Reserves were called out of civilian life. And this situation continued for months: the Army sitting on the Border, with an implied threat of intervention.

In his industriously well-researched book, Professor Thomas Hennessy averts his eyes from the fact that the Taoiseach set out Government policy on August 13th, before Captain Kelly wrote any reports (as far as we know). Instead he prefers to blame the instrument:

“The entire Government was convinced that there had been an orchestrated attack by the Protestant state on the Northern minority. This mistaken view was compounded by the poor intelligence reports that were delivered to Dublin confirming this. The choice of personnel for this task was, to say the least, unfortunate—in particular Captain Kelly” (Ibid, p391).

The fact is that the Irish Cabinet shared the Captain’s view of the situation. Military preparations were made to intervene in the North. Irish Government archives indicate that the Cabinet did think deeply and seriously about the North in the months that followed. And it kept its options open while it considered what might be done.

\*

Mrs. Sheila Kelly made Captain Kelly’s Reports available to Justin O’Brien, when he was researching a doctoral thesis on the Arms Trial. This was later to appear as a book. However, O’Brien did not make any straight-forward use of them, but fitted the Captain’s activity and recommendations into a narrative which effectively accused him of setting out to split Sinn Féin and form the Provos. Government policy disappeared from the picture. O’Brien accused “*Military Intelligence*” of “*fomenting the split in the republican movement*”, to enable factions in Fianna Fáil to “*further their political ambitions*” (*The Arms Trial*, p.xv).

In fact, splitting the IRA had already been considered in Government before Captain Kelly was ever given a role in the North. The military wing had been taking direct action against German farmers and foreign multi-national companies, causing the autocratic Peter Berry, Permanent Secretary at the Department of Justice, to propose in July 1969 that there should be moves to split the republican movement, as had happened in the 1930s. (This is pointed out by John Mulqueen in his 2011 Thesis, *Irish Republicanism And The Cold War*.)

It appears that Mr. O'Brien wrote his account under the tutelage of academics, some of whom had themselves been in the Official Republican Movement. Professors Paul Bew and Henry Patterson are among those acknowledged in the book. Professor Bew had been associated with the People's Democracy in his youth and both he and Patterson were to join the Official Republican movement in Northern Ireland. Indeed, Lord Bew has not denied having been a member of Sinn Fein and the IRA Army Council after the allegation was made in the *London Review Of Books*.

And the 'Officials' have had a particular grievance against the Irish Government of 1969-70, and against the Provisional IRA movement which started its gestation as a result of the August events. In August 1969 the Dublin-led IRA was in pole position to be the Irish Government's ally in pursuing the unity ideal. In fact, it was given sizeable sums of money by the Government so that it could arm for Northern defence. The alliance would have required the movement to put its social agitation into abeyance, and to focus single-mindedly on Catholic defence and achieving unity.

For whatever reason that policy did not work out. However, the Official IRA-to-be did start its own war against the British, in competition with that of the Provos. That war lasted for a couple of years and featured some unfortunate military adventures, such as the Aldershot Bombing—a bungle that was to be defended for years by Mrs. Anne Harris (the former Editor of *the Sunday Independent* and ex-wife of Eoghan).

Professor the Lord Bew (to give him his correct title) in his various 'histories' does not see fit to refer to any of these matters, but prefers to throw out snide remarks about an Intelligence Officer who acted in keeping with Government policy throughout.

Captain Kelly continued to act for the

Government until towards the end of April 1970, when there was a sudden change in Government policy. The Captain and others were put on trial for Criminal Conspiracy and, though comprehensively exonerated, were then effectively criminalised by an Oireachtas Public Accounts Committee investigation into the affair. After producing the Arms Crisis series, I unfortunately ran out of steam and did not produce what should have been the next publication in the series: an analysis of the PAC Investigation. By means of this, the Lynchite Fianna Failers, Fine Gael and Labour collaborated to cover up the actual Government role in the North and to produce a false narrative, blackening the names of those who had been comprehensively vindicated by a jury a short time earlier. But the jury verdict had not been perverse: the Head of Irish Military Intelligence, a man of sincere religious beliefs, found he could not perjure himself when it came to the trial. From being the premier Prosecution witness, he became a Court witness.

Outside the mainstream, Official Sinn Fein-IRA/the Stickies—that is to say the Republican movement which remained after what became Provisional Republicanism split away in January 1970—was to the fore in promoting the lying version of what had happened. That body had its own axe to grind, and grind it it did through its many tentacles in Irish public life, including the print and broadcast media, and in Irish and British academia. All that should have been dealt with in the context of the Dail Public Accounts Committee hearings and report.

Communist States have been accused of thought control, falsifying historical records and black propaganda, but their simple-minded efforts pale into insignificance beside the very successful and sustained propaganda effort by official Ireland to capture the public imagination, propagate a false received wisdom and re-write history—a project in which journalists, politicians, and above all British and Irish academics all played their part. It was all part of the ideological project to reverse the gains of independence and bring Ireland back under the British wing.

Justin O'Brien's *The Arms Crisis* welcomed this ideological project as "*the birth of a new conception of the nation, in which irredentist nationalist rhetoric could no longer be used as the primary legitimising ideology of the Southern state*" (*The Arms Trial*, Gill and Macmillan, 2000, Preface). That sums up the prevalent attitude in the official world.

I have said that Hennessy's book is well researched. It is better researched than any comparable book. But it is flawed. His *forte* is deep research into Irish and British archives, but somehow he seems to have overlooked the released Irish Department of Defence documents which set out some of the military operations and preparations which were made as a result of the new Cabinet strategy of August 1969 and the months which followed. (And I might ask here, having moved to destroy Captain Kelly's Intelligence Reports, what else did the Lynch Government destroy!)

Not only that, but Hennessy—who happily quotes newspaper accounts of various Troubles incidents—fails to mention the newspaper accounts of the Arms Conspiracy Trials. Above all, he ignores the testimony on Oath of the Director of Military Intelligence, Colonel Hefferon, which made it abundantly clear that the Captain was acting on Government instructions in the Arms Importation project.

Hennessy should also have seen the political context of the Troubles. British government in the Six County region of the British state was sub-let government, conducted on communal grounds under very peculiar political conditions. That is not the sort of fact to be found in the archives. But it was a striking reality of the situation, creating the political dynamic that brought about war in a region of a liberal-democratic state—his state.

It was not Captain Kelly's business to deal with that aspect of the situation. He was the servant of a State which asserted *de jure* sovereignty over the Six Counties in its Constitution, and which held British government in the Six Counties to be illegitimate, and by implication unstable, on grounds which had nothing to do with its internal governing arrangements. He was bound by the sovereignty claim of the Constitution, as the Government was.

His Reports were entirely within the parameters of Government policy during the period in question. The Government did not enact a change of policy before prosecuting him. And, when the next Government tried to step away from the obligations of the Constitution, it was held to them in the Courts.

Captain Kelly's Reports were well-informed and his proposals were well-judged. When the Government eventually rejected them (as they did by prosecuting him—we have no evidence of anything else) and broke off relations with Catholic defence in the North, the result was not peace but a war that was entirely beyond control by the Dublin Government.



Captain Kelly's Intelligence Reports provide valuable insights into the events of August 1969 and after. They deserve to be published, along with other material providing the context of what is in many ways 'a foreign country': the Ireland of 1969.

Angela Clifford

Part Two

## Trump's Vision For Palestine

If the US is OK with Israeli annexing the West Bank, why is it sanctioning Russia for annexing Crimea?

At a ceremony in the East Room in the White House on 28th January 2020, President Trump [unveiled](#) his 181-page ["vision" for Israel/Palestine](#) to an audience of enthusiastic cheerleaders, many flown in from Israel for the occasion. While he spoke, the Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu stood by his side and afterwards he welcomed the President's "vision" ecstatically.

And well he might. The "vision" was written for him, if not by him. According to US Ambassador to Israel [David Friedman](#), it is the "product of more than three years of close consultations" between Trump, Netanyahu and their senior staff. Understandably, therefore, it gives Netanyahu almost everything he has ever wished for politically. In essence, the document contains proposals for the future of Israel/Palestine agreed between the US and Israel.

### TRUMP'S FAVOURS TO NETANYAHU

Of course, this is not the first incidence of Prime Minister Netanyahu, and Israel, receiving political favours from President Trump. Already, under the Trump administration,

in December 2017, the US recognised Jerusalem as Israel's capital and, in May 2018, moved the US embassy to Jerusalem from Tel Aviv

in August 2018, the US ended financial support for the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA).

in September 2018, the US cut \$25 million of financial support for 6 hospitals for the care of Palestinians in East Jerusalem

in September 2018, the US closed the PLO office in Washington

in February 2019, the US ended financial support to the Palestinian Authority

in March 2019, the US recognised as

## Eoin MacNeill, the 1916 Rising and the War of Independence

Felix M Larkin is quite correct in disputing a description of Eoin MacNeill as "the 1916 leader" (February 24), and in quoting his February 1916 view that to consent to a Rising at that juncture would "make me false to my country besides involving me in the guilt of murder".

As one of the Sinn Féin TDs elected in its 1918 General Election victory, MacNeill did, of course, go on to endorse the post hoc ratification, by the inaugural meeting of Dáil Éireann, of the Republic that had been proclaimed by the 1916 Rising. And as the Dáil's Minister for Education, MacNeill not only championed the War of Independence but, as the RIC strove to suppress Irish democracy, he forcefully denounced attempts to describe the shooting of such policemen as "murder".

In a letter to the Archbishop of Tuam on 22 July 1920, MacNeill argued that "we Irishmen are morally entitled to carry arms" in defiance of "the so-called 'police', who are no police but a mere branch of the British military forces", and to resist 'police' who "endanger our lives in the exercise of that right". He added that "undoubtedly the bearing of arms, being the occasion of shooting on sight by those in command of the so-called police, will also be the occasion of the so-called police being shot at sight."

Mac Neill concluded by asserting his own moral right to shoot such RIC policemen: "For my part I have not the slightest doubt that I am entitled to bear arms in defence of Ireland against the British forces, and that I am also entitled to resist being disarmed to the same degree as I may resist an attempt to destroy my house or my life or the lives of my family. I am not bound to put up my hands when ordered to do so by any subordinate of the British Government. I have the clearest evidence therefore that my life and the rights I am entitled to defend unto death are always threatened by the so-called 'police'." The emphasis here was Mac Neill's own.

Manus O'Riordan  
*Irish Times* (26.2.20)

Israeli sovereign territory the Israeli-occupied Golan Heights (which Israel took over by force in 1967 and has subjected to military occupation ever since)

in November 2019, the US declared that the 130+ Jewish-only settlements in the Israeli-occupied West Bank and Golan Heights are "not per se inconsistent with international law" (in the [words](#) of US Secretary of State Mike Pompeo)

Perhaps, the US flagrantly breaching the nuclear deal it signed with Iran (and other states) should be added to this list. When he unveiled his "vision" on 28 January 2020, President Trump boasted:

"As everyone knows, I have done a lot for Israel: moving the United States Embassy to Jerusalem; recognizing — (applause) — recognizing the Golan Heights — (applause) — and, frankly, perhaps most importantly, getting out of the terrible Iran nuclear deal. (applause)"

### A MUCH BIGGER FAVOUR TO NETANYAHU

Now, the President has done Netanyahu (and Israel) a much bigger favour - he has undertaken that the US will henceforth recognise a lot more Israeli-occupied

territory as sovereign Israeli territory, this time territory East of the Green Line, that is, in the West Bank (including East Jerusalem).

In recent months, Netanyahu has said that he would annex to Israel (a) the Jordan Valley and (b) areas surrounding the Jewish-only settlements in the West Bank. It is probably not a coincidence that annexations along these lines are at the heart of the President's "vision" for Israel/Palestine.

After the President unveiled his "vision", Netanyahu responded ecstatically:

"This is a historic day. And it recalls another historic day. We remember May 14th, 1948, because on that day, President Truman became the first world leader to recognize the State of Israel after our first Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion, declared our independence. That day charted a brilliant future.

"Mr. President, I believe that down the decades — and perhaps down the centuries — we will also remember January 28th, 2020, because on this day, you became the first world leader to recognize

To page 34

Does  
It  
Up

Stack  
?

## COVID—19

Something does not stack up about the coronavirus called COVID—19. Indeed many things do not stack up. The simplest of these many be the name COVID -19. Where did that come from and what are COVIDs 1-18? Where are they gone to? These names are usually given in a laboratory which is developing various versions of a product. For example, that great invention WD 40 is named WD 40 because it is the fortieth formula of a Water Dispersant product which was found to be the most effective.

So, is there a laboratory somewhere which is developing these viruses, and did COVID -19 escape accidentally or was it released intentionally? Is it biological warfare? The COVID-19 is apparently remarkably similar to the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) which first appeared, we are told, in China in 2002. Both COVID -19 and SARS are pneumonia-type diseases. Why no outbreaks between 2002 and 2019? Or were these outbreaks somewhere, of which we were not told?

For example, I recently came across a reference to the medieval virus 'The Black Death', and apparently there are up to ten deaths a year from it in modern San Francisco: and the policy is to cover it up in case people panic.

Another mysterious thing is that months after the COVID-19 virus came into public notice we still are not told about its life cycle. This is vital information of the most basic nature. How long does the virus survive outside its host, for example,—if we knew this we could make simple avoidance decisions like, is it safer to go out early in the morning or does it not matter? Or like, when is it safe to handle cash or credit cards which have been in contact with an infected source of the virus.

This is simple information that sensible people want. If researchers do not know the basic life cycle of the virus at this stage—that is truly frightening. They most likely do know and so we ask who

is keeping this vital information from us? Who is filtering it out? And what else is being filtered out from us?

The attitude of the English under their leader Boris Johnson is compatible with their Darwinianism—the survival of the fittest. Not the survival from COVID -19 but the survival from the National Health Service (NHS). Scarce resources in the NHS are to be given to the young and active and not to the “*over-seventies*” who are deemed to be weaker and not worth saving. A very capable surgeon working for the NHS has contacted COVID—19 and has been denied treatment because he “*is over seventy*”.

A woman on TV when discussing this was quite clearly in favour of not treating the “*over-70's*” but started waffling around when clearly asked by the TV host Philip Scofield and she then to his astonishment commented that euthanasia might be OK in these circumstances. But she thought that it was unnecessary to put it in such blunt terms. Needless to say she was not “*over70s*” herself.

That is and has always been the English way. Weaker races deserve to die and the superior race—always the English elite—will survive.

Ireland's problem is to avoid infection from England's recklessness. In the North East, all the nationalist schools have closed and the loyalist/British schools stay open as a matter of principle. It may prove to be an interesting exercise to study disease control if it goes on like this.

### CRISIS!—WHY WASTE IT?

Somebody said of 9/11 at the time, *why waste a good crisis?*, and we can be fairly sure that there are opportunists out there who will be thinking that at this time.

For example, teaching may never be the same again, with the schools closed, now will be the time to promote e-learning. There must be many other examples. There is the example of *'The Irish Examiner'* newspaper, which had announced in its recent editorial that it would like to go digital but with the *caveat* that it hoped it would be subsidised by our State—given that it would be providing a vital service for democracy.

However, it is people who make things happen and not computers. And so we will need people for some time yet. People need to be fed and nourished and so the

security and dependability of the food supply chain is important.

Perhaps, now is a good time to investigate the soil mechanics of Irish bog-land. Why all the bog-land? The Netherlands has a large acreage of productive land under sea-level producing a good portion of the vegetables hitherto consumed in Ireland. The fens in Cambridgeshire UK are famously fertile for tillage crops. So why can't we grow our own vegetables on Irish bogs? Maybe the bogs can be altered by the addition of fluvial mud, of which we have too much. Fluvial mud is a good part of the reason for flooding on the lower River Shannon and also on the River Lee. Is it not time for some lateral thinking and put all this self-isolation to some good use by coming up with schemes that will help our lives in the coming times.

Let us get creative about our food security because—if the borders remain sealed in European countries—our free frictionless trade had gone out the window. It was sobering to watch the *News Tonight* on RTE and see all the backlog of Lorries in Europe with refrigerated foods, gridlocking back some 30 kilometres! The EU Commissioner Ursula von der Leyen basically begged the European 27 to get some sense and start progressing the Lorries on their route to various countries—including our own. I looked at the vegetables on our dinner table tonight: our broccoli was from—get this—Guatemala and our spuds were from only God knows where.

President Macron and Chancellor Merkel *et al* would want to heed the warnings of their newly installed Commissioner.

Michael Stack ©

### CORRECTIONS

Below are two corrections to Brendan Clifford's *Some Forgotten History in the March Irish Political Review*:

page 2, column 3, paragraph 7,  
line 4: the first word should read:  
'state'

page 29, column 1, line 5: *Herons*  
should read *Horans*

## DEV concluded

policy. When those of our representatives who are members of the DAIL wish to communicate with the DAIL they must do so in an independent and separate communication, either through me or the Secretary of the DAIL—not through the Foreign Affairs Department. I will see that it is duly brought forward and considered at our Sessions. This alone will prevent misunderstanding and very probable friction. Of course were our circumstances not what they are, there would be no thought of having a member of the DAIL appointed as an Ambassador abroad.

Your letter also demonstrates what a danger we run when our representatives are too long from home, particularly when through infrequency of communication they derive their information either from

the general outpourings of the press, or from communications from centres other than headquarters. This leads to a further danger which is developing, that of communicating by letter to private and unofficial persons matters which will not be treated as confidential, and which in any case should not be discussed except in official communications with the heads of the State Department, or other authorised persons. The abuses in that direction would not be tolerated for an instant by any of the universally recognised governments. It must be put a stop to in our case else we shall one of these days have a sharp reminder that it is not without purpose the older Governments take care to rigidly enforce this rule.

Our communications are unfortunately still most unsatisfactory, and our Under-Secretary just when we were re-organising the Department had had to go on sick leave.

You are I expect being supplied regularly with *The Bulletin*. When the Under-Secretary comes back I feel certain that you will be supplied in addition from month to month with a confidential journal which will enable you to keep more definitely in touch with the general situation here.

The Ministry has recently been taking stock of our finances, and the absence of a detailed statement of the expenditures of your establishment has caused considerable inconvenience. You will please not neglect furnishing such statements monthly in future as required by the Minister of Finance.

Very sincerely yours,  
Eamon de Valera

P.S. In a raid on the London Office despatches from you were captured unopened. I asked our Foreign Affairs Department to make inquiries from you as to their contents. I am anxiously waiting for this information.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Trump's Vision

from page 32

Israel's sovereignty over areas in Judea and Samaria that are vital to our security and central to our heritage. (Applause) ...

"For too long — far too long — the very heart of the Land of Israel where our patriarchs prayed, our prophets preached, and our kings ruled, has been outrageously branded as illegally occupied territory. Well, today, Mr. President, you are puncturing this big lie. (Applause)

"You are recognizing Israel's sovereignty over all the Jewish communities in Judea and Samaria, large and small alike. (Applause)"

Israel seized the West Bank (including East Jerusalem) by military force in June 1967 and has colonised it relentlessly in the ensuing years transferring over 620,000 of its citizens across the Green Line into Jewish-only settlements.

If some or all of the West Bank (including East Jerusalem) becomes sovereign Israeli territory on a permanent basis, then with the blessing of the US Israel will have acquired territory by military force in flagrant violation of the first principle of international law. The US can no longer complain about Russia annexing Crimea, not least because that was done with the consent of the people living there.

### A FALSE NOTION: ISRAEL AN OCCUPIER

This US recognition of Israeli sovereignty over first the Golan Heights and now parts of the West Bank was foreshadowed during the Trump presidential campaign by his advisory team on Israel. This consisted of Jason Greenblatt, who was until recently his chief

negotiator on Israel/Palestine (along with his son-in-law, Jared Kushner), and David Friedman, who is now US Ambassador to Israel.

A [joint statement](#) by Greenblatt and Friedman on 2 November 2016 contained the following short but very significant sentence:

"The false notion that Israel is an occupier should be rejected."

That principle has been implemented in respect of the Golan Heights and now in respect of part of the West Bank. In addition, it is reflected in US State Department documents, which no longer refer to the West Bank (including East Jerusalem), Gaza and the Golan Heights as "the occupied territories".

### THE INTERNATIONALLY AGREED POSITION

The Security Council has always regarded the West Bank (including East Jerusalem) as Israeli occupied territory and never as territory belonging to the State of Israel. Thus, Security Council Resolution 2334 passed on 23 December 2016 specifically called upon UN member states to "distinguish, in their relevant dealings, between the territory of the State of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967".

The same is true of the International Court of Justice ("the principal judicial organ of the United Nations" in the words of the UN Charter). In its July 2004 Advisory Opinion [Legal consequences of the construction of a wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory](#) it left no doubt that Israel was the occupying power in the West Bank under international law:

"The territories situated between the Green Line ... and the former eastern boundary

of Palestine under the Mandate were occupied by Israel in 1967 during the armed conflict between Israel and Jordan. ... All these territories (including East Jerusalem) remain occupied territories and Israel has continued to have the status of occupying Power." (Paragraph 78)

All, or nearly all, states in the world (apart from Israel and the US) accept this UN position that the West Bank (including East Jerusalem) is Israeli occupied territory.

Most states also accept the UN position that, along with Gaza, the West Bank (including East Jerusalem) should form the territory of a Palestinian state, with its capital in East Jerusalem, existing alongside Israel in its pre-1967 borders – and that any adjustments to the pre-1967 borders by way of land swaps must be agreed between Israel and Palestine. The EU has always been very firm on the latter point, saying:

"The EU will recognize changes to the pre-1967 borders, including with regard to Jerusalem, only when agreed by the parties."

Of course, a "two-state solution" along these lines is not going to happen. It's not going to happen because Israel has no intention of reversing its aggression of June 1967 and withdrawing from the West Bank (including East Jerusalem) so that a Palestinian state can be established. And there is no chance of sufficient external pressure being brought to bear on Israel to force it to withdraw – which is what should have been done in the wake of Israel's aggression in June 1967.

David Morrison

To be continued



## DEV continued

as the Irish Republican Brotherhood had controlled the Irish Volunteers before the Easter Rising.

Devoy broke with President De Valera and the IRB in 1920. He supported the Anglo-Irish 'Treaty' in 1921. Cohalan also formed a friendship with leading political figures in the Irish Free State, such as Executive President William T. Cosgrave who in turn valued Cohalan's corporate and political connections.

As for Dev —

"His American mission had been a qualified success. He had not achieved his primary aim of securing diplomatic recognition, nor had he helped to end the developing split among Irish-Americans, but he did leave behind a viable organisation that was primarily dedicated towards serving the Irish cause, rather than using the Irish situation to serve American ends. In addition, he collected over five million dollars and secured invaluable publicity for the independence movement at home. By his clever exploitation of the opportunities afforded for propaganda, he managed to exert enormous pressure on the British to negotiate an Irish settlement, if only to avoid Anglo-American difficulties" (*De Valera's Darkest Hour 1919-1932*, T. Ryle Dwyer, Mercier Press, 1982, p.52).

This from an author, Ryle Dwyer, who has little regard for De Valera and concludes his chapter on Dev's time in the United States with the final paragraph above—some "Dark Hour".

### COLLINS: THE SCAPEGOAT MYTH

"It is said that De Valera insisted on sending Collins to London to get him out of the way, and then made him a scapegoat for the inevitable compromise.

"A more plausible view is that, as Collins was the 'extremist', it was necessary that he should be implicated in the inevitable compromise. He had condemned De Valera's suggestion that Britain might be accorded some military rights in Ireland for its own defensive purposes internationally, on the lines of the US/Cuba arrangement. And he had said that the effort necessary to gain Dominion status could gain independence.

"In London he would either have to carry these positions in negotiations with the enemy, or agree to compromise. What was not expected was that he would go against the instruction from his own Government without consulting it, unilaterally agree to a compromise, put pressure on the whole delegation to sign it, and then have the Treaty broadcast around the world as an accomplished fact, leaving it to come

to the Irish Government as a news item in foreign newspapers.

"This was done on the authority of the IRB. But it was found that the IRB writ did not run with the bulk of the IRA" (*Irish Political Review*, March, 2020, p.28).

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

"Before leaving America he [President de Valera] entered into negotiations with the government of Soviet Russia for recognition of the Irish Republic; draft terms included plans for training the IRA in Russia and for the interests of the Catholic Church in Russia to be entrusted to representatives of the Irish Republic. On behalf of the Republic De Valera made a loan of \$25,000 to the Soviet Government..." (*A Dictionary of Irish History from 1800*, Hickey & Doherty, Gill & Macmillan, 2003).

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

### DOCUMENTS ON IRISH FOREIGN POLICY (Internet)

*Extract from letter from Eamon de Valera to Sean T O'Ceallaigh (No. 5) (Copy) Dublin, 28 April 1921*

No. 79 NAI DFA Box 14 File 96; DFA (Dept. of Foreign Affairs)

A Chara, Yours No. 3 received. Our unnumbered letter should have been No. 3 — the letter dated March 15th should have been No. 4. It should have been numbered in the Foreign Affairs Office.

Your reference to the so-called Cuban proposal proves to me that so far from understanding the 'full meaning' of it you do not understand it at all. Everything you have said about it in your letter and most of the documents containing your own proposals would be unintelligible if you did.

If you have looked up the Cuban Treaty, will you please remember that my statement had reference to Article 1 only, and that the 'Westminster Gazette' interview was but a cabled fragment of a much larger article in which there was no doubt that I referred to one part of the Treaty only.

You had better not attempt to draw up this proposed parallel. Your apparent prepossessions clearly show that you would not handle it in the way in which it should be handled if it were not to do much more harm than good. The suggestion of preparing the parallel was not mine in the first

instance, I considered it of but really small moment, and paid only casual attention to it when it was mentioned.

I might have known that cut off from home as you are, and with only misrepresentations of its meaning, on the one hand by the British and on the other by certain Americans—each for its own peculiar purpose, you could not be supposed to understand this question as it should be understood before it could be appreciated or dealt with.

I have myself never considered it worth while directly to elaborate it, simply because the time for doing so had not arrived. It was given by me originally in a speech as a studied argument against England, and was not propounded as a policy, tho' I should be quite prepared to move in that direction and to stand or fall by it as such if ever I thought the time for doing so had arrived.

Again, I emphasize the matter has reference solely to the first article of the Platt Amendment, and not to any others, which apparently appear far more humiliating to me than they do to you else you would not have forwarded your suggestions which are but elaborations of certain of them.

If ever the time comes for arguing the position, I shall do it in public. No good purpose can be served by arguing it either in public or in private for the present, and we are likely to have much more immediate and dangerous controversies to deal with in the near future if I can read the signs of the times.

Your letter suggests the necessity for having a clear understanding on other matters.

Our representatives abroad, whether they be members of the DAIL or not, must regard themselves unequivocally the direct agents of the Department of Foreign Affairs, and must carry out the instructions of that Department whether they personally agree with the Policy or not. Objections or considerations having special reference to conditions in the country in which they are stationed are of course legitimate and may be urged in the correspondence with the Department, but where the Department insists it is only by resignation that the Representative can find a way out.

The Ministry is responsible to the DAIL, and therefore its policy is ultimately DAIL  
continued on page 34



**LABOUR**

# Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 38 No. 4 **Does it Stack**

**CORK**

ISSN 0790-1712

## Irish Independence: *The Cuban Parallel*

Statement of **Eamon de Valera**

(*New York Globe*, February 6, 1920)

EAMON de VALERA, President of the Republic of Ireland, in an interview with the New York correspondent of the Westminster *Gazette*, divulged today, for the first time since his arrival in the United States, the concessions that the Sinn Fein or Republican Party is willing to make to Great Britain toward reaching an amicable settlement of the Irish problem.

The two most salient features of the settlement proposed by Mr. de Valera are:

First—The grant of complete independence to Ireland on the same basis as the independence granted to Cuba by the United States following the Spanish-American War of Liberation. Under the Platt amendment Cuba enjoys an autonomous government under the virtual protection of the United States.

Second—The granting of complete independence under the operation of a policy based on the American Monroe Doctrine.

President de Valera said:

“A favourite argument of those who seek to justify England in holding its grip on Ireland, despite the obvious right of the people of Ireland as a distinct and separate nation to choose their own way in life and obedience, is that Britain’s security demands it.

“Now if it were really her independence and her simple right to life as a national State that Britain wanted to safeguard, she could easily make provision for that without in any way infringing upon the equally sacred right of the neighbouring nation to its independence and to its life.

“The United States, by the Monroe Doctrine, made provision for its security without depriving the Latin Republics of the south of their independence and their life.

“The United States safeguarded itself from the possible use of the Island of Cuba as a base for an attack by a foreign power by stipulating:

‘That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any Treaty or other compact with any foreign Power or Powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorise or permit any foreign Power or Powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise lodgement in or control over any portion of said island.’

“Why doesn’t Britain do with Ireland as the United States did with Cuba? Why doesn’t Britain declare a Monroe Doctrine for the two neighbouring islands? The people of Ireland, so far from object-

ing, would co-operate with their whole soul...” (*Irish Political Documents 1916-1949*, Mitchell & O Snodaigh, Dublin 1985).

**PRESIDENT DE VALERA**

The fundamental issue in this controversy over President de Valera’s Cuba statement was the authority of the President himself, little over twelve months previously, the people gave Sinn Fein an overall parliamentary majority in an election conducted under the rules of the Occupation power. A new phase in the struggle for national independence had begun following the December, 1918 election.

The two most vigorous opponents of the President’s Cuban statement were the Clann-na-Gael leaders John Devoy and Judge Daniel Cohalan of the New York Supreme Court: both treated the President as if he was a mere emissary for a conspiratorial organisation without an electoral mandate.

“We from Ireland simply ask this: that we should be accepted as the interpreters of what the Irish people want—we are responsible to them, they can repudiate us if we represent them incorrectly—De Valera” (*Gaelic American*, 25.9.1920).

In De Valera’s opinion: Irish interests were only a secondary consideration to Cohalan, while De Valera wanted Irish considerations to be paramount.

There were already two contending factions within Clan-na-Gael, which controlled Friends of Irish Freedom (275,000 members) in much the same way

continued on page 35

*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>**