

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

and Northern Star incorporating Workers' Weekly Vol.35 No.7 ISSN 0790-7672

July 2020

Vol.34 No.7 ISSN 954-5891

Fianna Gael etc !

The Anti-Sinn Fein Fianna Gael Government is being set up after much difficulty. The Green Party had some difficulty about ceasing to be a widespread movement and narrowing itself down to be a party instrument for use against Sinn Fein, particularly since much of its electoral support came from the Sinn Fein surplus.

But, if all that Fianna Gael has said about Sinn Fein over the past sixty years was in earnest, it is vital that it should be kept out of Office. Professor Dermot Keogh of Cork University—who has had the ideological formation of so many politicians—declared at the time of the British Embassy burning in 1972 that it was a Fascist organisation intent on establishing a Fascist state, and we do not recall that anybody in the Establishment ridiculed him for saying it.

For Keogh—and for Micheál Martin—the present situation must appear to be a reproduction of the German situation of 1933. If the Green Party does not sacrifice itself to the anti-Sinn Fein cause, what is to be done? The obvious answer—call another Election—is the wrong answer. Hitler was consolidated in power by elections.

This Fascist scenario is a fantasy scenario, sincerely constructed by hysterics as a mode of evading the question of what Northern Ireland was, and how on earth a 28-year War against the British State could be sustained by two-fifths of the NI population and fought to a viable reform.

Meanwhile Mary Lou has been trying to charm the Ulster Unionists. She has expressed appreciation of their resistance to Rome Rule and said they had a case. She said that,

"while aware of Northern Ireland being what she called 'a cold house for Catholics', she added: 'There was merit when our Unionist friends feared and said that 'Home Rule was Rome Rule'. We have to say that out loud, because that did nobody any favours, and

continued on page 2

continued on page 6

Human Rights Court Allows Israel Boycott !

"Criminal conviction of activists involved in the BDS campaign boycotting products imported from Israel had no relevant and sufficient grounds and violated their freedom of expression"

That is the heading on the 11 June 2020 judgment of the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), in which it overturned the conviction by a French court of eleven individuals for engaging in BDS activity.

The Court ruled that their conviction violated Article 10 of the *European Convention of Human Rights*—the right to freedom of expression—which states:

"Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers."

The Economic Recovery

In recent years the idea that economic problems can be solved by monetary policy has gained in popularity. Printing money or quantitative easing seemed to provide a solution to the last economic crisis so why not apply the same policy for the current one?

The most fervent advocates of such a policy support the principles of Modern Monetary Theory (MMT).

The first thing to be said about printing money is that it is not particularly new. The State has been creating money since both (the State and money) were invented. Kings have debased currencies in order to increase their purchasing power for various reasons such as fighting wars or self-aggrandisement.

With the advent of *fiat money*—or

money not backed by an asset with value—any constraint has in theory been eliminated. For countries that control their own currency there is no limit to the amount of money that can be created.

MMT supporters say there is a case for printing money to rectify defects in the market. Examples of such defects are:

i) The market does not always lead to full employment. Keynes pointed out that companies only employ an extra employee

continued on page 13

C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Fianna Gael etc. Editorial	1
Human Rights Court Allows Israel Boycott. David Morrison	1
The Economic Recovery. John Martin	1
Readers' Letters: Forestation And Revisionism. Dave Alvey	3
LEST WE FORGET (25). Extracts from <i>Irish Bulletin</i> . This issue lists British Acts Of Aggression, 31st May - 5th June 1920 (ed. Jack Lane)	7
The O'Connor Column (The So-Called Euro Crisis; Why Trump Is On The Way Out	9
Es Ahora Julianne Herlihy. Elizabeth Bowen. A Review of Patricia Laurence's biography. (Part 5)	11
British Labour: The Zionist Purge Begins. Editorial	15
The Guardian Censors Churchill! Avi Shlaim	15
The Occupied Territories Bill. Brian Ó Éigearaigh	15
Edwina Stewart: Life-Long Belfast Communist Wilson John Haire (Obituary)	16
Taking The Bloomin' BeJoyces Out Of Zurich. Manus O'Riordan	17
The Arms Crisis Dissected. Angela Clifford (Review of Michael Heney book)	18
Greaves And A Rabid Trotskyist. Brendan Clifford (Reprint of a 1980 article from <i>The Irish Communist</i>)	21
British Labour Governments! Donal Kennedy	25
VE Day Trinity Students Likened To Nazi Students In Prague. Manus O'Riordan	26
Biteback: Leopold II And Roger Casement. Unpublished Letter, <i>'Irish Times'</i> , Jack Lane	26
Stephen Collins On Frank Ryan. Unpublished Letter to <i>'Irish Times'</i> , Manus O'Riordan	27
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Brexit; The Government; Covid 19)	28

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

Civil War Politics Alive And Well?

(back page)

Down Memory Lane—well almost!

(page 30)

New Party Divide?

*(Irish Examiner, Letter, Pat Maloney, Editor *Labour Comment*)*

A Perplexed Fianna Failor

(page 29)

I say that as a Catholic, and I know lots of people who are Catholics do recognise that that was wrong—and actually damaged everyone, and I think it damaged the Church too'..." (Belfast Telegraph, June 22).

Religion was to some extent an element in the differences between the two peoples in Ireland, but the rejection of Roman Catholicism by Ulster Unionists was different in kind from tis rejection by elements in Sinn Fein in recent times. Ulster Unionism was what it called Christian. Christianity was deeply ingrained in it. And, when Sinn Fein campaigned for homosexual marriage and free abortion, it met with no friendly response from the anti-Romanist Unionist. Sinn Fein had to look to the British State to impose its liberal programme on Ulster Christianity. It could not carry it within the devolved system.

Sinn Fein anti-Roman Catholicism does not establish ground of agreement with Ulster Unionists, but reinforces the ground of difference.

And the Roman Catholicism of the South had no independent institutional base from which it was imposed on the populace. It rested only on public opinion. The priest never had any resource against the people. And the elaborate structure of the Church that accompanied the post-Famine national development was something new which was adopted as an effective means of eroding British hegemony. The Irish Republican Brotherhood aspired to establish some kind of anti-Catholic nationality but it was completely ineffective. Britain dominated and oppressed the Irish as Catholics and it was as Catholics that they freed themselves.

*

A hundred years ago Britain gave Ireland a Catholic Viceroy to govern it as the 4th Home Rule Bill was enacted—the one which the Irish refused to implement. This was intended to be an epoch-making event—the abolition of one of the remaining Penal Laws which would enable Ireland to surrender to the embrace of Empire under a Catholic representative of the Protestant

monarchy.

If the Irish did not submit to the embrace, they were to be governed outside the British representative system as a Crown Colony. In the event, something altogether different happened, and the institution of a Catholic Viceroyalty was forgotten.

The classic Crown Colony was Hong Kong—a piece of China which the British hung onto when it was obliged to abandon the major project launched by the Opium War, a war waged by a Liberal Government from 1839, to compel China to make itself a market for opium produced in British India. It held Hong Kong under the fig-leaf of an imposed Treaty.

When the time on the Treaty ran out, Hong Kong had ceased to be Chinese in anything but a racial sense. Britain might have held it on much better grounds than the grounds on which it had conquered it, but it decided to return it to China. Its position in Asia had been comprehensively undermined by its 2nd World War, in which it chose to antagonise Japan in order to get American support for its war in Europe, which it was unable to prosecute with its own resources. So it dressed up its weakness in moralistic finery and demonstrated how meticulous it was in observing Treaties by handing it back.

The ill-gotten goods were returned with great ceremonial display by the last Viceroy, Chris Patten, who was a Catholic. A transition period was arranged so that Hong Kong could be re-assimilated gradually into the life of the Chinese state. But Lord Patten decided to make Hong Kong a democracy in the course of handing it back.

Democracy is a form of government. Hong Kong as a Crown Colony had no responsibility for its own government. Government was strictly the business of the Crown. The freedom of Hong Kong was the freedom of capitalist enterprise under State structures maintained by an external Power.

The artificiality of Hong Kong life was maintained by Peking for a while but, when the process of incorporating it into the Chinese state began, it was met with capitalist Utopian demonstrations of resistance, encouraged with worldwide publicity by the British media. And, when Peking availed of the opportunity of the Corona Virus to impose political lockdown on the demonstrators, Lord Patten declared that an International Treaty was being broken and that something must be done about it. The implication of what he says is that Britain has not relinquished sovereignty over its Crown Colony but

has placed it under a kind of joint sovereignty with Peking, and that Britain as joint sovereign has responsibility to police the implementation of the agreement it made with Peking. Peking dismisses this as nonsense.

Britain might have held Hong Kong without war a generation ago, but it had the bright idea of returning it to China as an element of anarchic capitalist democracy that would subvert the Chinese State. The only way it could now prevent the anarchy it bequeathed to its Crown Colony from being snuffed out is by making war on China. The will to do it is there, but the means were thrown away when Britain broke its alliance with Japan at the insistence of the United States. It is now reduced to bluster and complaint—and fantasy.

Professor Matthew Goodwin, a Fellow of Chatham House, appeared on Sky News on May 26th to explain what made Britain great in the world was its culture of fair play and living by the rules. This is the fairy story that England likes to tell itself. And it tells the world how modest and self-effacing it is because the world somehow fails to notice these attributes of the English character!

*

"“England is like a prostitute who, having sold her body all her life, decides to quit and close her business, and then tells everybody she wants to be chaste and protect her flesh as if it were jade”. So writes He Manzi in the Shanghai Liberation Daily, with reference to Britain’s discovery of a passion for democracy in Hong Kong under Chinese rule, having denied it democracy under British rule." (Quoted from the *Dictionary Of Insulting Quotations* by Jonathan Green.)

*

Lord Patten set up what he called "democracy" in Hong Kong when handing it back to China in 1997. If he had been in earnest about democratising government in capitalist Hong Kong, he would have established it as an independent political entity, instead of handing it back to a State which he regarded as "totalitarian". Democracy is a way of governing a state. Elections to something that is not the Government of a state do not constitute a democracy. The purpose of the pseudo-democratisation of Hong Kong was to establish a point of antagonism within the Chinese state that would be useful for propaganda purposes.

The West is concerned that the growth of Chinese influence in the world is undermining Western values. What is particularly obnoxious about Chinese activity around the world is that it empowers the former colonised states by offering real

Forestation and Revisionism

Further to the two part article in the O’Connor Column on revisionist efforts to obfuscate the history of colonial exploitation of Irish forests in the May and June Irish Political Review, it may not be widely known that the First Dail attached particular importance to afforestation. One of the first acts of the democratically elected Republican Government in 1919 was to advertise the raising of a public Loan, one of the aims of which was "*for developing and encouraging the re-afforestation of the country*". So at the time of the formation of the State, forestation was up there with the establishment of Consular Services, Arbitration Courts and a Land Mortgage Bank. Nor was the commitment merely verbal. By the end of 1919 a quarter of a million trees had been planted by officials of the underground Government.

The source for this information is an authoritative book that revisionist historians have long endeavoured to disparage: *The Irish Republic* by Dorothy MacArdle (see pages 285 and 318, Wolfhound edition, 2005).

From a different perspective the political and historical dimensions of Irish forestry were explored in a fascinating ten part documentary on the Irish language channel, TnaG, in 2018. The series had the title, *Crann na hEireann* (The Trees of Ireland) and one of the programmes described recent campaigns defending native woodlands and public ownership of the forests. In the early 1980s a campaign to save an oak forest in Coolattin, County Wicklow, had a successful outcome when the Government stepped in to purchase it. Local people and public figures like Thomas Pakenham had prevented a massive tree felling from proceeding by removing in the middle of the night all labels from the trees.

An academic from Galway University (NUIG), Uinsíonn Mac Dubhghaill, also recounted how, in the years following the 2008 Crash, the Government was planning to sell off the State owned forests. When it became public knowledge that a consortium of Chinese investors advised by Bertie Ahern wished to buy the State forestry body, *Coillte*, a massive social media campaign of opposition was quickly mobilised. The Government plan was quietly dropped. Mac Dubhghaill opined that the campaign had been so strong that *Coillte* will never be sold off. Concluding the broadcast the narrator/producer, Manchan Magann, said in summing up that at the crucial moment the people stood up for their trees. "*Our trees are our nation’s soul*", was his parting shot.

In pursuing a planned programme of forestation, it seems that the twin evils of Anglophilic revisionism and privatisation of natural resources can be opposed.

Dave Alvey

development along with mutually beneficial trade. It does not interfere in the internal political structures in the states with which it has a relationship.

Chinese intervention in world affairs exists only because Western values determined that China could not be let be. It was interfering with nobody else when a British Liberal Government made war on it in the 1830s, in order to compel it to accept and facilitate the sale of opium products from British merchants in India, under a system sponsored and organised by the Imperial administration.

The War Minister for the first Opium War was the most influential of all Liberal ideologues, Macaulay. The First Opium War was followed by others. The British example was followed by others. The Chinese State was broken down and its place was taken by a series of War Lords.

When an effective Chinese State was eventually restored, after the 2nd World War, it was through the growth of a Communist movement. The West was therefore hostile to it on two counts: for being Communist and for being an effective State. For a while China had the protection of being in a bloc with the Soviet Union. When the Soviet Union fell apart, it had to be able to stand alone against the immense power of the triumphalist West. It was able to do so. And, since it was able to defend itself against the West, it was a danger to the West.

That is how things are in the world brought about by Western liberalism.

If the Opium War is mentioned, Britain yawns. It was so long ago!

For China it marks the beginning of modern times. It is current affairs, whereas

the Slave Trade, which is so much in discussion just now, was over and done with before the assault on China was launched. But we have not heard it mentioned.

Where does Ireland stand in all of this? After all, it has captured a seat on the Security Council. Has it ceased to be what it was for so long, "*an alien of the West*"? Is it now part of the pack?

When the modern national movement was being shaped by Young Ireland the destruction of China was under way. The Nation, its paper which circulated around the whole country, commented on it. Official Ireland has consigned The Nation to the rubbish-bin of history. It might now be prudent to retrieve it. The Chinese have been forced onto the stage. They are not going to go away.

*

"Church bells rang out across Hungary last Thursday. Citizens stopped work, stood, and bowed heads for a minute's silence..."

"Commemoration, not celebration. One hundred years ago the Treaty of Trianon was signed by the victors of the first World War, reordering what was left of the Austro-Hungarian empire. As Versailles was to Germany, the treaty of Trianon is known to Hungary as the *bekdiktatum*, or 'dictated peace', a grave 'historical injustice'... The reversal of the treaty is the cornerstone of prime minister Viktor Orban's far right narrative" (Irish Times, June 8th).

So the *Irish Times* is of the opinion that Trianon was not a dictated peace!

Well, it would, wouldn't it? It became patriotically Irish when Sinn Fein was broken by the Irish 'Treaty', submitted to under threat of "*immediate and terrible war*" by the Empire, if it was not submitted to. The 'cancer' of Republicanism had not been rooted out in response to the Easter Rising, as the paper had demanded, and it saw a rigorous enforcement by Britain of the dictated arrangement—which it pleased the British to pretend was a Treaty—as being the way in which its particular interest in Irish affairs could be redeemed at a moment when all had seemed to be lost.

And the paper saw the Egyptian Election—called by General Sissi following his coup d'Etat, and prolonged by scrutinised voting day after day, until Sissi won it—as a democratic election. Its editorial on Sissi's power-grab was called *Hardly A Coup!*

Of course Sissi was upholding liberal values in the face of Moslem Democracy.

Hungary, in its understanding of things, was a piece of "what was left of the Austro-Hungarian empire".

What had happened to that Empire to leave pieces of it lying around, needing to be dealt with by Britain? The British war propaganda described it as the "prison house of nations", so those imprisoned nations followed the example of the Irish at Easter 1916 and tore it apart with national rebellions?

That is what the British propaganda suggested should happen. But it didn't happen. There was not a single rebellion in the Hapsburg Empire during the Great War. But there was a national rebellion, launched from Austria against Britain's ally in the Great War For Democracy And Nationality, the Tsarist Empire—the Polish Rebellion. And it was backed by Germany. And we seem to recall that James Connolly hailed the Liberation of Warsaw.

The Hapsburg Empire had no national rebellions to put down, as Britain had. It survived the stresses of the Great War with ease. But the British Empire decided to destroy it, late in the War, when it refused to desert its German ally and make a separate peace. That was at a moment when Britain thought it might lose the War, which it had launched in the expectation that it would "win it by Christmas".

America saved it—won the War for it and went home. Britain then, in complete freedom, set about destroying the European order of civilisation which in August 1914 it said had been its purpose to save in deciding to make war.

If there is meaning in the word Evil, then it must be said that what Britain did with Europe in the moment of its triumphant dominance in 1919 was pure Evil. And the worst of it was the breaking up of the Hapsburg Empire and the setting up in its place of a series of nationalist states without regard to their viability.

A British writer on nationalism and nations, Ernest Gellner, who has been much referred to by academics in Ireland, has the interesting idea that nationalism creates nations, rather than nations giving rise to nationalism. That was certainly the case with the array of nation states set up by Britain in place of the Austrian Empire. They had not created themselves. They had been thrown together recklessly by Britain, just because it was in punitive mood. And then they had to give themselves internal unity by means of intense nationalism.

And the worst thing of all was that they all had a commercial idle class which

could not integrate with them on nationalist grounds. The Jews were a people of the Empire, dispersed throughout the Empire. They were not nationalists in the new Versailles nation-states that took the place of the Empire. The nationalist bodies ruling those new states were not roundly developed nations. Nationalist development lay ahead of them and the Jews of the Empire lay across the way as an obstacle. Anti-Semitism was inherent in the situation.

Britain had further aggravated things by adopting Zionism into its Imperial programme. It treated the Jews as a unity, conferring on them the status of a nation, giving the Jewish Agency a voice at Versailles (which it denied to the Pope or the Irish), giving them State rights in Palestine, and establishing the Zionist Organisation in hegemony over Jewry.

That is to say: it set in motion an irredentist Jewish nationalism which hindered what possibility there was of the Hapsburg Jews being absorbed into the series of new nationalisms of the Versailles nation-states.

In the diaries of a Hungarian Jew, recently published in English translation, it is recorded that a Hungarian friend of his, a famous poet, assured him that he was "*no more anti-Semitic than is proper*", and the translator and Editor, a son of the Jew, leaves the remark stand matter-of-factly, without moralistic comment (see *A Nation Adrift. The Wartime Diaries Of Miksa Fenyo*).

Britain propagated the ideology of nationalism in its Great War in order to justify the breaking up of the Hapsburg and Ottoman Empires, while stamping on it within its own Empire. And it set up nation-states where there were no corresponding nations, and then deplored the nationalisms that it had deliberately brought about. It thought it could treat the world as its kindergarten and instruct it about behaviour.

Imagined nations, and invented traditions, were notions that were very popular with floundering Marxist intellectuals in the 1980s and 1990s. Professor Comerford of Maynooth even wrote a book on the invented Irish nation late in the day. The writers usually said that they did not mean what the words apparently convey—but, if they didn't, then they meant nothing and were only using catchy phrases in salesmanship. (Invented tradition was the gimmick of Eric Hobsbawm, who was also the author of *The Forward March Of Labour*

Halted. As a Communist ideologue, it had been his business to keep Labour going forward. When he failed in that, he got himself a position on the other side with invented tradition.)

Those terms apply literally to the Versailles states. Various bodies of people were thrown together in imaginary nation-states and were told to invent appropriate traditions. And, if the states didn't work, that was because of Corruption and Dictatorships. But the reverse view is much more plausible: corruption and dictatorship were what enabled them to work after a fashion, because they were fundamentally incoherent.

The major invented nations were Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Czechoslovakia was the invention relevant to Hungary. Millions of Hungarians were included in it as punishment of Hungary for having been a pillar of the Hapsburg Empire. Millions of Germans were also included, as were large numbers of Poles—and the Slovaks denied that they formed a common nation with the Czechs.

The Hungarian case against Trianon was viewed differently in England from the German case against Versailles. It was given newspaper publicity, and the famous English novelist—author of the Scarlet Pimpernel novels—Baroness Orczy, wrote a Pimpernel novel about Hungarians being rescued from the Czechoslovak terror.

The Czechoslovak invention was pulled apart in 1938—not only by the Germans, but also by the Hungarians, and the Poles, and the Slovaks. It was restored in 1945, with the assistance of massive ethnic cleansing, but it fell apart again when the Soviet regime fell.

Britain launched its second World War against Germany a year after Munich, and Hungary naturally got engaged on the German side when it became a war with Russia. It was conquered by Russia a few years later, the conquest at the time being described as a 'liberation'. It was under Russian control for almost half a century as part of the defence system against the West, and its autonomous national development was stifled. In 1956 a movement which would have transferred it to the Western sphere if allowed freedom to develop was suppressed by force. Its free national development did not begin until the 1990s. An attempt is now being made by the EU to curb it.

The "invented nation" doctrine was formulated within the thin veneer of cosmopolitanism. The vast majority of the peoples of the world never lived in that

veneer. Many of those peoples are now beginning to live publicly the national lives which they have always lived privately.

The *Irish Times* complains that Orbán has conferred active Hungarian citizenship on Hungarians living abroad. It sees this as tending to undermine a pillar of EU membership, "*a promise by acceding countries to accept the permanence of each other's borders as they find them, like it or not*". But we do not recall the Irish State repealing Article 2 of its Constitution, asserting sovereignty over the Six Counties, in 1972—or the *Irish Times* supporting the demand that it should do so.

The editorial concludes:

"Trianon may have been an injustice, but the nationalist conceit that history can simply be rewritten or erased is a poison to the body politic. One that the EU was precisely created to lance."

In fact a primary purpose of the founders of what became the EU was to put an end to the game of balance-of-power intervention, which Britain had been playing against Europe for centuries, preventing it from ever finding its own basis of settlement. They had direct experience of what it had done with Europe in 1919-39 and were determined to sideline it in 1945.

The Europe of The Six, which made the Treaty of Rome, had a coherence of purpose which was dissipated when a later generation let Britain in, and random expansion followed.

The Six, leaving aside the oddity of Luxembourg, were all Imperialist states whose Imperialism was in recession, and Luxembourg was deeply into International Finance Capitalism. They had never been as dependent on Empire as Britain was, and they were in transition towards the construction of a European system that could live out of its own resources. The admission of Spain, Portugal and Greece did not alter the texture of the alliance. (The Greek Imperialism had only been a brief episode in 1920 when the Greeks, egged on by Britain, attempted to wipe out Turkey—and were left at the mercy of the Turks by Britain when they failed.)

The admission of Hungary, Poland, etc.etc.etc was different in kind. These were not Top Dog nations. They had been peoples within large political entities. They had recently become nation-states and it was the collective business of each to fill itself out as a nation. And, by comparison with the somewhat jaded culture of the post-Imperial West of Europe, they were old-fashioned.

The *Irish Times* editorial of June 26th

is very concerned that the Polish Presidential Election will give encouragement to Orbán's movement in Hungary by strengthening family values at the expense of 'LGBT rights'.

LGBT rights are a novelty that appeared in the last ten or twenty years in Anglo-Saxon culture, which has no aptitude for letting things be. John Milton, the Cromwellian, asserted that the English were chosen by Providence to direct the world on how to live and it is ingrained in English culture that the way England chooses to live at any moment is the way the world ought to live, and that the world is wrong and is deserving of punishment if it lives otherwise. And this remains the case, even if England changes its mind about what the right way of living is!

Liberal England criminalised homosexuality in the late 19th century, and imposed draconian penalties on it. It was wrong in England and therefore it was wrong everywhere.

About a century later England decriminalised homosexual practices, and therefore it was wrong that they should be criminalised anywhere. The Taoiseach recently apologised to homosexuals for the Irish anti-homosexual laws—laws enacted when Britain governed Ireland.

Homosexual practice was decriminalised in England but the advocacy of homosexuality to the young was made illegal. It was to be treated as an abnormality to be tolerated. And that was the only right way for a while.

Then Britain decided that there was no such thing as sexual normality, except for certain unmentionables, and the concept of homosexual marriage was enacted in law, and marriage as an institution for producing and raising children was declared to be in no way more valid than marriage which was not based on sexual difference and therefore could not produce children.

This view is fairly obviously related to the condition of an immensely wealthy society (living on arrangements made in the world when it was a powerful Empire), which no longer reproduces itself, but depends on large imports of people from family-based societies.

But these old-fashioned societies are held to be delinquent, even when the keeping up of the population of post-familial societies depend on them. They are in breach of universal LGBT Rights, and deserve anything that may be done to them.

The EU elite of post-Imperial countries certainly have a problem with these bustling new nation-states, which have an old-fashioned future before them.

Israel Boycott

continued

The Court ruled that their “*actions and words had fallen within the ambit of political or militant expression*” on “*a subject of public interest*”, which is protected under Article 10.

Providing the judgment is not overturned by the normal review procedure, it will be very significant—it means that non-violent BDS activity is legal in all 47 states that are party to the European Convention on Human Rights.

TWO MINISCULE DEMONSTRATIONS

The original conviction in French courts arose from two minuscule demonstrations, the first on 26th September 2009, when, under the banner of Collectif Palestine 68, five of the group took part in an action inside the hypermarket in Illzach, in which they called for a boycott of Israeli products and drew attention to human rights violations by Israel in the Palestinian territories it occupies. A similar event was organised by the Collectif Palestine 68 on 22nd May 2010 in the same hypermarket, in which eight of the group were involved. They also presented a petition to be signed by customers, inviting the hypermarket to stop selling products imported from Israel.

In its judgment, the Court observed that

“the applicants had not been convicted of making racist or antisemitic remarks or of inciting hatred or violence. Nor had they been convicted of being violent themselves or causing damage during the incidents of 26 September 2009 and 22 May 2010. It transpired from the case file that there had been no violence and no damage had been caused. The hypermarket where the applicants had conducted their actions had not claimed damages as civil parties before the domestic courts.”

Nevertheless, for participation in one or both of these incidents, in November 2013, the *Colmar Court of Appeal* convicted the eleven of “*incitement to discrimination*” under section 24 (8) of the Law of 29th July 1881 on freedom of the press. The penalties meted out to them by the Court of Appeal for involvement in these trivial incidents were extraordinarily severe (see details below). In October 2015, the Criminal Division of the Court of Cassation upheld their convictions.

VERY SIGNIFICANT JUDGMENT

Under Articles 43 and 44 of the European Convention, this judgment of the European Court is not necessarily final. For a three-month period following its delivery, any party may request that the case be referred to the Grand Chamber of the Court. If such a request is made, a panel of five judges considers whether the case deserves further examination. In that event, the Grand Chamber will hear the case and deliver a final judgment. If the referral request is refused, this judgment will become final on that day.

If this judgment becomes final, it will be very significant: it will mean that non-violent BDS activity—and likely similar consumer boycotts to attain a political objective—will be legal in all 47 states that are contracting parties to the European Convention on Human Rights. Prosecuting authorities in these states should no longer charge individuals for engaging in such activity and, if any are charged, domestic courts should dismiss the charges. Failing that, individuals who are convicted in domestic courts may make application to the European Court of Human Rights, as the eleven convicted in France did successfully.

GROUND BREAKING US JUDGMENT

Conceivably, the European Court’s 11th June 2020 judgment will prove to be as ground breaking as the 1982 ruling by the US Supreme Court in the *NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware Co.* This ruling established that consumer boycotts with a political objective are a constitutional right under the freedom of speech guarantee in the First Amendment to the US Constitution and it held that a damages award against the NAACP for its role in organising such a boycott of white merchants in Claiborne County, Mississippi, was unconstitutional.

Nearly forty years later, that is how the law stands in the US. But that hasn’t stopped the Israeli lobby in the US trying to legislate to restrict BDS activity: as of 1st June 2020, according to Palestine Legal, legislation with that objective has been passed in 29 US states and it is pending in 13 others. The legislation generally takes the form of requiring state contractors—as a prerequisite to receiving any paid work from the state—to certify that they are not engaged in a boycott of Israel and to promise not to do so during the life of the contract. Texas famously came under criticism after one city in Texas required Hurricane Harvey victims

to sign such an undertaking in order to receive state aid.

Legislation of this kind, which denies people benefits simply because of their political views and their activism in expressing them, directly violates the First Amendment’s guarantee of free speech. It is not surprising therefore that most if not all legal challenges to the legislation have been successful and have upheld the right to boycott Israel without being penalised by the state. See, for example, Glenn Greenwald’s account of what happened in Kansas (*Federal Court Strikes Down a Law that Punishes Supporters of Israel Boycott, The Intercept*, 31 January 2018).

Endnote:

Penalties imposed by French Court

According to the European Court judgement, the following penalties were imposed by the Colmar Court of Appeal:

“As regards the incidents on 26 September 2009, the Court of Appeal imposed on each of the five accused a suspended fine of 1,000 euros (EUR) and ordered them to jointly pay each of the four admissible civil parties (the International League against Racism and Anti-semitism, the Lawyers without Borders association, the “Alliance France-Israel” association and the “Bureau national de vigilance contre l’antisémitisme”) EUR 1,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage, and EUR 3,000 on the basis of Article 475-1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (civil party expenses not defrayed by the State).

“Concerning the incidents of 22 May 2010, the Court of Appeal imposed on each of the nine accused a suspended fine of EUR 1,000 and ordered them to jointly pay three of the civil parties (the International League against Racism and Anti-semitism, the Lawyers without Borders association, the “Alliance France-Israel” association) EUR 1,000 each in respect of non-pecuniary damage, and EUR 3,000 on the basis of Article 475-1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (civil party expenses not defrayed by the State).”

In total, therefore, fines of 14,000 euros were imposed, albeit suspended, but much more seriously the eleven were required to pay four anti-BDS groups 7,000 euros in damages and 21,000 euros in court costs. French law seems to have allowed them to become “civil parties” to what was a criminal case and to receive damages and have their court costs paid when the accused were found guilty. Hopefully, they will have to pay back the money now that the accused have been exonerated !

David Morrison

16.6.2020

While continuing our series on events of 1920 with the help of the daily newspaper of the First Dail, the *Irish Bulletin*, we are reducing the amount printed to just one week per month as reproducing the full monthly report of the summaries is taking up too much space at the expense of other items in *The Irish Political Review*. The weekly summary of events below and those of following weeks for the month, as well as all the previous instalments which have appeared in this magazine, can be seen on our dedicated Facebook:

https://www.facebook.com/FrankGallagher1919/?modal=admin_todo_tour

It should be noted that these summaries are not by any means the full content of the *Irish Bulletin* which also contains daily accounts of all significant developments in the war

LEST WE FORGET (25)

The following are the Acts of Aggression Committed in Ireland by the Military and Police of the Usurping English Government as reported in the Daily Press for the Week ending:- Saturday, June 5th, 1920.

S u m m a r y

Date:-	May 31st	June 1st.	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	Total.
Raids:-	30	29	-	56	21	2	
Arrests:-	16	19	12	5	11	12	138.
Sentences:-	-	9	2	1	-	-	75.
Armed Assaults:-	4	1	-	-	-	-	12. 5.
<u>Daily Totals:-</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>230.</u>

The sentences passed for political offences during the above six days totalled one year.

MONDAY, MAY 31st, 1920.

Raids:-

Police and military raided upwards of thirty Houses in the Ballyglass district of Co. Mayo.

Arrests:-

Sixteen persons were arrested on the streets of Dublin on a charge of being "abroad" between the hours of 12 midnight and 5 a.m., with the permission of the British Military Authorities.

Armed Assaults:-

Attempted Murder. As Mr. Martin Kelly, Blackbuoy Pike, Limerick City, was standing in the Street talking to some friends he was shot at and seriously wounded by a police patrol who were driving past in military motor lorries. No provocation was given for the assault. In Limerick City armed police patrol the streets nightly and citizens who are out after dark complain of maltreatment at their hands. In many cases occupiers of houses were ordered by police to put out their lights, and when they failed to comply they were threatened. Countrymen who were returning home from fairs and markets and who had banded themselves together for safety were attacked and scattered by armed police patrols.

Following an attack on the fortified police barracks at Kilmallock, Co. Limerick, large bodies of police and military were drafted into the town. The streets were paraded during the following day and night by squads of armed troops accompanied by armed police and by tanks and armoured cars. The armed forces fired volleys along the public streets and into the residences of the townspeople. Forty-eight hours after the attack had concluded and when the troops and police were in complete control of the streets, the People's Hall, a large building in which National Concerts were given and Irish Language classes held, was wilfully set fire to by uniformed forces of the Crown, who collected supplies of petrol and burned the Hall to the grounds. They also poured petrol in through the windows of houses occupied by prominent Sinn Feiners. When the houses took fire some of the occupants had

to jump from upper windows to save themselves. Consequent upon this reign of terror the people are flying from the town. The exodus was described by an ex-Army Officer as resembling that which was seen in Belgium after the German occupation. At Queenstown, Co. Cork, soldiers of the Essex Regiment attacked a crowd which had assembled to receive and accompany to their homes two Republicans who had recently been released on hunger-strike from Wormwood Scrubbs Prison, London.

TUESDAY, JUNE 1st, 1920.

Raids:-

In the dead of the night armed police raided the houses of prominent Republicans in Mohill, Co. Leitrim. In all some twenty house were forcibly entered and searched. Police and military raided nine houses at Mitchelstown, Co. Cork.

Arrests:-

Thirteen 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 the permission of the British Military Authorities. Three men whose names did not appear in the Press, were arrested at Cregganbarney, Co. Galway, on a charge of unlawful assembly in connection with land agitation. Mr. Michael Clifford and his sons John and Richard, resident at Guran, Mitchelstown, Co. Cork, were arrested by police and military on a charge of having a gun in their possession.

Sentences:-

At Ballinasloe, Co. Galway, nine men whose names did not appear in the Press were sentenced to fourteen days imprisonment each on a charge of unlawful assembly in connection with land agitation.

Armed Assault:-

At Cononagh, Roscarbery, Co. Cork, armed military and police rushed a field where an Irish festival was being held and drove out the people at the point of the bayonet. A machine gun was trained on the entrance while the military tore down the

decorations and wrecked the platform.

Militarism:-

The "Tratisa" arrived at Queenstown, Co. Cork and disembarked the Cameron Highlanders about 1,000 strong. Three motor lorries laden with soldiers arrived at Dungarvan, Co. Waterford, taking up quarters at the Royal Irish Constabulary Barracks. A detachment with fixed bayonets was posted around the Courthouse and remained there during the night. A force of Lancers arrived in Waterford City yesterday.

Barbed wire entanglements are still arriving in Dublin from England. A convoy of 60 military cars for service in the 22 towns of the Western military district have arrived at Brigade Headquarters, Athlone, Co. Westmeath. Military aeroplanes were busy in the neighbourhood of Youghal, Co. Cork, between 11 p.m. and midnight on Sunday. A number of warships are now being fitted out at Sheerness for despatch to Irish ports. Large reinforcements of troops with accompanying stores and equipment are to arrive in Ireland this week for distribution in the South and West. The people of Moycullen, Co. Galway, are suffering many hardships at the hands of the military stationed in that neighbourhood. (Irish Daily Press, June 1st, '20)

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2nd, 1920.

Arrests: -

Eight men whose names did not appear in the Press were arrested at Taughboy, Co. Roscommon, on a charge of unlawful assembly in connection with land agitation. Four 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 the permission of the British Military Authorities.

Sentences:-

Two men, Messrs. Murray and Brennan of Killarney, Co. Roscommon, were sentenced to three month's imprisonment each on a charge of unlawful assembly in connection with land agitation.

Murder:-

At the inquiry into the circumstances of the death of James Saunders, who was shot dead by police in the streets of Limerick City, on May 19th, the Jury brought forward the following verdict:-

"That James Saunders met his death by a rifle bullet, fired by the police, and we consider it murder on the part of the police in firing into the street without any provocation on the part of the citizens. We condemn the action of the authorities in refusing to give evidence that would throw proper light on the inquiry."

On the plea that they had instructions not to answer any questions all the police witnesses at the inquiry refused to answer any questions put to them by the Counsel for the next-of-kin, although the Coroner declared that the questions were most relevant. The police refused to state who was in charge of the patrol which killed Mr. Saunders, and they refused to produce their barrack diaries. They also refused to state how many police were out of barracks when the firing occurred.

THURSDAY, JUNE 3rd, 1920.

Raids:-

Military and police visited several houses in Garryowen, Co. Limerick, raiding in all about thirty residences. At Clogherlynn, Co. Mayo, police and military carried out twenty-six raids on residences.

Arrests:-

Five 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 the permission of the British Military Authorities.

Sentences:-

Mr. M. Mulvihill, Athlone, Co. Westmeath, who is aged 70 years, and was formerly a well-known sportsman, was sentenced to two months' imprisonment on a charge of having in his possession a sporting gun.

Militarism:-

"The battleships Valiant and Warspite arrived at Plymouth yesterday. 1,200 Marines of the Plymouth Division, and 1,000 men of the 1st Batt. Devon Regt., at Devonport will embark for Queenstown on Friday" - Irish Daily Press.

FRIDAY, JUNE 4th, 1920.

Raids:-

At Blarney, Co. Cork, police and military raided upwards of twenty private residences. Members of the Dublin police force raided a house in Parnell Street, Dublin. It was found to be unoccupied.

Arrests:-

Eleven 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 the permission of the British Military Authorities.

Militarism:-

Large forces of police and military took possession of Loughrea, Co. Galway. A Press Association message says:- A Government troopship has arrived in Bantry Bay and disembarked 100 soldiers in full war kit. Other landings are being effected along the coast. Two hundred men of the Royal Marine Artillery, from Portsmouth and 200 Royal Marine Light Infantry from Gosport, have been despatched to Ireland. A "Star" Belfast wire states that large quantities of ammunition have during the past week been passing southwards through Belfast, having been landed at northern ports.

SATURDAY, JUNE 5th, 1920.

Raids:-

Police and military raided the residences of Miss O'Sullivan and Mr. Timmons, Moneytown, Co. Wicklow.

Arrests:-

Twelve men whose names did not appear in the Press were arrested at Tulsk, Co. Roscommon, on a charge of unlawful assembly in connection with land agitation.

Militarism:-

The "Daily News" Plymouth correspondent says the 1st Batt. Devonshire Regt. has left for Ireland "and other units having been sent previously the garrison is being depleted in a manner reminiscent of August 1914". "The Devons, about 1,200 strong, sailed on the Czaritza for Queenstown, and are to be distributed through Wexford, Waterford, Cork, and other southern counties. Both marines and infantry are in full war equipment. A platoon of the Essex Regt., arrived in Skibbereen on Thursday night. A large number of soldiers are now quartered in Dunmanway Workhouse. A force of artillery in full war kit have arrived in Tullamore and camped on the lawn in front of the jail and courthouse. A new type of armoured car was seen in Dublin yesterday evening.

A convoy of ammunition has arrived in Athlone from the Curragh" - Irish Daily Press.

The O'Connor Column

The So-called “Euro crisis”

The German Supreme Court has ruled that the German Central Bank may not participate in the European Central Bank (ECB) where the latter pursues expansionary policies. The opinion pages of the newspapers are again filled with much fretting about (yet another) “*Euro crisis*”.

The Column has been very satisfied with the nonchalance and even jocularity with which the solemn judgement of the German Court has been received in European political circles. Though on the surface heralding a deep constitutional crisis, there is a widespread assumption that politics as ever will ride to the rescue and overcome this pebble in the stream.

In fact, the decision by the EU Council that the European Commission itself should take on a fiscally expansionary and debt mutualisation role is partly designed to evade the German court ruling: transposing the expansionary strategy from the ECB to the Commission removes it to the political sphere, and hence beyond the reach of the German court’s jurisdiction.

In the 1990s-2000s, many German economists were vociferous in their scepticism of, and opposition to, the creation of the Euro. This was not so much because they were fretting that the academic prerequisites for an “*Optimal Currency Area*”—the perceived necessary combination of monetary, fiscal and political union—did not exist, but because they believed that in profligate southern European hands, the “*hybrid*” currency could never supply the stability their precious Deutschmark (DM)—which had made Germany great again—had provided.

But, in the political world, German Chancellor Helmut Kohl wanted the Euro for the same political reasons as French President Francois Mitterand—to integrate the languishing EU and drive it forward to economic and political union. France wanted to tie Germany into the EU at a time when Eastern Europe was opening, while Germany wanted a viable basis for continued economic success in the same context. Both were real Europeans and wanted Europe to succeed as

an entity in the shifting sands of the new post-Cold War geopolitical world. Both Kohl and Mitterand ignored their various economists and got on with creating the Euro, establishing its inexorable basis in the 1992 Maastricht Treaty.

At the same time, German re-unification was on the cards—its realisation famously facilitated by Charles Haughey at the emergency Dublin summit he summoned in 1990. Academic economists claimed that, not only the Euro, but also German unification made no sense economically. The Column forgets which economic theory German unification was meant to clash with, but no one cared anyway. The politicians of Europe ensured it happened.

On the issue of the Euro, Kohl couldn’t totally ignore his economic critics at home, because they struck a certain cord in the populace. While German sentiment was overwhelmingly in favour of both reunification and European integration, there were many who, like the mythical Swabian housewife, feared that the profligacy of others would doom a common currency. The solution found to allay these fears was the *European Central Bank* (ECB). The principal reason for the ECB was not—as is often assumed—the new-fangled neoliberal/monetarist doctrine of the need for “Independent Central Banks”, but rather straight-forward political compromise.

The Franco-German deal was that the EU would have the Euro, but with a mechanism in place to ensure it behaved in practice like the DM. To most people—including the Irish Government—this seemed an eminently sensible idea.

The ECB was then structured to consist of representatives of the variously-composed Central Banks of the participating member states, operating on the fiction that they were neutral “Independent” bankers not representative of their countries (the same fiction underlying the European Commission itself and giving it its strength at the time). But it is no less a fiction for all of that. No other Central Bank in the world has such a democratic political structure. It is also unique in history in being a multi-national Central Bank.

While many continue to bemoan the alleged “*structural flaws*” of the Euro, this Column believes its one major structural flaw—which is never mentioned—was allowing EU member states to opt out of it. In the Column’s view, that was a political compromise too far, as it prevented the Euro aligning smoothly from the start with the other structures of the EU. All its lesser—and to the Column’s mind rather inconsequential—‘structural flaws’ flow from this. Compulsory Brexit should have been the cost for refusing to participate in the Euro from the moment of its creation.

The Euro ‘crisis’ of 2009-12 has been put down to those lesser “*structural flaws*” of the currency. It can be conceded that this may well have been the case in how the crisis played out for Greece, whose membership of the Euro in the first place resulted from a deception engineered by the globalist bankers of Goldman Sachs. But it does not apply to any other country. In reality the Global Financial Crisis, in which the “*Euro crisis*” was a mere subset, had nothing to do with any alleged “*structural flaws*” of the Euro, but was, as an editorial in *Church & State* put it, a “*Usury Crisis*”, a crisis in the structure of the cascading of debt through global (i.e. US-dominated) finance capitalism (see *Church & State*, Jan. 2011, No.103). The Euro “*crisis*” was a structural upset within this actual crisis, though it was used for an international assault on the currency. The Euro nearly disappeared for some years as a currency for oil trading for example.

At the height of the ‘*Euro crisis*’, around 2012, some of the same economists in Germany who had opposed EMU [European Monetary Union] during the 1990s reappeared to forecast the demise of the Euro (“*we told you so!*”) and advocated a return to the DM. Most famously Hans-Werner Sinn. These German economists were, of course, feted as geniuses by the global Anglo financial press (*Financial Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, *The Economist*, etc.). While their rebellion went nowhere on the major issue, it did lead directly to the founding of the *Alternativ für Deutschland* party (AfD).

In fact it was the issue on which that party was launched. As the AfD developed along predictable lines, the embarrassed anti-EMU economists who had initially been involved in it scurried for cover.

The reality, of course, is that there never really was a "*Euro crisis*". It proved to be one of the world's most stable currencies, even in the midst of the global usury crisis. Since then, there has been so much investment in the infrastructure of the currency (e.g. SEPA) that it is now inconceivable it could collapse. As the years go by there has also been ever greater integration of the EU economy. The only possible scenario for a collapse of the Euro would be a collapse of the EU project itself.

Irish academic economists who opposed EMU also tended to be secret admirers of the Progressive Democrats. Newspapers in the 1990s brimmed with columns by these celebrated experts criticising EMU ("*It can never work!*"). The ostensible grounds were our old friends, the "*indispensible criteria*" for an "*Optimal Currency Area*". Particularly vociferous in their macho opposition were those associated with the so-called "*Doheny and Nesbitt School of Economics*", the nickname given to the smart boys of the financial and political world who networked in that famous Dublin hostelry near Government Buildings. They included Colm McCarthy, Cormac Lucey and many others. They were admirers of the monetarism of the Thatcher variety, and in reality were just good old-fashioned West Britons who found it hard to credit the Irish state had it in to succeed economically.

Charles Haughey, who was in power when the critical decision was made by

both Government and the Social Partnership body, NESC, to opt unreservedly to support rapid completion of the Franco-German EMU project, ignored the experts at Doheny & Nesbit's. Many economists close to actual politics, such as John Fitzgerald of the ESRI, as well as Kieran Kennedy, Patrick Honohan and Dermot McAleese, supported the Government strategy, despite being mostly Fine Gael/PD in their political sympathies. In fact all political parties (except Sinn Fein) supported EMU despite the D&N prophets of doom.

Many of the same Irish 'experts' who opposed EMU in the 1990s re-emerged during the 'Euro crisis' to foretell the final death of the currency ("*we told you so!*") and to advocate that Ireland consider leaving it and "*go it alone*" (which of course in reality could only mean returning to the Sterling zone).

Rather than the somewhat discredited "Optimal Currency Zone" arguments of the 1990s, they now claimed that the economies of the EU had different cycles, with Ireland's fortunes, for example, being more in sync with the US economy than the Eurozone and hence needing independent access to interest and exchange rate levers. They claimed that, during the Celtic Tiger era, our interest rates should have been high to dampen the roaring economy. But, of course, there were many other policy tools available to restrain such 'exuberance'—such as pay restraint, tax increases, etc.—but were not used.

Instead we had parties vying in the 2007 election with proposals to reduce or even abolish Stamp Duty to keep the housing market bubbling, and we also had the nonsense of public service pay

"benchmarking", which teachers' union leader Joe O'Toole famously—and victoriously—described as an "ATM" for the public service.

Fintan O'Toole—to be fair, decidedly not an economist—gave the doom-sayers during the 2010-12 financial crisis an added political edge. Torn between his Europhilism and his contempt for the Irish state, he launched his "*corrupt*"/ "*failed state*" theory to explain Irish multiple policy 'failures'. A book he published at this time was entitled *Ship Of Fools: how corruption and incompetence sank the Celtic Tiger*. This was a type of modern version of the classic colonialist contempt for the native: "*Look, see how unfit they are to govern themselves!*" Unfortunately, O'Toole became an international celebrity on the back of this, his toxic "*Irish failure*" formula being much reproduced across the global liberal press, from London to New York and Munich. His thesis and its incontinent dissemination across the liberal word could not but impact on bond markets, causing probably at least 1% to be added to the Irish debt spread, i.e. billions.

To be fair to Colm McCarthy, a genuine, hard-working and honest economist, while he again gave voice to his EMU scepticism during the 'Euro crisis', he never fell for the O'Toole "*failed state*" theory in relation to Ireland, and in the end also saw that the Euro was not fundamentally doomed. He therefore worked hard, despite his euroscepticism, at making sense of it, and ended by advocating technical changes to strengthen its survival chances. He was very pleased when Mario Draghi, the then ECB President, did the necessary.

Why Trump is on the way out

It seems to the Column that only some extraordinary turnaround can save President Trump for a second term. Rarely has a US President been so besieged by media and opposition. Even *Facebook*, *Twitter* etc.—the new king-makers of today—have intervened to excise his posts or those of his supporters, and military Generals have given press conferences denouncing him. In any other country, this would be called a coup.

Some clue as to the grounds for the extraordinary united front building against him may be found in recent comments he made to graduating officer candidates at Westpoint, indicating he had no intention of changing course on his radical protectionist agenda:

"Each of you begins your career in the Army at a crucial moment in American history. We are restoring the fundamental principles that the job of the American soldier is not to rebuild foreign nations, but defend—and defend strongly—our nation from foreign enemies. We are ending the era of endless wars. In its place is a renewed, clear-eyed focus on defending America's vital interests. It is not the duty of U.S. troops to solve ancient conflicts in faraway lands that many people have never even heard of. We are not the policemen of the world."

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-2020-united-states-military-academy-west-point-graduation-ceremony/>

Editorial Note: The Church & State Editorial, The Usury Crisis, can be read at the address below:

http://current-magazines.atholbooks.org/readers/full_article.php?article_id=77&&title=The%20Usury%20Crisis

es ahora *

'These fashions on the Plain of Eibhear'
**'These fashions on the plain of Eibhear make me sick
beggerwomen's sons with curling locks,
white cuffs around their wrists, and fancy rings,
like Ireland's one-time princes of Dál gCais,**

**slaveys and their sons starched to the chin,
garters upon them and their scarves thrown back,
tobacco pipe in jaw, at full blow,
and bracelets on their claws at every joint.**

**A trick of this false world has laid me low:
servants in every home with grimy English
but no regard for one of the poet class
save 'Out' and 'take your precious Gaelic with you!'**

Pádraigín Haicéad. (C.1600-1654) '*An Duanaire*'.

A Dominican priest from the area of Cashel, Co. Tipperary, Haicéad spent some time in Louvain before returning to Ireland to become actively involved in pastoral work and in national politics. He was one of the earliest and most accomplished of the poets to write accentual verse. A good deal of his substantial poetical opus is centered on topical events of his day and is inclined to be propagandist. While he has few completely satisfying poems, all his work is informed by an enormous intellectual energy and sometimes, as in Do-chuala inné, by a great cantankerousness against his enemies, both political and clerical.

"To an extent, the history of the Bowens is the stock history of the Anglo-Irish family, and of a class which came to full flower in the late eighteenth century, went into decline thereafter and was, by the 1920s, an isolated minority cut off from the country it had once dominated. This way of life has been so often and so colourfully recorded that the line between fiction and history can seem blurred. The Big House builders' obsession with self-aggrandisement and self-perpetuation, the orgies of hunting and drinking, the lawsuits and deeds of sale, the notorious eccentrics, the demesnes falling into ruin, the marriages for money, the interbreeding between the gentry, the absentee landlords, the usurping agents, the high life in Dublin before the Union: many of these clichés are facts of the Bowen family history."

Hermione Lee: 1983 Introduction to *Bowen's Court and Seven Winters* by Elizabeth Bowen. Vintage, London, 1999.

Elizabeth Bowen

A Review of Patricia Laurence's biography. Part 5.

I don't know what has been happening during the pandemic lockdown elsewhere but I have to say that it is *lands* I have been getting since the lockdown has eased. About two weeks ago as I rambled through my beloved Cork—again a voice called out—and wasn't it this man who had been involved in the Trevor/Bowen Summer School in Mitchelstown some years ago. A very jovial country man, he asked me how things had gone for my husband and I and after confirming that all was well and the same for him, we took to having

a grand old chat. After awhile, rather hesitantly, he asked me about the Bowen book and I replied that the lockdown had considerably helped in concentrating my mind on the project.

And this is where I got my *land!*

"What" says he "do you think of recent events?"

"And what might these be" I replied.

"There is this man with a posh accent, a Protestant I think, who is going around saying that the site of Bowen's Court needs to be preserved."

I was genuinely shocked as, in my last article in the *Irish Political Review*, I had

mocked the whole idea of Eibhear Walshe taking Patricia Laurence to see Bowen's Court. I thought the academics/literati who talked up this activity of visiting what is essentially a farmer's field and endeavouring to make it into a 'holy site of pilgrimage' to be a crowd of *oinseachs*. But now, it seemed—that there was a new game in town and I was the one who was late to its play.

Could this really be true? But my friend was adamant and what's more, he assured me that many of the locals weren't against it, seeming now to believe that what happened to the Big House was an act of destruction. I couldn't believe my ears—where were these people during the Trevor/Bowen Summer School, when lack of funding saw to its demise? He replied that that was a few years ago and things change—there was more money (this was obviously before the pandemic) and a lot more University-educated locals who now see things very differently to their parent's generation.

I was really taken aback. Could things change so quickly? Was this post-colonialism in reverse? Around the awakening world, *woke* politics are now in vogue. Statues are being toppled in the US and in the UK. The very fabric of Empire was being rent all round and yet we at home were acting up against this very necessary re-ordering of things. The bloody Irish, really—do we always have to get it so wrong?

The area around Thomás McCurtain Street, a fine thoroughfare, dedicated to our murdered Lord Mayor, has for the last few years undergone a quite but effective rebranding as the *Victorian Quarter*. And, yes, that would be after the Famine Queen herself—none other! Rebel Cork, how are you? Deader than O'Leary's grave!

But first I had to track down the man with "*the posh accent*", the one who was re-educating the locals of Kildorrery/Doneraile. The latter were now indeed re-educated enough by having attended the university—anything more was just grist to the mill. And so I came upon this man, and his name is *David Hicks*, an architectural technician from Co. Mayo, who had indeed become an educator of our people through applying his skill by using online media to propagate his cause. He has a blog called '*The Irish Aesthete*' and underneath it he has a warning—"This is not an Oxymoron".

Just in case anyone got the idea that we Irish had any aesthetic sensibilities, this sort of leg-pull is necessary to highlight the opposite but stated with taste. Hicks is associated with the *Georgian Society* which

again has its very own tell—you wouldn't get many Murphys for example or their likes involved with this very high-brow society. Hicks got his training as an '*architectural technician*' from the Institute of Technology in Sligo and then went to work for a local Builder—Bourke Builders, Ltd. Ballina.

But he started to get interested in the Big Houses of Ireland and "*criss-crossed*" the country to get copies of photographs and to look up old archival drawings and scan in those he was interested in. During the course of my research, I found the following on one online site:

"David Hicks has always been interested in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Irish history. Research into his family background led to investigating the history of Irish country houses and the circumstances of their downfall. A designer and architectural technician, he has contributed to 'My Showhouse' on RTE."

Hicks has written two books, *Irish Country Houses: A Chronicle of Change*, Collins Press, Cork, 2012 and *Irish Country Houses, Portraits and Painters*, whose publishers have not been ascertained by me but, if I were to make a guess, it would be by Collins again and the year it was published was 2014. From pictures on the website, the books' covers display a probability that they are 'coffee-table' products, with lots of pictures and little text, but which sell well to certain Irish consumers i.e. university graduates with lots of money and educated tastes.

But it is Elizabeth Bowen's ancestral home that I am interested in, and how that was presented by David Hicks. The latter turned up at Doneraile Court on 1st September 2019 and gave a lecture titled: *Elizabeth Bowen & Bowen's Court, Co. Cork*.

A local who was present, and has requested that I don't identify him/her, told me that as soon as the 'Office of Public Works' advertised the lecture, the tickets, which were free, went like wild-fire and, as only forty could be accommodated, they were snapped up almost immediately. As I am now relying on a third-party account, I am aware that I must be very careful in how I present things.

But what seems definite is that Hicks told the assembled people that Bowen's Court need never have been abolished, and he produced some drawings/photographs to back up his claims. And, on one of his social media platforms, there is a very odd reference to this account. There is a an archival copy of the drawing of the Big House, which shows its floor plan, and, bizarrely accompanying this, there is an aerial photo of the green field which shows a depression

in it which can only be seen from the air, where several tons of the limestone house pressed upon the earth. Hicks and others of like mind want the State to acquire the site of Bowen's Court—the field that is—and put up a map showing the outlines of the house and other such mementoes as well as providing better visitor access to the site.

Hicks in his outline of his lecture makes the following statement:

"Change was also evident for Elizabeth, who was the first female to inherit her ancestral home, Bowen's Court, in Co. Cork. However, it was with her tenure that the family association would also end. Elizabeth's beloved home was soon demolished after she sold it in the 1950s, despite reassurances to the contrary by the purchaser." (Underlining – JH: From my own researches, this latter statement is absolutely untrue.)

This is how Elizabeth Bowen remembers it:

"I had not enough money, and I had to face the fact that there never would be enough. Anxiety, the more deep for being repressed, increasingly slowed down my power to write, and it was upon my earnings, and those only, that Bowen's Court had by now come to depend..."

Matters reached a crisis. By 1959 it had become inevitable that I should sell Bowen's Court".

The buyer was a County Cork man, a neighbour. He already was farming tracts of land and had the means wherewith to develop mine, and horses to put in the stables. It cheered me also to think that his handsome children would soon be running about the rooms—for it was, I believe, his honest intention, when first he bought the place from me, to inhabit the house. But in the end he did not find this practicable, and who is to blame him? Finally, he decided that there was nothing for it but to demolish the house entirely. So that was done.

It was a clean end. Bowen's Court never lived to be a ruin."

So where David Hicks got the impression that Bowen was fooled by her "*neighbour*", I will let my own readers to decide. Bowen also wrote in a 1964 edition of '*Bowen's Court*' an introduction which also captures very vividly her feelings once Bowen's Court was gone.

"The house, having played its part, has come to an end... The shallow hollow of land, under the mountains, on which Bowen's Court stood is again empty. Not one hewn stone left on another on the fresh-growing grass. Green covers all traces of the foundations. Today, so far as eye can see, there might never have been a house there."

This poetic prose piece captures for all time how Bowen saw the land post Bowen's Court, the grass, and the mountains bloomed

on and were in no way lessened by the absence of the Big House. If only today's locals and the odd posh-voiced Georgian Society member could look at themselves and acknowledge that they are effectively forelock-tugging to a past not theirs.

Spencer Curtis Brown, her literary executor, wrote in an Introduction in 1974 to '*Pictures and Conversations*' (Allen Lane, London, 1975), Elizabeth Bowen's partial autobiography, that for him the book '*Bowen's Court*' was:

"a fascinating record of the close-knit society, English but in no way English, Irish but in no way Irish – the families of the vanishing Protestant "Ascendancy"...".

In fairness to Bowen, she never claimed to be the "*ascendancy*" but rather the "*Protestant gentry*", accepting in her family memoir that they were so minor a family that they were not needed to be bribed on the passing on the *Act of Union*.

One thing I just need to clear up is that *Local Taxation Rates*—or "*the rates*" as they were called—applied if there was a roof on a building, not just on the house, but on the stables and barn as well. So the buyer of Bowen's Court would know that if the rates had not been paid—that he was responsible. So that would act very much on his decision about what was to be done with the house. It is common knowledge now that Elizabeth Bowen wasn't able to pay her bills. In fact, Patricia Laurence wrote in her biography that:

"Uncharacteristically, she left behind bills unpaid for which her niece Aubrey" (Fiennes) "and Sackville-West assumed responsibility". (Eddy was her friend, of Knole, a homosexual who had bought a Big House, Coolville in Co. Tipperary, to be near to Bowen as they were very close friends, and with whom Elizabeth had thought they might find a path towards marriage after Alan Cameron's death. The thing was badly bungled by Elizabeth, it is thought, though neither of them ever brought up the subject again so there is where it stands but for the gossip!)

This is quite wrong about others paying the bills and no wonder Laurence doesn't source it—Aubrey only found out about Elizabeth Bowen's appalling financial state when she was just about to take the train back to Cork in 1959, when the latter blurted out that Bowen's Court was gone i.e. sold. She had five minutes to digest the news and, as she boarded the train, she realised how fierce the strain was on Elizabeth.

Julianne Herlihy ©
To be continued.

Economic Recovery

continued

if the additional value produced exceeds the additional cost. But the marginal or additional cost to companies of employing someone may be greater than the social cost. And there is no reason to believe that the point at which the additional product equals the additional cost will correspond to full employment.

ii) The market undervalues long-term as opposed to short-term returns. The lifespan of the State is longer than individual private investors.

iii) The market understates social returns. For example, it's difficult to see how a private investor would obtain a private return from investing in street lighting, but there will be numerous people who have not contributed to the cost who will benefit. In general, most infrastructural investment—including health and education—give a greater social return than that which could be appropriated by investors.

To remedy the defects of the market the State must intervene. It does this by acquiring the capacity to spend or influence how the resources of the economy—especially Labour—are utilised. But the State must be judicious in how it acts. It is possible that State intervention could exacerbate, rather than ameliorate, market defects. If for, example, it employs too many people in relatively unproductive activities it may be drawing productive Labour away from activities that would give a greater social return.

Increasing the money supply is only one of a number of options available to the State for increasing its purchasing power.

The other options are:

Domestic borrowing
Foreign borrowing
Taxation

In the case of domestic borrowing the purchasing power of those lending to the State decreases. Domestic borrowing keeps the money within the economy. When the State pays interest or repays the capital the money remains within the economy. There is little risk of inflation since, when the creditors lend, they transfer their purchasing power to the State. The overall purchasing power has

not increased. Inflation will only occur if the State's intervention undermines the productive capacity of the economy.

In the case of foreign borrowing there is an overall increase in the purchasing power of the economy. However, this may not lead to inflation. The purchasing power of the domestic economy is increased at the expense of the foreign economy which lends. This will enable it to purchase imports. However, unlike domestic borrowing, the interest payments and repayments of capital are lost to the domestic economy. Another factor is that, if the borrowing is not denominated in the domestic currency, the State incurs an exchange rate risk.

The economic effect of taxation is similar to that of domestic borrowing. The main difference is that the State does not have to repay interest or capital since it is expropriating—not borrowing—the purchasing power of domestic taxpayers.

In the above three methods of increasing the purchase power of the State, there is a degree of engagement with those whose purchasing power has been reduced. In the case of borrowing, the State has to convince the lenders to part with their money on the basis of a promise of future returns.

In the case of taxes there is usually a level of political debate around the overall level of taxes as well as about the proportion of the taxes the various economic classes should pay.

But in the case of a government that has the capacity to print money no such engagement is necessary.

The economic effect of printing money is similar to raising taxes. The State is appropriating to itself purchasing power from the economy by printing money. But, since money has no intrinsic value, the extra money produced for use by the State must be at the expense of the purchasing power of the rest of the economy. The greater the volume of money created, the less the value of each unit of currency held by private individuals and corporations.

It may be wondered why the State would go through the political and administrative bother of collecting taxes when the option of printing money is available.

But there are a number of ways that printing money differs from raising taxes. Firstly, it is a crude instrument. It does

not necessarily result in the wealthy paying the most. Indeed, the opposite can be the case. Those on fixed incomes, such as pensioners, are adversely affected. People with cash holdings see their wealth diminished.

On the other hand, borrowers have the value of their liabilities reduced. People with non-cash assets, such as houses or shares, can benefit from the inflationary spiral. Also, people with the capacity to move cash abroad are not adversely affected. Indeed, in Latin American countries the wealthy have tended to sell domestic holdings of cash in favour of a hard currency, such as the dollar, exacerbating the devaluation of the domestic currency.

Secondly by devaluing the currency, the risk of high inflation and exchange rate instability is increased, making it difficult to do business.

For these reasons most modern states find it prudent to accord some independence to their Central Banks.

Advocates of MMT claim that ultimately no inflation will result; that the economic stimulus initiated by the State will somehow stimulate production. But modern manufacturing is a complex process. It cannot be called into existence merely by an increase in demand. The effect of a sudden stimulus is to increase the level of imports as well as stimulating service industries, such as pubs and restaurants.

As an example, during the recent pandemic there was a massive increase in the demand for medical device equipment and PPE. Here was an opportunity for British manufacturing to step into the breach. But, in my view, it failed miserably. Johnson set up a committee of British manufacturers to produce ventilators. They failed in even producing a decent prototype, never mind deploying the necessary resources to manufacture at scale. This is not at all surprising. The British economy has been moving away from manufacturing in the last forty years and has been losing the necessary know how and skills.

These shortcomings will not be remedied by printing money. Indeed, such a policy will accentuate the movement away from manufacturing to services.

Even before the pandemic, an expansionary monetary policy was presented as a solution to Britain's economic problems. But what problem would printing money

have solved? Before Covid 19, Britain had less than 5% unemployment. In some areas of its economy it had shortages of Labour which could only be mitigated by immigrants and even then, there were reports of rotting fruit and vegetables that had not been harvested in the east of England.

Another justification for an expansionary monetary policy is that there needs to be an end to austerity. But Britain does not have austerity policies. As would be typical of a service economy it has been running balance of trade deficits from the 1980s when Thatcher began to undermine British manufacturing. In other words, Britain has been borrowing from the rest of the world in order to sustain a standard of living that is in excess of what it produces.

The strongest, most successful manufacturing economies are relentless in their pursuit of austerity policies.

The CIA, which takes an interest in these things, compiles statistics on countries' balance of payments on their current account. The country with the largest balance of payments surplus is Germany. In second place is Japan. Japan is an interesting case. It has one of the highest State debts in the world, running at about 200% of GDP. But this is funded by Japanese savings which are far in excess of the State debt.

China comes in third.

Ireland is tenth on the list, which is interesting given that during the Celtic Tiger era it was running balance of payments deficits. Following the last financial crash, the Government reconfigured the economy away from consumption towards production. Public sector pay was frozen. Disposable income was reduced by increasing taxes.

Before Covid 19 Ireland had returned to full employment. There is no doubt that austerity works.

Another interesting country on the list is Italy which, like Japan, has a massive state debt. But contrary to their happy go lucky 'dolce vita' image, the Italians, or at least the Northern Italians, are ferocious savers. It was interesting to note that, during their recent banking crisis, the Italian Government, which included populists, did not favour burning the bond holders and indeed resisted EU pressure to do so. The Government realised that the bonds were owned by Italians.

Of course, Italian credit is not created out of thin air. Its source is the vast surpluses generated by one of the strongest manufacturing regions in the world. Unfortunately, Northern Italy, with its historic and current close economic ties with China, was at the epicentre of Covid 19.

On the deficit side the country with the second largest balance of payments deficit is the UK. The country with the largest deficit is of course the United States. How long the US can maintain the dollar as the world's reserve currency is a moot point. Trump's policy of bringing manufacturing back to the US is at least a peaceful route out of the impasse, even if it will adversely affect Ireland.

So, what economic policies should Ireland and the EU adopt in response to the pandemic? It is possible that policies that worked following the last economic crisis may not be appropriate for the current one. It is at least understandable for Germans to be sceptical of the ECB buying State and possibly corporate debt. The policy of low interest rates discourages savings in favour of consumption. This favours service industries which don't require a large outlay of capital. Manufacturing economies, on the other hand, have a much higher ratio of investment capital to national output. This is financed by savings.

The policy of printing money helped the EU to emerge from the last economic crisis. It enabled the banks to repair their balance sheets and debtors to repay their debt. But it doesn't follow that the same prescription should apply to the current crisis.

The EU was founded partly to ensure food security. The current crisis has brought to the fore health security. The idea, for example, that the US could buy a German pharmaceutical company with the aim of ensuring that any vaccine it might develop would be exclusively sold in the US seems anathema. Although a substantial amount of medical devices and PPE is manufactured in Europe, any dependence on China in this area is not satisfactory. The EU may have to acquire a golden share in various strategic private sector companies to ensure the interests of the Union are safeguarded. There will be greater State expenditure in the health sector in general.

Apart from the Health sector and related industries, how should the State/EU respond to the economic crisis? Firstly, it is

necessary to identify areas of greatest need. Secondly, it must distinguish between permanent changes in the economy that have occurred and areas which a downturn is temporary and can recover once some type of normality returns.

On the first point there are many companies that have done well. Companies that are in the data storage, medical devices, pharmaceutical and other health related industries are doing very well, even if manufacturing overheads have increased because of social distancing. These sectors don't need State support.

But, of course, many have fallen off a cliff. There is scope to help the unlucky. In Ireland the balance of payments in March had a record surplus. This suggests that the Economy (through the State) has the capacity to borrow. Debt is far less of a problem than it was ten years ago.

But how should the State help those who have been adversely affected? At present it has been trying to help employers keep their employees on the books. The assumption is that, once this pandemic recedes, everything can return to normal. This may not be valid.

Certainly, the State should help people who have experienced a dramatic fall in income. But should it help companies in trouble? There may be companies who have experienced a temporary downturn but which have a viable future. These companies should be helped. In this writer's opinion the help should be in the form of zero interest loans, rather than grants. And the loans should be routed through Enterprise Ireland, rather than the commercial banks, which have a doubtful ability to evaluate the viability of companies.

Unfortunately, there will be companies that have no future. In this case the people should be helped, but not the company. It does not make sense to freeze employment in unviable companies and thereby deprive more dynamic companies of badly needed labour resources.

Covid 19 has accelerated a radical restructuring of the economy. In such circumstances a catch all, indiscriminate, economic stimulus may not be the medicine required. An effective prescription must take account of the new economic realities for the patient to recover.

John Martin

Occupied Territories Bill

Jackie Goodall (Letters, April 18th) speaks of planning permission and demolition as though Israel's Civil Administration in the West Bank (a body overseen by the Israeli military) were a legitimate and normal authority which treats all residents equally. In fact, Israel's Civil Administration has long weaponised its planning policy to thwart the development of Palestinian communities, and facilitate the expansion of Israeli illegal settlements. Within Area C (65 per cent of the West Bank) Israel's Civil Administration controls all planning, and rarely grants planning permission to Palestinians for new builds, extensions or even renovations. Inevitably, Palestinians are forced to build without planning permission, and live under threat of demolition.

Israeli human rights group B'tselem reports that since 2006, Israel has demolished over 1,548 Palestinian homes in the West Bank (not including East Jerusalem), leaving 6,773 people homeless.

By continuing to allow the import of produce from Israel's illegal settlements, we are incentivising the Israeli state to continue its policies of oppression in the West Bank. It is time for Ireland to end its complicity in war crimes in the Middle East and elsewhere.

The past few weeks have shown us that when the political will exists, Dáil Éireann can pass much-needed legislation swiftly and harmoniously. The Occupied Territories Bill has wide cross-party support and is endorsed by a former attorney general. I call upon all TDs to ensure that the Bill is passed into law; it has been delayed for far too long.

– Brian Ó Éigearaigh [See *Southern Star*]

British Labour: The Zionist Purge Begins?

The new British Labour leader, Keir Starmer, who shielded his Zionist affiliations during the leadership campaign, has declared his leadership rival, Rebecca Long-Bailey, to be an anti-Semite, and has sacked her from his Shadow Cabinet.

Her 'anti-Semitism' consists of commending a writer who pointed out Israel/US security connections and suggested that the knee-on-the-neck policing method had been secretly taught to the American police forces by their Israeli counterparts.

In fact, the similarity of treatment meted out to subject populations by the dominant power in each instance is obvious: it is plain that the US and Israel exert considerable influence on each other. Israeli spokesmen have defended actions against the Palestinian natives by pointing out that it was much the same as what the United States did to its natives. And Washington spokesmen see what Israel is doing as being the same as what they did.

With regard to Israel's announced intention to annex formally the conquests it made beyond the UN General Assembly's award of territory for a Jewish State, Washington has said clearly that it is entirely

a matter for Israel itself to decide. Kerr Starmer has made no comment.

It was convenient in 1947 for the Security Council to let the General Assembly—pretending to represent the world—decide that one thing on its own, and then put it back in the chatter-box. The division of Palestine is the only decision of any consequence that has been left to the General Assembly.

Israel's annexation of its conquests, in defiance of the paper position of the UN as a world authority, should help to dispel the cultivated illusions on that subject.

Starmer's assertion that Rebecca Long-Bailey is an anti-Semite because she endorsed a factual observation about Israeli influence on American policing methods makes it clear that Anti-Semitism, in its new definition, is not about racial hatred of Jews.

It is about treating Israel, the Jewish State, as a normal state, and criticising it as one would criticise any other state.

Starmer brings Labour into an Orwellian world in which two and two do not equal four.

The Guardian Censors Churchill !

[Editorial Note: Avi Shlaim, the Israeli academic forced into exile has circulated an op-ed, which appeared in the *Guardian* on 22nd June:]

Due to the *Guardian's* carelessness and censorship, Mr. Shlaim circulated the following corrections:

"Trump announced his plan not in January 2019 but this January—the editor's mistake. *The Guardian* also reduced the original text by a third and omitted two whole paragraphs. Here is the omitted paragraph on Churchill:

"Churchill, Johnson's hero and role model, personified the racism of the British ruling class of that era. This is what Churchill told the Peel Commission inquiry into the Arab Revolt in Palestine in 1937: "I do not agree that the dog in a manger has the final right to the manger even though he may have lain there for a very long time. I do not admit that right. I do not admit for instance, that a great wrong has been done to the Red

Indians of America or the black people of Australia. I do not admit that a wrong has been done to these people by the fact that a stronger race, a higher-grade race, a more worldly-wise race... has come in and taken their place". This statement is shocking but not surprising: racism goes hand in hand with colonialism. A "Black Lives Matter" activist recently wrote on the plinth of Churchill's statue in Parliament Square that he was a racist. The activist had a point."

The other omitted paragraph is about a letter to Boris Johnson from a group of liberal Israelis who campaign for international recognition of Palestine as a state. They are a very impressive and energetic group. One of their members is Alon Liel, a former Director-General of the Israeli Foreign Ministry and a good friend of mine:

"Last month Mr Johnson received a letter from The Policy Working Group, a voluntary team of senior Israeli academ-

ics, former diplomats, media experts, and human rights defenders who campaign to end Israel's 53 year-old occupation of the Palestinian territories. The signatories call upon the British government to recognize the State of Palestine in line with the resolution passed by the British Parliament in October 2014, a resolution ignored by David Cameron's government".

Avi Shlaim, FBA
Emeritus Professor of International Relations
St Antony's College, Oxford OX2 6JF

Churchill's Evidence to the Peel Commission, in which he made his 'Dog in the Manger' remarks quoted above is reproduced in the following Athol Books pamphlet

Serfdom Or Ethnic Cleansing?
A British Discussion On Palestine.
Churchill's 'Dog in the Manger' Evidence to the Peel Commission (1937).

Introduction: Angela Clifford.
48pp. €6, £5, postfree in Ireland & UK

Edwina Stewart, Life-Long Belfast Communist

I knew Edwina Stewart (nee Menzies), who has died at the age of 86, when we were in the Young Workers' League, back in 1950. (The YWL isn't mentioned in the Northern Communist Party Of Ireland Unity publication that published her obituary.) She was 16 and I was 18, so as young people, like the rest of the YWL, it was politics and socialising non-stop with our boundless energy.

Later we YWL members graduated to the CPNI (again not mentioned in Unity).

She was part of the Menzies family. Her parents, Eddie and Sadie Menzies, were founder members of the old CPI of the 1930s, when it was Nationalist-orientated.

The Menzies were not the only Protestants in the old CPI. The majority membership were Protestants. My father was a member at the beginning of the 1930s. He had come from the Workers' Revolutionary Group. He left because of its Nationalism but stayed a life-long communist. He never called himself Irish and supported the British link. The Menzies family could be described as British. Certainly Edwina, back then, would have found the Catholic Falls Road foreign territory.

My father also didn't want Protestant militancy in what he thought should be a revolutionary movement. But it was mostly Protestant, with very few Catholic members. No one understood the politics of Northern Ireland then like we do now, with its two nationalities. There was to be no unity and certainly no one-nation-one-people.

Sean Murray, former IRA Commandant in the War of Independence, wrote the nationalist pamphlets in the old CPI of the 1930s. The Protestant members worked in the Trade Union movement, with the Protestants holding most of the jobs that mattered. It was like two parties in one. That became all too obvious with the WW2 split in the CPI, with the CPNI in the North and the Irish Workers' League in the South.

Edwina organised a reception for the Irish Workers' League youth wing around 1951, when they came to Belfast from Dublin. They were put up for the night in

various comrades' homes.

The YWL members found out soon enough that they had nothing common with the Southerners, as Protestants, and the few Catholics, like myself, couldn't understand their politics, and so it was just socialising.

The whole ridiculous idea was: 'you get your part of country communist and we'll get our part communist, then we'll unite'. It was like saying: 'You stay on your side of the border for now and we'll stay on our side.'

In 1970 the two halves of the party came together again as the Communist Party of Ireland, and again it had a Nationalist slant. The Northern Ireland Protestant members, like the Menzies, stayed as members—along with notables like Betty Sinclair, a Trade Union organiser, as did other Trade Union chiefs.

The party as the CPNI had good relations with the Protestant community. It had offices, on the Albertbridge Road, a highly militant Protestant area, and beside the offices was an Orange Lodge social club which we were allowed into to watch, on TV, the Hungary versus England football match in the early 1950s.

Then, as the 28-year-war progressed and the party was once more the CPI, Protestant militants torched the Albertbridge Road offices and all the records of the old CPI, the CPNI and the revived CPI, were destroyed. They needn't have bothered, for both wings of the party turned out to be of no value to the suffering Catholic population over its 90 year history. In fact some of the members of the new CPI, during that war, joined the UDA (Ulster Defence Association). Another wrote a pamphlet addressed to PIRA, with a foreword by Clare Short (a British MP then), appealing to them not to kill Protestants (RUC and prison personnel).

There was the spectacle, witnessed by a friend of mine, of two former members of the YWL in some ruckus in which one was chasing the other with gun, intent on killing him.

Another, the Protestant son of an RUC man, used to sing Republican and communist songs in the Duke of York pub, had his boat burnt by PIRA after he joined the

UDA. So a stormy time for communists. Some of its male members were taken in by the British Army and had their heads shaved and their clothes fumigated in order to humiliate them, thinking they were a danger to their war effort. They also wasted their time.

Edwina was very much into the Civil Rights movement before the bullets began to fly. I can't account for all her work during the war situation because I wasn't living in NI anymore. I had left in 1954 but I caught up with her again in 1957 when I went back to live in Belfast for 18 months, to avoid conscription.

In that same year, 1957, preparations were being made for the World Youth Festival in Moscow. Her obituary in Unity claims she organised the delegation—which included the Irish musicians, the McPeakes; and the Mulholland School of Irish Dancing. No, it was Bob Heatley, a CPNI member, like Edwina, who organised that trip. I was with him when he visited the McPeakes to invite them to Moscow. Eventually the delegation had a majority of Protestants.

I began to see Edwina as the good Presbyterian who gave room to all faiths, though she would never have attended any church. She had the aura of a pacifist Joan of Arc who would sacrifice herself for a good cause. She lost her teaching job through calling for a proper inquiry into Derry's Bloody Sunday and for attending the hearings.

She was a quiet person who never panicked or raised her voice. She would never claim to have done things she never did. Such a person was lost in a political party which failed to deal with Catholic emancipation for opportunistic reasons, like keeping its Protestant Trade Unionists on side. When it did make some effort during the war situation, it was already too late, the Catholic population had taken the matter of their oppression into their own hands.

In Moscow, in 1957, Bob Heatley, who had swung the Young Workers' League over to Nationalism, provoked anger when he wanted the NI delegation to walk behind the Irish Tricolour. A Protestant himself, he angered the Protestant members of the delegation. They wanted the Union Jack. The conflict reached the higher echelons of the Soviet Government, which decided the Irish Tricolour was the flag to use in the Red Square parade. Either that or go home. The Tricolour won.

In the *Unity* obituary it is claimed that Edwina founded the Communist Youth League: In fact it was Bob Heatley who changed the Young Workers' League into the now Nationalist Young Socialist League. Something has gone wrong here. The Northern section of the CPI could be blind without those records, while the Southern part of the party wants to bury the YWL and the CPNI phase of the party, and tout the CPI as the party of continuity.

Anyway, someone is dead whom I admired and respected. I can't think of anything to fault her on. She was very much her own person. She was brave throughout her life.

As I have said, the Young Workers' League had a majority of young Protestants.

The membership was up and down. It had around 30 members when I was there and that included just five Catholics. The stalwarts, beside Edwina, were the daughters of the Trade Union leaders. (They all seemed to have only daughters.)

Being head of Trade Unions creates a middle-class life, with its high earnings and long-lasting jobs in a place like Northern Ireland. So we had quite a bunch of young middle-class girls. I can't remember any working-class girls. The males were mostly working-class.

Edwina, was already a young sophisticated girl who was familiar with phones, like the rest of the girls in the YWL. I was near 19 and had never used a phone.

In the meeting rooms above the Party bookshop in Church lane, we decided to contact the French Communist Party and support them in their campaign to free Jacques Duclos from prison. The Party secretary had been arrested when his car was stopped by the Gendarmerie.

There had been a massive demonstration against the visit of the American General Matthew Ridgeway to Paris on 28th May 1952. A pistol, a club, a notebook and two pigeons were found in Duclos's car. In court it was claimed the birds were carrier pigeons being used in spying against France for the benefit of the Soviets. It turned out the pigeons were dead and were part of Duclos's food.

It was Edwina who made the phone call and it was some of the girls who got together a telegram in French. Duclos was released through massive support from worldwide communist agitation

An English girl student attending Queen's University, and a member of the

YWL, suggested we all went to see a film called Death Of A Salesman. Most didn't want to go so I ended up with the English girl and Edwina, going to a cinema in Royal Avenue. On the way I thought about how the English loved books and films about murder and crime. The film turned out to be Arthur Miller's play made into a film.

I suppose most of us should have been out of the YWL by 18 but it was more congenial than the older CPNI which had an age gap of 20 and 30 years, compared to us. And we were hated as the YWL, becoming the Socialist Youth League with its Nationalist slant. The Catholic youth didn't turn up in droves after our conversion, but we did get one Catholic lad whom we thought was in to spy for the IRA. I can't remember Edwina's reaction to these changes. When we decided to go to Milltown for the Easter Rising commemorations, she refused to go, as did the rest of the girls. So it was three Protestant lads and myself. Two of the lads became so frightened by Special Branch attention they never went there again. Bob Heatley continued and played the Protestant card to the Branch in saying as a Protestant he had the right to go anywhere in Ulster. I knew I didn't so I stayed away.

Edwina's mother, Sadie, was a middle-class woman, placid and genteel. Her father Eddie, had been a shipyard worker, had had a bad accident at work, got compensation and became a business man. He mainly fitted in with his wife's life-style but was known on occasions to let out crude gulders* to let you know he wasn't

a sham but a working-class man. In the meantime he had built one of the biggest houses in Belfast, which the locals named as the Menzies Commune.

Edwina didn't like the 'take' on the female version of Edward as a name. And of course her father's crude explosions on occasions. But like a lot of young people parents seemed an embarrassment sometimes and might even be better off dead.

She was to become happily married to Jimmy Stewart, a teacher, and Ballymena man—Paisley's territory. He became the Secretary of the YWL and was in the communist movement all his life. We used to whisper:

"Edwina converted him. How could he think like us when he comes for Ahoghill where they call soda bread pastry?"

But he was a school teacher and very good on literature. His favourite topic was Scottish border ballads, which he tormented us with, quoting some, at YWL meetings.

Edwina, at sixteen, already had a good taste in films and literature. This cultural aspect of the YWL and the CPNI, I was grateful for. We had Lagan Films, which screened the best films, in the Party's facility on the Albertbridge Road. The films came from the USSR, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Progressive films came from India and Japan. That was thanks to Edwina's dad. There was nothing like it in Belfast.

Wilson John Haire, 5.6.20.

* a crude, garbled shout, Ulster Scots – Ed.

(Part 2)

Taking The Bloomin' BeJoyces Out Of Zurich!

[The following items complete the compendium compiled by Manus O'Riordan. The final item, the statement by President Higgins on the death of Stephen Joyce, makes it perfectly clear that the wishes of that last member of James Joyce's family were that the remains of his grandfather should remain undisturbed in his Zurich grave, and not be subjected to a farcical Irish "repatriation".]

SOME IRISH TIMES LETTERS

(1) Who Owns James Joyce?

"Sir, Dublin City Council's recent motion in favour of "repatriating" the remains of James Joyce and other individuals interred in Zurich treats these distant bodies as if they were somehow the property of an ideal Ireland, with the Government asked to take "all appropriate steps" to bring them to Dublin ("Return writer's remains to Ireland, say Dublin

councillors", News, October 15th). By way of response, a spokesperson for the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht stressed that any reinterment would be a matter in the first place for family members and trustees of the Joyce estate, thus acknowledging the primacy of family wishes over a potentially insensitive political vote.

The motion is only the latest in a long series of Irish requests to move the Joyce remains. The persistent clamour has

been such that in 1977, one of the Irish Times's most distinguished satirists caustically noted the implications of the rolling calls for a Joyce reburial. Donal Foley, in his "Man Bites Dog" column, declared that the "Joyce funeral" would be an ideal way to introduce visitors to a newly established Irish "Festival of Funerals". Other repatriations might include Thomas Moore, John F Kennedy, Niall of the Nine Hostages, and Che Guevara. A spokesman for Bord Fáilte (Great Funerals Festival Department) said that when they ran out of "Great Irish Bodies", they would dig up figures such as Brian Boru, and transfer them to their "rightful place in the republican plot at Glasnevin". In the run-up to the centenary of Ulysses, Dublin City Council might do better to encourage its literary citizens to engage with the undoubted quality of the novel rather than to lead a campaign to rattle the bones that lie in Zurich. In Ulysses, the narrator in the Hades episode refers to a pauper "nobody owns". Who owns Joyce? **Patrick Callan**, October 19, 2019."

(2) Repatriating Lucia Joyce

Sir, Apropos the debate about returning James Joyce's remains to Ireland I wish to draw attention to the sad fate of Lucia Joyce, James Joyce and Nora Barnacle's daughter. She spent the last 30 years of her life in St Andrew's Mental Institution, Northampton, England, and is buried in nearby Kingsthorpe cemetery. Perhaps those who are proposing the return of Joyce's remains should devote their efforts to having Lucia interred with her parents and her brother Giorgio. Anne McManus, October 29, 2019."

[See www.theguardian.com/books/2010/feb/21/james-joyce-daughter-in-asylum and www.irishtimes.com/culture/stage/the-lost-story-of-james-joyce-s-daughter-as-a-parisian-dancer-1.3534604 for more on Lucia Joyce (1907-1982) — MO'RJ.]

(3) Joyce Chose To Remain British

"Sir, The notion of returning James Joyce's remains from Zurich to Ireland, as Anthony Jordan suggests, should take into account that Joyce chose to remain officially British to his death in 1941. Joyce positively rejected Irish nationality on several occasions.

Living in Paris in 1930, he wrote to his son Giorgio: "Some days ago I had to renew my passport. The clerk told me he had orders to send people like me to the Irish delegation. But I insisted instead and got a British one." A decade later, the Joyce family were again offered Irish passports which would have enabled them to leave Nazi-occupied France more

easily if needed. The offer was declined and Joyce clung doggedly to his British passport, despite the increased risk... Dr John Doherty, October 30, 2019."

AN IRISH CITIZEN AND A PRESIDENTIAL FINAL WORD

(1) "Stephen Joyce, the boy who became guardian of his grandfather's legacy" — Katherine McSharry, Irish Times, February 8, 2020:

"Early last year, Stephen Joyce asked Eamonn Ceannt (Chairman of the Museum of Literature Ireland) to come to the Île de Ré, to help him apply for Irish citizenship. Thankful throughout for the assistance given by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Stephen was particularly pleased when President Michael D Higgins subsequently congratulated him on becoming a citizen. He was delighted to receive his Irish passport — although, mischievous to the last, he remarked that the cover should be green, not maroon."

(2) Statement on the death of Stephen Joyce, by the President of Ireland, Michael D Higgins, January 24, 2020:

"I have heard with sadness of the passing of Stephen Joyce, grandson of James Joyce, in Ile de Ré last night. Thus passes our last direct connection with James

Joyce. Stephen was pre-deceased by his wife, Solange, who died just over three years ago and to whom he was deeply attached. On our last conversations he mentioned how much he missed her. We had a number of discussions both before and after my visit to his grandfather's grave in Zurich in June 2018. He was very grateful for the care and attention that had been paid to the grave of James Joyce by the public authorities in Zurich. He expressed it as his wish that some way might be found possible for James Joyce's poem *A Flower given to my Daughter* ... to be inscribed at the memorial in honour of Lucia Joyce. (In other words, on the memorial at Joyce's own resting place in Zurich — MO'R)... Stephen Joyce worked for the OECD on African Development. He was deeply committed to what he saw was the special duty to defend the legacy of the Joyce family in literary and personal terms. This was not a task carried out in harmonious circumstances at all times with those seeking to engage with James Joyce's life and works. Stephen had recently become an Irish citizen and in our last conversation he expressed his appreciation to all of those who had assisted in the processing of this. To his relatives and friends Sabina and I express our deepest sympathy."

Review: Michael Heney, *The Arms Crisis Of 1970*

(Head Of Zeus, €15.75)

The Arms Crisis Dissected

Michael Heney was enticed into investigating the Arms Crisis decades ago. Captain Kelly's wife, Sheila, had seen his investigative programmes on RTE and rang him up to tell him, You're an investigative reporter: I have a story for you!

And it appears that the more investigating Heney did, the more there was to be found out. He has followed the trail and come up with an excellent book. It is a book that puts other writers on the topic to shame.

Heney's remit in *The Arms Crisis* is wider than that of my *Arms Trials*: and he has found and digested a plethora of sources. In addition, he deals very thoroughly, not only with the events leading up to and surrounding the Arms Crisis, but has also investigated the Dail Public Accounts Committee hearings into the affair — a thing that was badly needed.

The book has its origins in a PhD Thesis, researched under Professor Diarmaid

Ferriter, and undertaken after Heney retired from RTE. Despite the academic provenance, the book is well argued and written in a way that will interest a general audience. The thoroughness of the research and range of sources used are impressive. Sensitive issues are examined and carefully teased out.

Heney appears to have studied every relevant book, periodical and memoir, as well as doing an extensive trawl of the archives. He has turned up material which I did not come across when researching *The Arms Trials*, including the Colonel Hefferon Papers in the Military Archive and the privately held Maguire Papers. He also found some relevant Official Paper releases which appeared later than the main batch of 2001.

Among the sources investigated for the first time were the *Peter Maguire Papers*. This Senior Counsel led the Haughey

Defence Team and, crucially, he had tape recordings of parts of the Trials. As the transcripts of the Trials have disappeared, this is a valuable resource. The newspaper reports, while reasonably comprehensive, necessarily omit legal argument in the absence of the jury. Heney transcribes some of the Maguire Tapes, which thereby come into the public domain for the first time.

Thus we learn of a particularly important dispute between Defence Counsel and the presiding Judge at the Second Trial, Séamus Henchy, about whether the arms being imported could be viewed as being for the use of the Army.

It was the Defence Case that Captain Kelly was acting on behalf of the Government, which had acceded to requests from Northern elected politicians and others to help Northern Nationalists obtain arms, to defend against further attacks.

But providing such weapons presented a problem to the Government. With no native arms industry, Irish Army weaponry was imported, under British oversight. And no one in the Government wanted the British authorities to know that Ireland was facilitating the flouting of its laws. Of course, the Protestant community was very well armed at the time. And in particular the B-Specials, a popular part-time militia, were permitted to keep their weapons at home. This timidity in Irish official circles might be regarded as a colonial inferiority complex—but at the same time it has to be remembered that Ireland was not then as powerful as it has become now—thanks in part to its membership of the EU and to Charles Haughey's periods as Taoiseach, when he facilitated the breaking of the link between the Punt and Sterling, and enabled Ireland to enter the world of Finance Capitalism. (Also, at the time Irish Governments felt somewhat beholden to the British as the intention was that Britain and Ireland, who were joined in a free trade agreement, would join the European Community simultaneously: rightly, or wrongly, it was felt that British goodwill should be maintained.)

And all Governments in Ireland were at the time caught between two conflicting aims: the protection of the Northern Ireland minority and the assertion of the claim to a 32-County State. If Dublin had been able to accept that Northern Ireland was British for the foreseeable future, it could have made a strong democratic case over various practices designed to reduce Catholic power and to encourage emigration.

In addition, Northern Ireland voters were excluded from the British ruling

parties: this meant, for instance, that Catholics, a permanent minority within NI, could not assert their rights from within the parties which formed the Government at Westminster. While the lack of democratic representation in the party structure governing the State affected all the people of Northern Ireland, Catholics were disproportionately affected.

As the Irish Government was not in a position to directly protect Northern Catholics when trouble blew up in August 1969, in response to pleas for help from Northern leaders it was decided to assist the minority with defensive military training, subsidise IRA arms imports, and help the Defence Committees obtain weaponry under the radar. Military training was given to Northerners in the Autumn of 1969. And the provision of weaponry was the subject of a formal Directive from Defence Minister Gibbons to the Army in February 1970: the Army was instructed to prepare to make arms available to the minority.

It might be mentioned here that Heney does not seem to be aware of the crucial role played by ex-servicemen in mounting a defence of Catholic areas. In many areas they played a greater role than Republican elements, especially in the earlier period. In fact, the strategy of preparing barricades—to be simultaneously erected at all the entrances into the Bogside, in a swift, defensive operation—was conceived by an ex-serviceman and then implemented by Derry people along with the Sean Keenan Republicans.

As for arms importation: Irish law lays down that the Minister for Defence may import weapons for the use of the Army without any need for Import Licences. Director of Military Intelligence, Colonel Hefferon, Captain Kelly's Commanding Officer—initially a Prosecution witness—testified at the Trials that the Minister for Defence had in February 1970 instructed the Army to make preparations to provide weapons for Catholics. (The relevant Directive to the Army is reproduced in my *Military Aspects Of The Arms Crisis*, and by Heney.) This evidence was a turning point in supporting the Defence Case.

Essentially that case was that Defence Minister Gibbons authorised Captain Kelly to undertake arms importation, to access Arms which were not directly traceable to the Army. (The British authorities had detailed knowledge of Irish Army weaponry.) Defence Minister Gibbons admitted in court that Captain Kelly had reported to him over arms-buying schemes but denied that he authorised such schemes. And he might have been believed, but for Colonel Hefferon's evidence.

Using the Maguire tapes, Michael Heney reports a crucial dispute which took place in the absence of the jury on 20th October 1970, during the Second Arms Trial. Justice Henchy told Defence Counsel that he was inclined to rule that the Arms Importation at the heart of the Prosecution could not be regarded as being for the use of the Army. Such a ruling would have badly undermined the Defence Case, which was that the Captain Kelly was acting for the Army in the Arms Importation; and that the Government Directive from the Minister for Defence to the Army authorities made the whole operation legal.

Henchy said:

"...it does not seem to me, on any version of the evidence, that such agreement [to the importation] as has been shown in evidence to have been given by the Minister, amounted or could amount to an agreement or authority to import arms for the use of the armed forces" (p308).

There was then some debate between the Judge and Captain Kelly's counsel:

Tom Finlay: "The jury must consider whether the parties entering into the agreement believed that the Minister was authorising this importation—"

Judge Henchy: "for the use of the Defence Forces?"

Tom Finlay: "for the use of the Defence Forces..."

I don't know whether your Lordship suggests that the bringing in of arms here, to be held under the control of the Defence Forces, to be held by them as surplus arms, and if and when a decision was so made, to be distributed, in contingencies, to persons outside the Defence Forces, is not a use for the Defence Forces, my Lord? But in my submission if that were the point your Lordship was making... it would be at violent variance with the ordinary meaning of the word 'use'... To say that is something that is not for the use of the Defence Forces, would be, in my submission, straining words entirely."

The Judge responded that his problem was with the phrase "*for the use of the Defence Forces*": Finlay replied:

"If your Lordship were to make a ruling along the lines which your Lordship indicated, in my submission your Lordship would be falling into error in two ways: firstly, putting an artificial and unprovided restricted meaning on the word 'use' in the Section, and secondly, your Lordship would be usurping the function of the jury" (309-20).

Niall McCarthy SC for Mr. Haughey supported Finlay: if the Defence Forces were keeping arms for a given contingency, then that was importation "*for the use of*".

Eamonn Walsh for the State supported the Judge:

"Arms can't be brought in for the use of the Defence Forces unless they are under the control of the Defence Forces. They have to become Army arms. And not even the Minister can authorise the importation of arms which are not for the use of the Defence Forces... a certain consignment of ammunition would have arrived in Dublin docks on a certain date; it would have passed into the custody of a defendant who was, it so happened, a member of the Defence Forces, and a defendant who was not, as it happened, a member of the Defence Forces... there will be... grave difficulty for the defendants to point to evidence to support the defence that we are dealing with—an importation of arms that was for the use of the Defence Forces, and which had the sanction of the Minister for Defence..." (p310-11).

In the event, Justice Henchy did not rule that the arms in question could not be viewed as "*for the use*" of the Army. But arguments about these issues were to feature in the final Prosecution arguments, where Counsel for the State Eamonn Walsh pointed to the fact that it was not the Irish State or Army which had paid for the weapons in question, but the Defence Committees. (John Kelly testified to the Public Accounts Committee Inquiry, the Government money received via the Irish Red Cross was "switched" with other money the Defence Committees had, so that it might be said that it was they who paid for the arms, see Heney page 312, but there can be no doubt that Captain Kelly, acting on behalf of the Government, fully intended to supervise the storage and giving out of the weapons.)

Walsh also stressed that a consignment of Bullet Proof Vests, which had reached Dublin, was taken away by the Northerners on 19th March, suggesting that they intended to do the same with the weapons, had they arrived.

Henchy referred obliquely to the issue in his Summing Up, when he suggested that customary practice was that items being brought in "for the use of the Army" were put into the Army armoury to be checked over and recorded, a different procedure to that proposed by Captain Kelly. However, evidence had been given at the Trials that storing the weapons in Army facilities until required had been Captain Kelly's initial plan—until dissuaded by Colonel Hefferon, who pointed out that, once in Army custody, there could be difficulties in accessing them. That is when a second plan was made, to store the plans in a monastery just across the Border.

Of course, the representatives of the Defence Committees might not have agreed with this scheme, but that is mere speculation!

Heney also points out that Minister Neil Blaney had his own ideas about who should get control of the weapons (see below).

One of the interesting stories revealed in the Heney book is that two jurors, who sat in the second Trial, approached RTE after allegations were made that the jury were intimidated into passing a Not Guilty verdict. A juror, 'Mr. B.' was interviewed about the matter in 2001. He said that the jury view quickly acquitted three defendants, but there was debate about Charles Haughey:

"... Albert Luykx, Mr Kelly, Captain Kelly, they were the first to be found not guilty by the jury itself. Because we reckoned they were acting on behalf of the Irish government, because we were sure that the army were involved and we were also sure that the Minister for Finance [Haughey] and the Minister for Defence [Gibbons] were certainly involved as well... Most of the discussion was to whether Mr Haughey was guilty or not guilty of the importation of the arms without the knowledge of the government... even if it were with the knowledge of the government... it still had to be for the use of the Irish army. Those were the instructions of the judge... The whole thing revolved around the arms being for the use of the Irish army, and that was the stumbling block really..."

The jury accepted Dept. of Justice Secretary Peter Berry's evidence that Haughey rang him on 18th April 1970, asking him to allow an expected consignment coming through Dublin Airport, to come in on condition that it would be sent straight to the North. The Judge had told the jury that, if they believed Berry, that excluded the defence argument that the weapons were for the use of the Army.

What settled the matter for the jury, however, was the evidence given at the Trial that Northerners had been given military training at the army base in Fort Dunree. These men, with addresses in Derry, had joined the FCA prior to being given training:

"We came to the conclusion that if there were members of the FCA stationed in Derry, that presumably meant the arms could have been for the use of the FCA, and their distribution of it [sic] was a matter for them to decide..." (p317-8).

That is very sophisticated reasoning and a tribute to the jury system!

Juror B added that Defence Minister's grudging admission in the Witness Box that he knew of the proposed arms shipment convinced the jury that he should have been convicted of perjury on account of his initial denials.

The juror remarked:

"...it was a completely unanimous verdict without any browbeating or anything else... And all the points were discussed completely" (p320).

He also denied that the jury had been intimidated: "*to my knowledge, nobody was ever touched. No.*" (p322).

Juror A's recollection was not as clear, but he was certain, "*The whole thing was a charade*": the Government had decided to help out Northern Nationalists with arms, but Lynch "*got coldfeet...when Cosgrave blew the whistle*" (p321).

*

Heney explodes myths, not only about Haughey, but also about Niall Blaney. He produces evidence indicating that, while Blaney—with his Donegal base—had the closest links with Northern Catholics, it was with the Nationalist Party stable, rather than the Republicans that he was linked. When it seemed in the Spring of 1970 that the Irish Army would have to provide weaponry to beleaguered Northerners in Ballymurphy for defence, it was Paddy Doherty of the Bogside—who had Nationalist Party affiliations—that he put on standby to oversee distribution (see p174). Doherty was also one of the Derry men to receive military training from the Irish Army, via the FCA (p170).

As Heney concludes about the North:

"Blaney would have been keenly aware that Fianna Fáil, a twenty-six and not a thirty-two county organization, was engaged in a nationalist turf war with the IRA; in his view, offering leadership to the Northern minority in the Six Counties was the proper duty of a Fianna Fáil government, not the preserve of IRA gunmen, Provisional or otherwise" (p168).

And I think Captain Kelly would have shared that view: in an Intelligence report in January 1970 directed to Taoiseach Lynch he stresses that Government inaction with regard to nationalist defence left this popular issue to be hegemonised by the republicans (which at the time meant the Goulding Republicans).

Heney says that John Kelly, the Northern republican prosecuted in the Arms Trial, stated that in the Autumn of 1969 the Defence Committees were on the point of importing arms from the USA. However

in early December 1969 (ie, pre-Split) Blaney forced the cancellation of this project, "using the power of the purse". He insisted that the arms should come from Europe. Heney reproduces a Justin O'Brien quotation from John Kelly:

"I think perhaps the feeling from the government... was that they would have more control over weapons coming from the Continent than they would have had over a consignment coming from New York, that was being organized by physical force republicans" (p164: see O'Brien, *The Arms Trial*, p94).

Heney concludes about Blaney that:

"What he appeared to want... was that the arms would not go to the Goulding-led IRA, nor to the Provisional IRA, but to an entirely independent republican group with no connection to republicans in the twenty-six Counties:" (p167).

Here it must be remembered that the initial leadership in the IRA split was Southern, rather than Northern. It was some years before the Provisionals became a Northern-led movement.

Incidentally, Blaney refused to condemn the Provisional campaign in later years, holding that the Irish Government had "abdicated on its responsibilities to defend nationalists' rights" (p166, see Blaney interview with Joe Jackson, *Lawyers, Guns And Money*, in *Hot Press* 14/11, 14 June 1990).

This is a thoroughly researched and readable book: I can heartily commend it to those who want to find out what really happened in the Arms Crisis.

Angela Clifford

PS:

An article by David Burke in Village magazine (June 2020, Motley crew rewrote history) has dismissed Private Eye reports at the time about an Army intervention against Special Branch, in connection with the Arms Crisis: among the stories dismissed by Burke is that there was a stand-off between Army Officers and Special Branch at Columb Barracks in Mullingar.

Whatever about the Mullingar story, a reliable source has told me that Haughey told him that there was a threatened mutiny in his support in Athlone Barracks, and that he had persuaded the soldiers not to go ahead.

The same source also told me that he witnessed Mrs. Jack Lynch thank Charles Haughey when he attended Jack Lynch's funeral in Cork.

The following article was first published forty years ago in the *Irish Communist*. It seems to be worth reprinting now that some interest is being shown in the history of the Irish Left in that period.

Greaves And A 'Rabid Trotskyist'

A book about Sean O'Casey by C.D. Greaves is something that the present writer assumed he would not be obliged to read. Having dutifully, and with considerable effort of will, read O'Casey's plays and autobiographies and Greaves's books on politics, he did not suppose that anything in life would induce him to endure the tedium of reading Greaves on O'Casey: the stage-Irish Marxist on the stage-Irish dramatist. Since art is such a subjective business, one feels entitled to one's subjective response to it. If one can [sic] see nothing in O'Casey but fake people speaking fake language and indulging in fake sentimentality, there is nothing to be done about it except to refrain from seeing O'Casey. And one felt that Greaves, who has devised a quaint variety of Marxism for the quaint Ireland of his fantasies, could not be more appropriately occupied than in writing a book about O'Casey, and that he should follow it up with books about Somerville and Ross and Synge, thereby enabling one to forget about him altogether.

The stimulus to read Greaves on O'Casey came from having attention drawn to the following paragraph, which will be found on p. 164:

"...His (O'Casey's) contemporaries in the movement thought the centre of his politics his reaction to 1916. This phenomenon is not unique. One recalls the case of the young student who went with the republicans to fight on the border in 1956. He found he was not the man for freezing in ditches at midnight. He left the zone of operations, changed his name, went to England, became a rabid anti-national Trotskyist, and finally committed suicide—all the time insisting on speaking his fluent Irish. O'Casey, with his tons of intellectual ballast, could not be capsized by a psychological storm. But he had to win the inward peace that comes from justification of oneself to oneself. The fool or criminal does not trouble. But the man of genius must. And he achieved this by projecting his ultimate vision backward."

Greaves does not give the name of this "young student": but how many people are there who were in the IRA campaign in 1956, became trotskyists, and committed suicide, having known Greaves on the way? Can Greaves name another

one besides Liam Daltun?

It so happens that I knew Daltun fairly well in the early and middle sixties, at first on a personal basis and later in a political connection. It was at his instigation that I became involved in organised politics, and I became acquainted with the rudiments of Irish socialist politics through him.

I know nothing of Daltun's personal history. Family history was not a matter that interested us—though it interested a few of the others, as I recall. Daltun had presumably been "a young student" before going off to free Ulster in 1956 but when I met him about 1960 I took him to be a building worker like myself, though with more enterprise. I had forgotten, until I saw it in Greaves, that Daltun had changed his name, and I cannot recall his original name. The elemental proletarian circles in which I moved when I met Daltun treated names as sounds that enabled one to refer to particular individuals and not as tribal badges. I assumed that Daltun had sufficient reason for changing his name, didn't inquire what it was, and never gave the matter another thought. But Greaves is a believer in pedigree.

Daltun's political history, as he told it to me for my enlightenment, and without having any axe to grind that I could see, was as follows : He went off with the IRA to free Ulster, but it struck him before very long that the operation was futile. He concluded that the IRA leadership did not live in the real world. I doubt that freezing in ditches at midnight had much to do with his defection. If he could have seen the possibility of it leading anywhere, I have no doubt that he would have frozen. I also have no doubt that Greaves probed Daltun at length with a view to ferreting out something resembling an admission that it was personal inadequacy that caused him to defect.

Since the IRA leadership in those days frankly recognised themselves as the spearhead of Catholic Ireland, and therefore denounced communism with as much conviction as the Bishops, Daltun decided to find out something about communism. There was no Communist

Party in Southern Ireland. It had gone into liquidation in 1941 rather than support the war against Nazi Germany, and had not yet reconstituted itself. What existed in the late fifties was a timid little body called the Irish Workers' League, which was highly adapted to existence in the Catholic nationalist state. It was not the sort of organisation that a man of spirit would turn to—and, indeed, it seemed to recognise its own unworthiness, and rejected applications for membership from outside Dublin (all one or two of them).

Daltun was repelled by these chamber-communists whose over-riding aim was not to offend the priests, and he went to London in search of the real thing. He contacted the Communist Party of Great Britain, and he joined it as far as I recall. But this was not the best time for an aspiring Bolshevik to discover the C.P.G.B. Its illusion that it was a party of the Bolshevik type that had recently been exploded by the combination of the 20th Congress and the Hungarian revolution. The pseudo-democratic attitude it had adopted under the influence of the 20th Congress was too much of a sham to enable it to oppose the Soviet invasion of Hungary, and it ended up combining the worst features of Stalinism and social democracy. But Daltun was prepared to take a lot on trust, believing that there must be more to this fearsome thing denounced by the Bishops than was apparent to him at first sight.

Daltun also joined the Connolly Association. The C.P.G.B. then encouraged its Irish members to join the C.A., where they participated in an inner circle of initiates. Greaves singled out Daltun as leadership material, and began grooming him. Daltun had the secrets of politics revealed to him privately in Greaves's flat in Grays Inn Road.

It was Daltun's misfortune that he was a cultured person who respected his elders and sought to learn from the older generation of communists at a moment when that older generation was unfit to teach anything but sophisticated duplicity. But he wasn't a simply respectful character. If he had been I wouldn't have got to know him. I was uncouth, and disrespectful of my elders and betters as a matter of course, and at times I recognised in Daltun a kindred spirit. He would do the proper thing for so long, but then he would suddenly realise that he was being himbugged by whoever it was that he was looking up to, and he would break free.

Greaves was his first guru in social-

ism. And Daltun must have appeared to Greaves to be the ideal disciple. On his day he was an irresistible disciple. He had in him a powerful reflex of discipleship, so he sat at the feet of this respected master and imbibed wisdom. He felt this to be such a proper thing to do that it took some time for his mind to focus on what it was that he was imbibing. But when it did he recognised it as duplicity and rebelled.

Greaves's duplicity was both organisation and political. The CA consisted of an esoteric body of CPGB members which was not acknowledged to exist and a wider organisation which declared itself to be non-socialist, though having a vague predisposition in favour of the working class. It was the business of the esoteric group to operate in the broad mass of Irish immigrants and string them along, retaining manipulative control of the whole organisation. In fact the broad mass of immigrants went nowhere near the CA, primarily because they integrated into British society with remarkable speed. And most of those who took a look at the CA because they had been warned against it by the Bishops before emigrating reacted against it with healthy distaste on first contact.

If it cannot be said that many people were actually deceived by the CA, the intent was wide-scale deception. Daltun, therefore, found that he had left a futile though honest military operation only to join a futile pseudo-communist exercise in political deception. And who was it that was in practice being deceived? Not the broad mass of the emigrants (and they were a very broad mass indeed in the late fifties and early sixties). As far as the emigrants were concerned the CA had the worst of both worlds. Those who went to England with the intention of remaining good Catholics did what the Bishops told them and kept away from it. And those who resented Church control of Southern Ireland, and couldn't wait to get on the boat so that they could stop going to Mass and suchlike, and those who searched out the Connolly Association because of what the Bishops said about it, were put off when they found it ingratiating itself with the Bishops. The deception designed to attract the mass had the effect of repelling that part of the mass which was attractive. If the CA had declared itself to be socialist, and to be opposed to clerical interference in secular affairs, it would have connected up far more effectively with the emigrants. The main victims of the deception, therefore, were the would-be Communists who were diverted into operating it.

Greaves's policy for "completing the national revolution" and opening the way for socialism, as revealed to the initiates, was also greatly convoluted, and it proved in the event to be entirely impractical. It was a policy of outmanoeuvring the Unionist workers by use of unrepresentative bodies like the Belfast Trades Council. It came to grief, and could only come to grief, at the critical moment (that is, in 1969). Roy Johnston learned what Greaves had to teach and what Daltun refused to learn. He went off to do Greaves's work in Ireland in the early sixties. When the strategy failed at the critical moment because it was only a fantasy, Johnston retired from the revolution to become a political sniper on the sidelines. He helped to start a war of a kind which he could not approve of, and blamed everything on the wickedness of honest Republicans like MacStiofain instead of the fantasy at the core of his own political strategy.

It cannot be said that Daltun produced a coherent analysis of Greaves's politics. He shied away from Greaves in honest revulsion against something he felt to be rotten.

There was one piece of Greaves's teaching that he used to repeat with astonishment. It was the characterisation of the Free State as "the most progressive state in Western Europe". This was in the days when the dictatorship of the priests was unchallenged. Roy Johnston was prepared to accept that view and put it on paper. It would be found in a magazine published by the Hammersmith Branch of the CPGB.

The other definite political idea he (Daltun) had about the CA, which I recall, was that it was inexcusable to use Connolly's name for an organisation based on a conception of the national revolution which Connolly had categorically rejected. Connolly's idea was that the national revolution and the socialist revolution were one and the same thing in Ireland. But Greaves held an extreme form of the "stages theory", holding that socialism did not become relevant until after the national revolution had been comprehensively accomplished.

Such was Daltun's account of his relations with Greaves. I observed him in Greaves's company a number of times (when they were politically hostile), and they struck me as behaving like a father and son who could not forget that they had once been close even though a shadow had come between them. But perhaps this was more in Daltun's behaviour than

in Greaves. On Greaves's part there was something of the behaviour of a scared rabbit in the presence of this physically powerful son whose sense of honesty he had outraged. Now that Daltun is dead the despicable little rabbit is taking its revenge in the only way it knows how.

When Daltun turned away in revulsion from the Connolly Association, and the CPGB which ran it, the trotskyist movement was taking off and was representing itself as fundamental Bolshevism. Since that was what Daltun was looking for, he joined the SLL, (what is now the WRP). He was one of Gerry Healy's militants for a while, but suffered no personal traumas in that respect. He then sniffed around Tony Cliff's and Ted Grant's groupings. Finally he decided to have a go at setting up something himself, which didn't have a leader and wasn't enclosed in a cocoon of fixed ideology.

Around 1961 he had a hand in a number of trotskyist/anarchist nondescript groups which published one or two issues of a paper and dissolved. Prominent in those groups was John Palmer, who represented Tony Cliff's interest and at the same time was making a career for himself as a financial correspondent in the bourgeois press. His political substance lay in the fact that he was related to Sean Treacy, of Dan Breen fame. Also involved was a Christian anarchist tendency.

In 1963 Daltun organised a series of meetings which included no ideological eccentrics and no people with ancestors. They were entirely working class in composition, and even though they were politically diverse, it was the diversity that had been produced by splits in the communist movement. It included people who had been expelled from the Connolly Association for trying to make it honestly and openly socialist, people who had resigned from the CPGB because the Party leadership had refused to do anything about election-rigging in the ETU before the matter was made a public scandal, people who were at odds with the CPGB because of the frivolous way it was handling the Sino-Soviet split, people who had been in trotskyist organisations and became dissatisfied with them, some anarchists of the Marxist variety, and some people like myself who were entirely without previous political connection.

Greaves's description of Daltun as "a rabid anti-national trotskyist" is as absurd as it is malicious. If that is what Daltun had been, life would subsequently have

been much easier for Greaves. It was Daltun who got this diverse grouping together and set it functioning as a forum of political development. He was himself vaguely predisposed in favour of Trotsky because he was appalled by the human cost of collectivisation and industrialisation in Russia, because it was Stalin who governed Russia in that period, and because from 1923 onwards Trotsky had consistently opposed Stalin. He never tried to impose this view on the meetings, or to exclude people who disagreed with him, and in discussion with me he more or less agreed that his attitude was a reflex response to the inhuman aspect of the revolution rather than an alternative policy which he considered to have been implementable. My human sympathies lay entirely with the Workers' Opposition and Kronstadt revolt. If Khruschev had rehabilitated Shliapnikov, and raised the slogan of democracy against Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin, I imagine I would have become a Khrushchevite. If Trotsky had had the integrity to condemn himself in the name of Shliapnikov for his behaviour, along with Lenin and Stalin, in 1920-23, I imagine I would have become a Trotskyist. I recognised that the Workers' Opposition would almost certainly not have been able to guide the revolution successfully along the lines they indicated, and that the Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin line of development was almost certainly the only possible one. In that case the alternative to what is glibly called Stalinism was the operation of the revolution by workers' democracy. Half a century later one was not in a position of having to, or being able to, choose which line of development to support. If one opted for the Workers' Opposition, the landlords and the bourgeoisie were not going to be brought to power as a consequence. If one opted for the Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin position, millions of people were not going to be killed by a totalitarian state as a consequence. The actual line of development was an irreversible accomplished fact. All that one was required to do was to produce an honest history of the revolution, setting out its conflicts, and trying to reach some agreement about its possibilities. And if, in the interest of developing communist democracy in the present, some movement in the past was to be invoked, then that movement should have been democratic in some meaningful sense, and should have staked its existence on democracy at a critical juncture. Neither Lenin nor Trotsky met these requirements, so it was deceptive to invoke them against Stalin. Only the Workers' Opposition did. Daltun agreed that there was something to be said for this sort of approach.

In order to bring these meetings of diverse Marxist tendencies together, and to keep them functioning to some purpose, Daltun exercised a remarkable blend of tact, charm and firmness. They threatened every moment to blow apart, and yet they never did. The meetings finally produced a definite political organisation, at which point Daltun disappeared for a long period. The role of catalyst was one he could not sustain indefinitely, nor was it required indefinitely. The fact that he undertook that role so effectively when it was required, and brought various political elements into a vital relationship with one another when their spontaneous tendency was to repel one another makes him the least "rabid" person imaginable.

The Irish Workers' Group was formed early in 1964, and it became the Irish Communist Group a couple of months later. It was established on the understanding that it would start from scratch on the formation of policy on particular subjects, leaving consideration of the splits in Bolshevism in abeyance for as long as possible: and that when this matter could not longer be deferred, it too would be discussed freely and comprehensively, and without factional manoeuvring, to see whether sufficient agreement could be found.

To say that Daltun left the IRA and became a trotskyist is true in a Jesuitical sense. But it detracts from Daltun's political history in such a way that it tells a substantial lie about him. There is, however, not even Jesuitical truth in the statement that he was "anti-national". His position on the national revolution differed from that of Greaves only insofar as the role of the bourgeoisie in it was concerned. Daltun followed Connolly, holding that the national revolution was possible only as a socialist revolution. Greaves held a flat and uninspiring variant of the two-stage theory, which led to de Valera being described in the Irish Democrat as the greatest statesman of the 20th century.

I was on the anti-national wing of the IWG/ICG. When it was proposed to publish a pamphlet on Wolfe Tone for Wolfe Tone Sunday I was horrified. It was Daltun who tried to explain to me why this was a proper thing to do. In the days of Wolfe Tone the bourgeoisie was a revolutionary class. In 20th century social conditions it could only be a counter-revolutionary class. A pamphlet on Wolfe Tone would enable one to point up the difference, and show why the bourgeoisie could not complete the national revolution.

My initial idea, based on personal experience, was that the national revolution was long since over and done with in the South ad that the ideology of Republicanism made it a lost cause with the Ulster Unionists, and I didn't see what grounds there were for denying separate national rights to the Protestants since I knew from painful experience that the Catholic Church dominated the South. Daltun had no time for that idea, nor had the diverse trends in the group who had political experience. I had no political experience, and had been infinitely more interested in Russia than in Ireland, so I was prepared to put my idea down to ignorance and decided to see what sense of things could be made on the basis of Daltun's idea, which had the virtue over Greaves's of being anti-capitalist. I eventually reverted to my initial idea and concluded that Greaves and Daltun had developed their differences within a false general position which they held in common.

The jibe about Daltun becoming "rabidly anti-national" while "all the time insisting on speaking his fluent Irish" seems to have the object of depicting him as a ridiculous imitation of O'Casey. In O'Casey the absurdity was redeemed by "genius", but this could not be the case with Daltun since he was a rabid trotskyist. It is true that Daltun spoke Irish—or that he was capable of speaking Irish. In my experience he never made an issue of speaking Irish. He never attempted to speak it to me—an authentic speaker of English from a region that had barely stopped speaking Irish, who had not intention of voluntarily reverting to a language from which his recent ancestors had freed themselves with such heroic effort. So far as I know Daltun acquired Irish because he learned from Davis and Pearse that the Irish language is necessary to Irish nationhood, and he kept it up because it was also required by Connolly's socialist-nationalist outlook. Connolly seems to have approved of Irish without actually learning it, and certainly without writing in it. But Daltun wasn't a person who did things by halves. He never made a fad of it, however. Unlike Greaves, he was not a faddy sort of person.

Greaves's dealings with Irish deserve the ridicule which he tried to heap on Daltun. He usually published a column of gibberish in the Democrat which passed master as Irish. Nothing was ever said in it, and it was riddled with typing and grammatical mistakes. But it looked sufficiently like Irish to elicit a vague feeling of cultural distinctiveness in people

who, having been through the National Schools in the Free State, were capable of recognising something that looked like Irish, though they would have been entirely incapable of reading it even if it had been readable.

It should be remarked that Daltun picked up languages easily, and that Irish was far from being the only language that he spoke in addition to his native language. It was not even his chief foreign language. When he developed a spiritual affinity with Bolshevism he learned Russian. And when he offered his services to the Algerian revolution he learned French. He read French newspapers regularly and Russian newspapers occasionally. I do not recall ever seeing him with an Irish paper. There was nothing published in Irish that could have interested him, and he was not the sort of person who would have read rubbish in Irish just to indicate that he was Irish or to make himself feel Irish. He had this hazy idea that the revival of Irish would contribute to the socialist revolution, but he had no intention of shrinking his mind down to what was available in Irish. As far as he was concerned, the Irish literature of the socialist-nationalist revolution remained to be produced.

Greaves uses Daltun as the horrible example of what O'Casey might have been if he had not been a "genius". It occurs to me therefore that Daltun might have been a Protestant by origin. I would never have thought of asking him, but Greaves would certainly have found out what he was. (It's curious how the "non-sectarians" always know a person's religion.) And if he told me I've forgotten.

Daltun, we are informed by Greaves, was either a "fool or a criminal" because he did not "miss the inward peace that comes from justification of oneself to oneself". O'Casey did this by changing is past. He arrived at an "ultimate position" of fellow-travelling with the CP. His real past, according to Greaves, was dominated by the fact that, for inadequate reasons, he had not been at the GPO in 1916. This personal failure subsequently unmanned him. He regained his manhood by finding an adequate political reason for not having been at the GPO and by pretending that that was the actual reason why he wasn't there. "He had gone back into the past, changed what happened there, and then come back into the present to enjoy the improvements. Such is the power of art."

I am not interested in whether or not this was the case with O'Casey—but it

wasn't the case with Daltun. There is undoubtedly a sort of art which operates by improving one's past in fantasy. But this is not the only way in which art operates. If Daltun had gone in for fiction-writing I imagine he would have resembled Heinrich von Kleist or Lermontov rather than O'Casey—or Liam O'Flaherty as the nearest Irish equivalent. He would have forged pieces of reality out of his own powerful and contradictory existence, rather than sought relief from inadequacy in a fantasy reliving of his past.

I assume that he committed suicide (in the early seventies) because, under pressure of the Catholic-nationalist war on the Protestant working class, he was unable to forge any acceptable line of political action out of the contradictions of his position. There are some people who do not agree to live merely because they find themselves alive. One does not feel that O'Casey was prevented from killing only by "his tons of intellectual ballast", (a curious phrase that, intellectual dead weight, intellectual bilge!) And Greaves certainly lives as a matter of bureaucratic, almost priestly, routine. But Daltun was far from being unique in requiring an object in life, and in killing himself because the political object on which he had staked his existence broke down. I don't know whether he left an explanation of why he was about to kill himself. I doubt it. He wasn't given to dramatising himself. But I wasn't at all surprised to hear of his suicide at that particular time, and I found it as comprehensible as the suicides of von Kleist, or Hugo Wolfe or A.A. Joffe. The malicious little bureaucrat takes his revenge by patronising reference to "a psychological storm". But such storms can only be generated by powerful psyches. Only powerful characters can pass such judgements on themselves and execute them.

Greaves's description of O'Casey's genius altering the past is presumably a piece of devious self-revelation. Daltun attempted to alter the present in certain ways, but Greaves's main activity is to alter the past in order to present the status quo in a better light. I never had any personal dealings with Greaves, who impressed me the first time I saw him as a devious and malicious person. I observed that he had moulded himself into a sort of socialist parish priest. His manner was that of a cantankerous P.P. I suppose that, as an English socialist, he concluded that the Southern Irish were incorrigibly Roman Catholic in their reflexes, and that he therefore presented himself with priestly

attributes which they could relate to. He succeeded in building up a little congregation around himself, and soon acquired a good imitation of a curate in the person of Sean Redmond.

The priest is at his most influential when he is supposed to have a board of esoteric knowledge. The most effective way to curb curiosity is to make people feel that knowledge of everything important exists even though it is unknown to them, and to drop them a tit-bit every now and then. That was how Greaves operated. The Republican Congress was then a largely unknown event of supposedly great significance, to which Greaves and a few others made cryptic reference every now and then. When the ICO was established it took it as its first objective to spoil the capital of this ersatz priest by gathering information about the Republican Congress and other events and organisations and publishing it. In the course of this work it was discovered that Connolly had written numerous articles of a kind not represented in the existing selections or drawn attention to in Greaves biography, e.g. Press Poisoners in Ireland, giving expression to class antagonism within the national movement. In 1966-67 I did a number of meetings in Dublin on the Republican Congress and these Connolly articles. These were attended by Roy Johnston and some others of the new Republican leadership. Johnston was having difficulty in re-educating the IRA in accordance with the ideology devised for it by the CPGB. Greaves's slippery formulations were not the thing for capturing the imagination of the legion of the rearguard. People accustomed to sharply etched ideas and clear lines of policy which offered the prospect of purposeful action did not provide the best ground for the reception of Greaves's vague and convoluted verbiage. ICO pamphlets such as The Working Class in the National Revolution and The Republican Congress would have been infinitely more serviceable in the cause of re-educating the IRA in a world outlook. And since then there was a certain formal similarity between the position of Greaves and of the ICO, Johnston hoped to use the ICO material in the IRA. Indeed if we had only stopped calling ourselves [missing word, but clearly 'Communists'] we would probably have been offered the job of political educators of the IRA. But we made it clear that we had no interest in such a job. Johnston probably couldn't believe that to be the case. At an rate he revealed to me some of the secrets of what he considered to be real politics after a

meeting that I had done on Connolly. He explained to me that we were very naïve if we thought that these articles we had discovered were unknown to Greaves, and that we were badly mistaken if we thought that Greaves had suppressed them in order to represent Connolly as less of a socialist and more of a nationalist than he really was. The truth was quite the opposite. We supposed, on the basis of these few articles, that the socialist side of Connolly had been suppressed. But Greaves knew all that there was to know about Connolly, and he had presented the best image of Connolly as a Marxist that could be presented. If we persisted in searching out and publishing Connolly articles we would spoil everything, and we would discover that Connolly wasn't half the Marxist that Greaves depicted him as being. In a society like Ireland it was of immense advantage to socialists if they could relate to a great Marxist figure in the past who had been central to political developments. Greaves had taken Connolly and made him into a Leninist, and with his exhaustive scholarship he had confused matters so thoroughly that it would be extremely difficult for the bourgeoisie to unravel the tangle he had made.

Some time after this a leading member of the CPNI, Sean Morrissey, said much the same thing to Sean Kearney. Morrissey was not an admirer of Greaves, but he thought that Connolly was best left alone as a myth. The fact was that he had nothing like a Leninist position on the World War. He supported German imperialism.

Since the ICO was not in the business of myth-making it persisted with its investigation of the actual activities of the person called James Connolly and discovered that it was indeed the case that he had not sustained a coherent Marxist position in politics, and that he had not

taken up a position similar to Lenin's on the war but had supported the imperialist power whose victory was in the interest of the nationalist movement in which he was involved.

Greaves's alterations of the past, needless to say, did not alter the present. In 1969 the tortuous duplicity of Greaves and Johnston gave way to the coherent politics of Mac Stiofain. But Greaves and Johnston survived the collapse of their schemes with the greatest of ease. They passed no judgement on themselves. It would be intolerable if Greaves's spiteful little epitaph on Daltun were allowed to stand.

The ICG split in 1965 and Daltun went in the opposite direction from me. His colleagues of the late sixties are now too busy with their journalistic careers in the Sunday World to say a word for him, and in any case I imagine that his fierce honesty made him uncongenial company for Eamon McCann and Gerry Lawless. Daltun was an unlucky person. He was unlucky to come under Greaves's influence when entering socialist politics and to end up with Lawless and McCann. For about two years, between 1963 and 1965, Daltun was his own man and he acted to considerable political effect. When Lawless (a kind of trotskyist Greaves) decided to split the ICG he managed to drive Daltun in the wrong direction with a barrage of jibes and taunts. He then tried to use Daltun as a thug to dispose of me. But Daltun wasn't a thug. And he was as much beyond Lawless's conception of thugs as he was beyond Greaves, since neither of them placed any value on subjective honesty and both of them grossly overestimated the political effectiveness of duplicity.

Brendan Clifford
Irish Communist, No. 172,
April 1980

British Labour Governments

The late great Desmond Greaves, a card-holding Communist, used defend Fianna Fail from the charge that it was just another capitalist gang. Under de Valera, he said, it fulfilled the role that the Labour Party played in Britain. Beyond that, he said, Fianna Fail was anti-Imperialist.

He knew that the British Labour

Party contained many anti-Imperialists, some of them members of the Connolly Association, or its good friends such as Fenner Brockway(1888-1988).

But a Labour Party whose first Cabinet Minister, Arthur Henderson, approved of the execution of James Connolly in 1916, and a Dominions Secretary, J.H. Thomas, so hostile to Ireland and to de Valera per-

sonally in the 1930s, that both Thomas and Dev featured in a British comic song—"The Day That Chelsea Went And Won The Cup" (available on-line)—has never been anti-Imperialist in body and soul.

Following the Second World War, it was a Labour Government that sent troops to Greece in support of Fascists who had collaborated with the Nazis; and to Malaya—where they established Concentration Camps; used Agent Orange on vegetation, people, birds and animals; and committed murderous atrocities. Some British "anti-terrorists" had themselves photographed flaunting the severed heads of their victims.

General Frank Kitson, whose anti-insurgency baptism had been in Palestine, tutored by ex-Black and Tans, found his vocation in Malaya under a British Labour Government.

The 1965 Holocaust in Indonesia in 1965 was sponsored by a Labour Government, led by Harold Wilson. The Foreign Secretary was the lacklustre Michael Stewart, and the Defence Secretary—who expressed himself pleased by the affair—was probably the most impressive politician in Britain, Denis Healey. Certainly Wilson, Stewart and Healey were prime movers in the Indonesian murders. Were they the only Labour Ministers or MPs in the know?

Wilson was instrumental in the takeover by British Secret Agents of the direction of the *Irish Times*, masterminded by Sir Andrew Gilchrist, the grisly eminence behind the Indonesian murders, and was in Office (if not in power) when British security personnel murdered over thirty men, women and children, and maimed hundreds more in Dublin and Monaghan in 1974.

The Defence Secretary was Roy Mason, who possibly had an agenda of his own. Mason later served as Northern Ireland Secretary, antagonising all Nationalist opinion, however mild.

And it was a Labour Government which launched the unprovoked murderous war on Iraq in 2003, from which Tony Blair emerged with diminished respect and a fat fortune.

Donal Kennedy

VE-Day Trinity Students Likened to Nazi Students In Prague

This May 8th, an article by Ronan McGreevy, to mark the 75th anniversary of VE-Day, was published online by the *Irish Times*, under the heading and subheading: "*VE-Day 75—Haughey, FitzGerald and that Irish Times frontpage. Trinity students' provocative decision to raise the Union flag led to riotous scenes*". McGreevy's narrative proceeded:

"At 1.25pm on May 7th, 1945 Germany surrendered to the Allies in the town of Rheims in France, the headquarters of Allied supreme commander Dwight D Eisenhower... The news reached Ireland at 2pm via BBC radio. By 3pm students at Trinity College, Dublin (TCD), climbed on to the roof of the building and raised the flags of the victors, the hammer and sickle of the Soviet Union, the French tricolour and at the top, and largest of all, the Union flag. Underneath them, the Irish tricolour was at the bottom of the mast trailing on the floor of the roof. The flag-raising ceremony attracted thousands of onlookers to College Green. Carried away with the exuberance of it all, some of the students on the roof started singing 'God Save the King' and 'Rule Britannia'. The four flags were taken down after a while and replaced with the Stars and Stripes. The students on the roof burned the Irish tricolour and threw it on to the lawn beneath. News of the burning spread across the city. At the time TCD was regarded as a bastion of "west Brit" sentiment and of Protestantism, not helped by the prohibition on Catholics going to the college by the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin Dr John Charles McQuaid."

"University College Dublin (UCD), then based at Earlsfort Terrace, was its mirror opposite. The overwhelming majority of its students were from a nationalist and Catholic background. Among them was an 18-year-old commerce student from Donnycarney called Charles J Haughey who had won a scholarship to UCD... Haughey is alleged to have been the ringleader of a counter demonstration which began in Middle Abbey Street at 8pm that evening. On their way to the meeting, they tore down a Union flag hanging on a lamppost at the bottom of Grafton Street and set it alight. After congregating in Middle Abbey Street, the mob then marched over O'Connell Bridge, breaking windows in the offices of *The Irish Times* in Fleet Street as they passed, the paper perceived to be pro-British. The gates of Trinity College were closed so the group tried to scale the railings of the university at which point they were set upon by gardaí who baton charged them and split more than a few

heads. A dozen protesters were taken to hospital... One of the eyewitnesses to the events at Trinity College was Garret FitzGerald, another future taoiseach who would become Haughey's long-time rival. He was in town celebrating VE Day when he heard about what was going on in College Green. He recalled Haughey escaping from gardaí by "jumping over bicycles and going up Trinity Street. My views and his views would have been different. I was strongly pro-Allied". The story made the front page of most Irish newspapers including *The Irish Times*. The edition of *The Irish Times* published on May 8th, 1945 proved to be one of the celebrated in the history of the newspaper. The editor Bertie Smyllie was strongly pro-British and bridled against the strict Irish government censorship of newspapers, especially *The Irish Times* which was minutely scrutinised by censors. He got his revenge by rearranging the front page of the newspaper to make a V for victory sign..."

McGreevy is the trusted custodian of the *Irish Times* historical "record" of itself. As in so many of his previous narratives, his account of what happened in Dublin on 7th May 1945, was judiciously selective as to what he chose to omit from follow-up issues of his own paper, and which shed much clearer light on that day's events.

Those students of Trinity College Dublin who ascended the roof of that edifice to raise the Union Jack above the Tricolour, and who then tore down the latter and set it alight, had indeed committed an outrageous "*Croppies Lie Down*" provocation. But McGreevy failed to record what the *Irish Times* itself subsequently recorded over the following fortnight. The Trinity College authorities formally apologised for its students' Empire Loyalist provocation, while many other Trinity students—predominantly Southern Protestant in background and affirming their patriotic allegiance to this State—also came out publicly to denounce those actions. It was maintained by some of them that, far from being "*anti-fascists*", the offending culprits were actually a group of Ulster Orangemen who had safely sat out the War in Dublin as Trinity students.

Moreover, with the exception of myself over the course of more than a dozen years, nobody else has seen fit to record the commentary on that provocation provided by Hubert Butler. A fervent anti-Nazi, Butler

had journeyed to post-Anschluss Third Reich Vienna in 1938-39 in order to work tirelessly with the *Kagran Group* that would manage to secure the exit of 120 Jewish refugees, thereby enabling them to evade what otherwise would have been their Holocaust fate. Notwithstanding Butler's offensive belief in the intellectual superiority of his own Anglo-Irish caste when compared with the Catholic Irish, he was a self-described Irish Protestant Republican who had been sufficiently patriotic as to explode with indignation at the Trinity College provocation.

See www.independent.ie/opinion/letters/incisive-analysis-by-butler-missed-28957617.html for a 2013 letter from me in this regard.

In the *Irish Times* on 12th May 1945 an anonymous correspondent styling himself "Cato" had tried to minimise the outrage caused by that provocation with a diversionary reference to de Valera's visit to German Minister Hempel: "*Let us not lose all sense of proportion. Weigh an unpremeditated act of bravado by an excited schoolboy who ought to have known better, over that moral horror—a visit of condolence on the death of Nero*". The *Irish Times* of May 21st saw Butler reply as follows and, in the process, forcefully challenge the Churchillian myth-making 'history' that was already well under way:

"Your correspondent 'Cato' chose his name oddly ... Both Cato the Censor and his great-grandson would have found much to admire in Mr. de Valera's rather academic and unfashionable consistency. Hitler, Mussolini and, quite recently, Franco, received many compliments in the time of their prosperity from British Ministers, including Mr. Churchill. Shortly before the war, in a broadcast speech, Mr. Churchill referred to 'that great man Adolph Hitler'. Dachau Camp was at that time in existence. Mr de Valera's official condolences, at a time of utter ruin, compared with these tributes, seem in no way remarkable. If the mean and hypocritical Franco should join his two friends, is it likely the British Government will withhold the customary condolences? I hardly think so. The code of diplomatic politeness is a very queer one. His Holiness the Pope sent his congratulations to Hitler on his escape from assassination. Mr. Churchill has not ventured to insult him, as he has insulted Mr. de Valera for his neutrality. I wonder why. It is possible that Mr. de Valera was genuinely sorry for Herr Hempel, about whose undiplomatic activities so many lies have been told. The American Government is now in occupation of the German Legation. It

· Biteback · Biteback

Unpublished Letter To *Irish Times*

Leopold II And Roger Casement

Naomi O'Leary says that "Time's up for Leopold II, Belgium's butcher of the Congo" (11 June) and his statues may be removed in Belgium. If so, should they not be replaced by at least one of Roger Casement? If removing Leopold does not prove possible perhaps one of Casement facing him would be even more appropriate for the historical record to be appreciated.

Jack Lane (11.6.20)

Correction to Slander of Frank Ryan Not Published by *Irish Times*

Stephen Collins on Frank Ryan

Under the heading of "FF and FG have to take fight to SF on social media" (*Irish Times*, June 5), Stephen Collins bemoans the absence of any evidence that those near betrothed parties "are up to the job" of denouncing "Nazi collaborator Frank Ryan".

That, of course, is slander. In January 1942 Ryan wrote to Leopold Kerney, the Irish Minister in Madrid: "In time of national crisis like this, there must be unified command. The country comes before party. So, in his neutrality policy—which is the only sane policy under the circumstances—Dev should get 100% support."

In an April 1975 interview with the veteran *Irish Times* political correspondent Michael McInerney, ex-President de Valera said : "I am very pleased that you are writing the biography of this great Irishman. Frank Ryan always put Ireland first in everything he did or said, at home or abroad. He has earned his place in history."

Unless, of course, FF is on the point of shedding all its Dev traditions, somehow I don't see it responding to that particular Collins invitation. But, for that reason, neither do I see FG being shamed by Collins into rallying behind his anti-Ryan clarion call. In October 2017 the *Irish Times* reported FG Taoiseach Varadkar as praising Dev in the following terms:

"Ireland benefitted from single-minded determination during the Second World War, as de Valera affirmed our independence, and pursued a neutral course even in the face of considerable hardships and threats. That was probably his finest hour, building on some of his political successes in the 1930s."

Manus O'Riordan

will be able to tell us if scope or accommodation has been found there for those eighty intriguing secretaries, so much advertised in the British press."

"Cato" wishes us to get the T.C.D. episode into proportion. Let us, therefore, look for its equivalent in some other small nation with an unassimilated minority. Let us suppose that 'an excited schoolboy, who should have known better', from the Sudetenland, were to hang a swastika in pre-war days from the famous University of the German ascendancy in Prague. It would be a most natural thing to do. Would the Czechs dismiss it with 'Boys will be boys'! An officer in the National Army, with no liking for the Nazis, made to me this comment on one of the letters you have printed from Trinity students: 'Was it the insult to the flag or the insult to the bystanders he minded? Why does he keep saying "the Irish flag" instead of "our flag" or "the national flag"? Analogous questions are today being asked in every country in Europe."

Butler's words were very much to the point. They recognised the essential equivalence of such "*Croppies Lie Down*" Union Jackery and Nazi German flag-waving over those regarded as *untermenschen*. Successive Editors have, however, demonstrably failed to include that incisive analysis in any of the numerous editions of Hubert Butler's writings that have been regularly published over the past four decades.

Manus O'Riordan

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

Does It Stack Up?

BREXIT

We live in interesting times indeed. BREXIT is a major economic and social event which will continue far into the future to have major consequences in the UK and also in Ireland. And yet it has had to take a back seat when COVID 19 was presented and publicised as a major death-dealing pandemic by the World Health Organisation (WHO). But what happens to BREXIT now? The media, including the English *Financial Times*, is very quiet on the matter. Things are drifting along . . .

Neither the European Union (EU) nor the European Central Bank has, neither of them, covered themselves in glory over the past six months. Are they relevant to our lives? Not really. The EU came very close to a breakdown when it did not deal with the COVID 19 pandemic. Every Member State of the EU had to deal with the epidemic on their own. No EU leadership was effectively to be seen and EU public servants have been silent for the past three or four months. They were unquestionably on full pay, even though the EU income was falling due to the enormous drop in Value Added Tax (VAT). There seems to be an iron law that public service pay and pensions do not drop—but then it is the public servants who make our laws and they have their hands always in our pockets.

But what about BREXIT? Will the exit process be dragged on and on? There were so many deadlines that the word *deadline* has lost its meaning in the BREXIT context and it looks like after the next deadline the BREXIT process will rise up again and drag itself along to the next deadline. Like everything else going on these days we'll just have to wait and see. The politicians themselves do not seem to know what is going on and anything is possible. Just hope that in the meantime the EU stays afloat.

The Government.

At the time I write this on 24th June 2020 there is no Government. There has been no Government since the previous Dáil was dissolved. And no Taoiseach and no Ministers even though the media have continued to call the former office-holders "Taoiseach" and "Minister" as they deem appropriate.

There has been quite a lot of "*deeming*" going on recently. The Dáil has been deemed to have met to pass "*necessary laws*" even though all the TDs were not permitted to attend at the one time, due to COVID 19 social distancing observances. However, a full meeting of the Dáil has been called for Saturday 27th June 2020 at the National Convention Centre where Social Distancing will be possible. Whether Mr. Leo Varadkar has decided on one-metre or two-metre social distance is not yet announced as I write. Or perhaps that is a matter for the Ceann Chomhairle to decide.

Yesterday, 23rd June, Mr Micheál Martín threw a new spanner into the works when he said he would not rule out talks with Sinn Féin if the Fine Gael, Fianna Fáil, Greens agreement is not ratified by all three parties. Up to now, and for years past, Mr. Martín has absolutely ruled out any form of liaison between Fianna Fáil and Sinn Féin and so this is a new scenario for Fianna Fáil to think about.

Quo Vadis? some of them must be thinking. It does not stack up.

According to Article 18 of *The Constitution of Ireland*, eleven members of the Seanad are to be nominated by the Taoiseach

"who is appointed next after the re-assemble of Dáil Eireann following the dissolution thereof".

So Mr. Varadkar could not nominate the eleven Senators because he has not been elected Taoiseach by the re-assembled Dáil. But it is reported in the media that, even if the three parties do not agree to form a Government, and do not agree to elect Mr. Micheál Martín as Taoiseach on Saturday 27th June 2020, Mr. Varadkar is intent on the Dáil meeting and having a vote on the position of Taoiseach.

This could get interesting because of who will be the candidates proposed. If Mr. Martín is proposed without agreement from the Green Party, it is really taking it down to the wire! A move in such circumstances may cause some Greens to break ranks and vote him in. Or it may give an opportunity for some dissatisfied Fianna Fáil members to break ranks and confirm his non-election. On the other hand, should Mr. Varadkar be proposed, he might receive support from some unexpected quarter and be elected: but more likely he would be rejected, thus giving him grounds to go to the President to dissolve the Dáil.

However, in that event, the President has the power under Article 13.2:

"The President may in his absolute discretion refuse to dissolve Dáil Eireann on the advice of a Taoiseach who has ceased to retain the support of a majority in Dáil Eireann."

Also, the media report that, if an agreement is not reached with the Green Party on Friday 26th June 2020, Mr. Varadkar is intent on having the eleven Senators appointed by the whole Dáil voting for them. This is not permitted by the Constitution. It just does not stack up at all, at all.

COVID 19

This pandemic is still raging around the world and, if it follows the pattern of previous pandemics, it will be with us for a few years in reducing severity of incidence, but with varying degrees of severity in individual cases and, even after it appears to die out, it is likely to remain in Nature in the background as other viral outbreaks have done.

It would appear that a total lockdown was not necessary, once people took sensible hygienic precautions such as hand-washing and using masks if coughing or sneezing to protect others from one's germs. Distancing is also important, particularly in places of assembly, such as cafés, restaurants, cinemas and aeroplanes and queues generally. It was not necessary to close down libraries, public meetings in the open air, sports matches except contact sports such as rugby, and certainly it was not necessary to close down beaches, strands and public parks, provided social distancing was observed.

Several matters require attention from the authorities for future protection from viral infection: -

- * Sports and gym changing rooms must be constructed so as to allow at least one metre between people.
- * Re-circulation of air must not be permitted in air-conditioning systems in aeroplanes, ships, coaches, trains, public performance indoor spaces, cinemas, apartment blocks etc.

In particular, the circulation of air in high-flying aircraft must be completely re-designed. It was recognised even before COVID 19 that a trip as a passenger on a plane in the winter months was a sure guarantee of catching a cold, flue or even a chest infection.

- * Standard design of all public washrooms should provide automatic or foot-operated flushing and water emission systems to avoid touching by hand. This standard should apply to all licensed premises such as bars, restaurants, cafes, trains, planes, hospitals, hotels etc. These devices need not be electrical, they could be designed to be mechanically operated.

* Seats in public transport, in planes, in cinemas and theatres and in churches will have to be designed so as to enable distancing. This will mean a big cultural change and a restructuring in financial returns as well as in physical features, but is necessary if we are serious about viral and bacterial control in future.

Micheal Stack ©

TRIBUNAL continued

"I've had no discussion with Owen O'Callaghan, good, bad or indifferent since ... I want to make that very clear".

"Mr Martin was at the Mahon Tribunal yesterday to battle just the sort of unfortunate public associations that arise from mere proximity to flying mud. He was certainly done no favours when it finally emerged that in June 1991, at the time of the local elections, Mr Martin received a £5,000 political donation from Mr O'Callaghan.

"Nor did it look good that most of that money, apart from a sum turned into cash, was lodged to his wife's account in the AIB—at a branch in Dublin, not Cork.

"Mr Martin battled yesterday: "I was the senior party person in the south central ward and would have had responsibility for ensuring a good performance in that ward. I needed support not just for myself but the party. He did give me the money.

"There was no issuing of receipts at that time in respect of election contributions. That was not the practice."

"Mr Martin next found himself embroiled in the wider tangle of Bertie Ahern's relationship with developers at a time of eyebrow-raising lodgements.

"It was starting to look like the Bertie-gate controversy all over again; and when the issue blew up—just before lunch—Mr Martin was taken aback.

"The tribunal, for the first time, put an entry from Bertie Ahern's ministerial diary on the screen.

"The public didn't know what it was missing. The public gallery, instead of being thronged with shoals of onlookers as last September, stood all but empty.

"Mr Martin had just finished telling the tribunal that, while he knew his fellow Corkonian, he was certainly not O'Callaghan's 'political associate', as described by the 'Sunday Business Post' back in 1992.

"He had never brought Owen O'Callaghan to meet other politicians, or had hands-on involvement of that type with any of his projects, the Minister for Enterprise, Trade and Employment insisted.

"And then came the unpleasant surprise. Counsel for the tribunal, Patricia Dillon SC, called for a page from Bertie Ahern's ministerial diary to be put on display.

"The entry was for Wednesday, April 13, 1994. At 3.30 pm on this day, the entry in the diary for the Minister for Finance, Bertie Ahern, showed an appointment with one "Eoin O'Callaghan", the developer's name rendered in the Irish spelling of his Christian name.

"Below it on another line, but clearly appended to the same engagement, was

the name of "M Martin."

"Mr Martin agreed that was what the diary said—even though minutes earlier he had stated that he never accompanied Owen O'Callaghan at meetings with other politicians.

"Asked if there could have been such a meeting on that day in Government Buildings, Mr Martin said he "certainly had no recollection" of any meeting between himself, Mr O'Callaghan and Bertie Ahern in 1994.

""I don't have a memory," he added.

"This diary entry is entirely new, tribunal watchers noted yesterday.

"Mr Ahern is on the record as stating that he never got so much as "a cup of tea" or a "glass of water" from Mr O'Callaghan, but evidence of an apparent meeting while he was Minister of Finance may be uncomfortable.

"It is a safe bet that Mr Martin didn't like seeing it, although in fairness nothing is proved by the diary entry itself, while memory can easily blot out something from 13 years ago.

"But sight of the entry, on the other hand, did nothing to restore Mr Martin's recall.

"Counsel for the tribunal tried to help. She wondered whether it would assist him to know that Mr Ahern had a meeting in Los Angeles on the matter of a National Stadium the month before. Mr Martin said he was unaware of such a meeting, but one sensed the question was not being particularly directed at him anyway.

"The minister remained unable to be of assistance.

"Afterwards when questioned, he declared: "I've made my point to the tribunal, that's the proper place to make it. I'm not commenting any further"."(Irish Independent, 16.11.2007)

New Party Divide?

LETTER, IRISH EXAMINER,

26.06.2020

The current party divide in Irish politics originated over the so called 1921 'treaty', the divide was essentially between Sinn Fein and the Rest. In the next government it will be essentially Sinn Fein versus the Rest. And we are assured by 'those in the know' that 'Civil War' politics is dead!

The divide then and its continuation was based on different attitudes towards Ireland's relationship with the UK. What has changed is that one of the Sinn Fein offshoots, Fianna Fail, has joined with the other offshoot, Fine Gael, who accepted the logic of the 'treaty' and its subservient role towards the UK.

That has created a vacuum that Sinn Fein to-day, whether it wanted to or not, or whether it can or not, has to fill to justify its existence in Irish Politics in the Republic. It cannot forever live off its achievements in Northern Ireland.

It must replace Fianna Fail: it will be given a great opportunity to begin to do so in the forthcoming years when commemorating the destruction of the Irish Republic that people had voted, fought and died for against the terrorism of the British and the Free State as the founders of Fianna Fail had done. It will only be doing what Sinn Fein did then, led by its President, Eamon de Valera. If it can't do that and graciously accept his and his supporters role in the foundation events of the state, and just become another left-wing party, they will wither on the vine.

They must steal Fianna Fail's historic clothes which should be easy, as Fianna Fail itself has discarded them—and then wonder why the party's at the bottom of every poll.

Civil war politics alive and well?

PAT MALONEY,
Editor,
Labour Comment,
Roman Street,
CORK CITY.

A Perplexed Fianna Failer!

"My ballot papers sits on the desk in front of me; for the third time in a week I have taken it out hoping for divine inspiration.

I phone my 89-year-old mother and ask, what would my Dad have done? A lifelong supporter of Fianna Fáil, he was always pragmatic - could he have countenanced the ultimate compromise, a coalition with the old enemy?

We ponder but no answer is forthcoming. Do whatever your heart tells you, my mother says. In my heart is only anger and frustration. I look at the ballot paper one again and curse Micheál Martin, I curse the Fianna Fáil parliamentary party for putting its members in a position nobody wanted.

If we vote for it will we destroy Fianna Fáil? Vote against and we are warned of dire consequences to the State.

I wonder where the grassroots of the party are hiding? Barely a whimper of dissent. What has happened to the great Fianna Fáil machine built from every parish in the country, the men and women who would lay siege to Dáil Éireann to support Charlie or would storm out of a meeting with fists clenched on a matter of principle? Are these passionate men and women who I remember dead and buried or has their passion been worn down?

I look at the ballot paper again.

Damned if I do, damned if I don't.

So I don't.

Two wrongs don't make a right. I tear up the ballot paper and throw it in the bin.

Bobby O'Neill
Irish Examiner, 26.06.20

FF/FG continued

Agricultural Rates with a Land Tax. The 'Kulaks' would have none of it and less so the elected Representatives.

Housing

Overall, those opposed to the deal feel the section on housing is vague and doesn't commit to the kind of transformation that they had hoped to see. There is not enough progress on the delivery of public housing and the language on affordable and social schemes is vague.

Climate

Green Party members have cast doubt on commitments to the environment. They had hoped that the plan would commit to a 7% reduction in carbon emissions per year.

However, that figure will be an average, with Tánaiste Simon Coveney telling the Fine Gael parliamentary party that the cut in emissions could be backloaded to the latter half of the decade. Some Green members are aware that they may not be in government for that period (see Irish Examiner, 18.6.2020).

FIANNA FAIL DISSENTERS

A Fianna Fáil councillor said she believes party leader Micheál Martin won't hold her opposition to the planned government formation against her.

Cllr Deirdre Kelly, like a large number of other party members all over the country, is part of Fairer Future, a group formed to defeat the Programme for Government (PfG) negotiated by Fine Gael, the Green Party and the leadership of Fianna Fáil. The West Cork Councillor said:

"There's a huge cohort of Fianna Fáil members around the country and many of us were speaking with each other. We aren't happy with the decision to enter into a coalition based on the fact that we canvassed to deliver real change during January and February, prior to the General Election.

"We believe that a government with Fine Gael doesn't constitute change, it's just a continuation of the same. We feel we would be letting the members and voters down", she said.

Cllr Kelly added:

"I don't want to go into coalition with any party and wanted Fianna Fáil in government.

However, that's not what was voted for given that 75% of the voters voted for the three main parties. It's not about me or Fianna Fáil, it's about what the electorate wanted and I believe that all parties and

none should have entered into talks to provide a national unity government for a period of perhaps one year."

No wonder the Councillors are worried, in the third week of June, an Ipsos-MRBI poll for the Irish Times put the party on just 13%—four points below the worst ever election in February, 2011. Not just TDs Eamon O Cuiv and John Lahart, but a body of Local Councillors believe that, if Fianna Fail and Fine Gael share government, and face off against Sinn Fein, there will not be room for the two traditional ruling parties in Irish politics.

Varadkar has twigged onto this and has started setting out his stall for the next election, allowing Martin to flounder in his endeavour to cobble together a coalition where he is Taoiseach! Varadkar's remarks on Inheritance Tax are directed at our sacred property-owning classes, and the "*Accidental Landlord*" element, who are slowly leaving Fianna Fail and embracing the Blueshirts!

"This coalition government could put a century of discord behind us... The importance of tribal identity has faded as the old rivals align with each other on policy" (Pat Rabbitte, former Labour leader, *Business Post*, 21.6.2020).

LABOUR SUPPORTS TROIKA!

A poll conducted by the Mail on Sunday (21.6.2020) showed Labour voters would be 79% behind the deal if they had the choice, compared with just 15% of Social Democrats and 3% of Sinn Fein supporters. The Labour choice of support even surpassed Fianna Fail (78%) and Fine Gael (75%).

Speaking about the poll results, Dr. Kevin Cunningham of Ireland Thinks said:

The last time Fianna Fail had this level of support was when the Troika had arrived in Ireland. In 2011, Fianna Fail was unpopular, to-day Fianna Fail is irrelevant.

"Irish politics is polarising around Fine Gael and Sinn Fein. This is making it increasingly difficult for Fianna Fail to maintain visibility." A stint as Taoiseach for Micheal Martin might help but would that be adequate to improve the fortunes of the party. (Mail on Sunday, 21.6.2020).

SOCIAL PARTNERSHIP

Apparently—

"Fianna Fail wanted to get a return to the

Social Partnership process, so that unions and employers would be brought into the drawing up of the National Recovery Plan alongside the October budget" (*Business Post*, 21.6.2020).

No way was Fine Gael going to accept that nonsense, so an agreement to set up a form of social partnership called a "new model of engagement with citizens, sectors, and regions". Danny McCoy will be delighted.

ISRAEL STICKS IN ITS NOSE!

Having achieved such success in its activities in the UK of undermining the Labour Party's bid for power, Israeli ambassador to Ireland Mr. Ophir Kariv was carrying out "a heavy lobbying campaign" (*Business Post*, 21.6.2020), contacting the negotiating teams in the Government formation talks on the issue of the ban on the sale of goods made in certain Israeli occupation areas in the West Bank and Gaza. He was supported by pro-Zionist US Congress members writing in support of the Isreali position.

They need have no worries: both Fianna Fail and Fine Gael will concur with the Zionists, and probably send a strongly worded text prattling on about "expansion of illegal settlements".

Having spent a million Euros to gain a position in the Division Two league of the Security Council, the UK and US and Israel won't have too many problems dealing with the vipers in Iveagh House.

Down Memory Lane —well almost!

Political choirboy keeps a firm grip on his halo! (Irish Independent, 16.11.2007)

"Oops! Micheal Martin's halo slipped a fraction at the Mahon tribunal yesterday.

"The minister has always maintained a political choirboy image since first elected to the Dail in 1989.

"He had plenty of dealings with Owen O'Callaghan when Mr Martin was Lord Mayor of Cork in 1992 and the developer was a welcome friend of Fianna Fail.

"But O'Callaghan, the subject of a morsel of allegations by his rival developer Tom Gilmartin, is no longer a man that all politicians wish to be associated with in the public mind.

"Mr Martin himself made this point yesterday, stitching into the record that

continued on page 29

FF/FG continued

THE PROGRAMME

The draft *Programme for the Government* document runs to 50,000 words. It is a *magnum opus* of intentions, platitudes and political delaying tactics.

Its intentions are good, especially around issues like childcare, quality of life and tackling climate change.

For the Greens there is apparent agreement on small-scale environmental issues: retro-fitting, emissions, public transport and footpaths: but there are no serious gains on housing, farming and economic policy. There are big promises on reviews, but a political promise is not necessarily a gain.

The party has lost out on claims for a Wealth Tax, Flight Tax, Site Valuation Tax, a Windfall Tax and, symbolically, a Carbon Tax model that pays money back to households.

Despite the endeavours of one of the Greens' lead negotiators, Deputy Catherine Martin, to review the programme in December, 2022: "*Green Party leader Eamon Ryan dismissed calls for the Programme for Government to be renegotiated as there was no 'wriggle room' to revisit it*" (Mail on Sunday, 21.6.2020).

The question of deferring the payment of National Debt was blown out, and even the agreement to prevent the building of a liquefied natural gas (LNG) at Ballylongford, Co. Kerry, was left in confusion when Varadkar suggested that it could still proceed through the planning stage.

"Fianna Fail leader Micheál Martin told Radio Kerry that there have to be compromises with the other parties in government, including a U-turn on ensuring the liquified gas terminal at Shannon goes ahead" (Irish Examiner, 18.6.20).

"Mr Martin had supported the project but the programme for government says the new coalition, if formed, will withdraw the Shannon LNG terminal from the EU Projects of Common Interest list in 2021.

"We can't force our way on every issue", he said (*ibid*).

In the midst of it all, the Fine Gael leader is talking up the cutting of Inheritance Tax, which would predominately benefit wealthy people in Dublin—an issue his party hasn't addressed in the last decade.

HOUSING

The new housing targets are being soft-focused, to gloss over the prominent role of the new Nama, the Land Development Agency, as a bridge between public and private building.

The track record of Fianna Fáil and Fine Gael, partially in coalition with others, has been to allow the Health Crisis and Housing Crisis to develop out of control, despite abundant resources.

Instead of solving obvious problems, they created an ever-growing bureaucracy of reports, plans, committees and agencies.

The proposed new National Retrofitting Delivery Body?

This is to be established this year to oversee the energy conservation "retrofitting" of 500,000 houses. That's a great idea, but not now.

A Bricklayer mate says: "*It's far more efficient to build new houses to the highest standards than to tie up scarce resources in retrofitting.*"

Build enough houses first, then start retrofitting.

"Affordability" is to be at the centre of policy and there is no reason why we shouldn't have tens of thousands of affordable rental properties, under the cost-rental model that works across Europe. Just bloody well do it!

The mate supports the Green Party proposal—to "*examine the creation of an independent Building Standards Regulator*". This could herald a reversal of the disastrous move to self-certification and about time too!

RENTS AND EVICTIONS

"Rents will be frozen and evictions banned until at least the end of October by the incoming coalition government, Fianna Fail has said.

"The party's housing spokesman Daragh O'Brien, who is tipped to become housing minister, said the new government, if it takes office next weekend, will look to extend the emergency Covid-19 moratorium on rent increases and evictions for another three months beyond the current July 20 expiry date.

"The certainty has been helpful and has given peace of mind to a lot of people", he told the (*Sunday Independent*, 14.6.2020).

Whew! No evictions for four months?

LORDS OF THE LAND

According to the *Irish Examiner* (18.6.20), "*Farmers were generally*

supportive of this week's bid to form a new Government". In one voice, the IFA, ICMSA, ICOS, and Macra na Feirme are supportive of the new programme.

GREEN PARTY DISSENT

Green Party members who are against the deal have an array of issues with the document. Those who have indicated that they are either on the fence or voting No said their biggest concerns come from three key areas.

Economy

The party's finance spokesperson, Neasa Hourigan, who was part of the negotiating team, said that she and other party members have "*considerable concerns*" with the deal.

They have issues with the plan's economic strategy, saying that the commitments to tax cuts, protected welfare, and no return to austerity measures don't add up.

Windfall Tax

"A key Green Party policy on the reintroduction of a windfall tax on land development has been undercut by the revelation that it did not secure a single Euro in tax revenue when introduced previously by Fianna Fail at the request of the Greens in 2009."

This revelation arose in the Dail, a couple of weeks ago, when Finance Minister Paschal Donohoe said in an answer to a 'Dorthy Dixer' from fellow Fine Gael colleague Mr Bernard Durkan (Kildare North), referring to the 80% windfall tax which applied to certain disposals of land from 30th October 2009, to 31st December 2014. The windfall tax targeted land rezoned from agricultural use to residential use and then sold or developed.

One Fine Gael laggard noted:

"The Greenies are more than welcome to introduce as many taxes on property as they want if they are as successful as that one."

A hectare of agricultural land in 2016 cost an average of €24,000 in Ireland and €6,000 in France—in Germany in 2015 the average cost was over €19,000 and almost €19,000 in the UK in 2016. Dublin has virtually run out of rezoned residential land.

The last Cork Taoiseach, "Saint" Jack Lynch, removed Domestic Rates in 1977. Local Authority rates on agricultural land were found to be unconstitutional in 1986, and an attempt was made by the Fine Gael/Labour government of the day to replace

continued on page 30

**LABOUR****Comment**

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 38 No. 7

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

Civil War Politics Alive And Well?

The current party divide in Irish politics originated over the so called 1921 ‘treaty’, the divide was essentially between Sinn Fein and the Rest. In the next government it will be essentially Sinn Fein versus the Rest. And we are assured by ‘those in the know’ that ‘Civil War’ politics is dead!

The divide then, and its continuation, was based on different attitudes towards Ireland’s relationship with the UK. What has changed is that one of the Sinn Fein offshoots, Fianna Fail, has joined with the other offshoot, Fine Gael, who accepted the logic of the ‘treaty’ and its subservient role towards the UK.

That has created a vacuum that Sinn Fein to-day, whether it wanted to or not, or whether it can or not, has to fill to justify its existence in Irish Politics in the Republic. It cannot forever live off its achievements in Northern Ireland.

It must replace Fianna Fail : it will be given a great opportunity to begin to do so in the forthcoming years when commemorating the destruction of the Irish Republic that people had voted, fought and died for against the terrorism of the British and the Free State as the founders of Fianna Fail had done. It will only be doing what Sinn Fein did then, led by its President, Eamon de Valera. If it can’t do that and graciously accept his and his supporters role in the foundation events of the state, and just become another left-wing party, they will wither on the vine.

They must steal Fianna Fail’s historic clothes which should be easy, as Fianna Fail itself has discarded them—and which then wonders why the party’s at the bottom of every poll.

GOVERNMENT FORMATION

Happy Days? When Albert Reynolds passed an A4 sheet across the table to Dick Spring: “*Write down your wish list and we’ll get going*” : not quite but near enough. It was December, 1992. Albert headed for an EU summit in Edinburgh, and as Sean Duignan, his Press Secretary recorded: “*Bingo!—€Eight Billion smackeroos—10.30 p.m. after marathon session . . . tell that to the begrudgers . . . now watch me put a Government together!*” (*One Spin on the Merry-Go-Round*, 1996 circa)

That was then: it is now more than four months, since the General Election held on 8th February, the current caretaker Government has no mandate: it has been unable to pass legislation since the end of March; more than one million people are reliant on some kind of State income support and a national deficit of €30bn is looming by the end of the year.

It gets worse:

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>

“This year will be the worst global economic contraction since the Great Depression of the 1930s. The pandemic will have a profound impact internationally, Gita Gopinath, the IMF’s chief economist, said. It was an ‘unprecedented crisis’. The US and European countries will bear the brunt of the damage. Their economies are expected to shrink by 8% this year” (Irish Independent, 25.6.2020).

“New coalition plan is historic but reads more like fiction than economics... This document may neither be inspiring nor credible in some key respects, but it is probably better than the uncertainty of another general election”(Richard Curran, Irish Independent, 18.6.20).

The magic majority is composed of Fianna Fail: 38 (inc. Speaker); Fine Gael: 35; Greens 12 (Total: 84) (160 seats).

The Greens have 600 Northern members. Apparently only 195 out of the 600 members have registered to vote. A two-thirds majority is required for acceptance.

Fianna Fail claim to have 18,000 members, with voting on the Deal based on a 50% plus One majority.

According to RTE (26.6.2020), there was 15,000 Fianna Fail votes; 2,000 Green Party and, 700 Fine Gael voters based on a collegiate system.

Not a word out of the Fianna Fail leader that 600 people outside the jurisdiction could determine the future of an Irish Government—after a lifetime of demagoguery about Sinn Fein being controlled by forces outside the State.

continued on page 31