

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

August 2021

Vol.36, No.8 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.35 No.8 ISSN 954-5891

NI: Behind The Moral Veil!

A War was fought in Northern Ireland between the Catholic, or Nationalist, community there and the State. Wars are fought over conflicts of interest, and, until 1918, they were usually ended by negotiated agreements which took account of the strength of the conflicting parties as demonstrated in the war. In that 1918 era, war was thought of as “*the reason of kings*”, and it was therefore a manageable business of secular life.

In 1914, unfortunately, Britain annulled the mode of civilised warfare that had been making progress for a couple of centuries and reverted to the mode of religious war. It denied in August 1914 that it was going to war for any material advantage, and, urged on by John Redmond's Home Rule Party, it declared that its war of destruction on Germany (which was described as such by James Connolly and Roger Casement) was a war of Good against Evil. A condition of frantically moralistic public opinion was worked up during the War, which made it impossible for Britain to make a realistically advantageous peace settlement with the defeated enemy. The defeated enemy had to be punished because he was evil, and the fact that he was evil was proved by his defeat. When Providence is brought into the game, trial by combat becomes fair trial. And so the ground for Britain's second World War was laid down by its conduct during the first year after winning the first.

Once you get into the fugue of Good and Evil, it's hard to get out of it. It was said in 1998 that Tony Blair considered stepping away from it by declaring an amnesty for all concerned, but was told by Dublin that it was out of the question.

Boris Johnson has now made a definite proposal to legislate for an amnesty. The Northern Ireland Assembly, on an SDLP initiative, recalled itself from its Summer holiday for the purpose of expressing unanimous rejection of an Amnesty. All parties are eager to continue the War by other means.

continued on page 2

The EU's 'rule of law' moves up a gear

The clash between the Commission and Poland and Hungary is hotting up and is now destined for the Courts, with both sides fully lawyered up. The Commission tells us these states are opposed to the *rule of law*, repeated *ad nauseam*, and, as no normal state or person can be against the rule of law, it seems an open and shut case against the states concerned. But is it?

It is surely necessary to take a step back, as the logical outcome of this conflict could be the end of the EU as we know it. The EU prides itself on being nothing if not based on law. If what it claims is its values and laws are not adhered to by Member States, then it is a question of ‘*Quo Vadis?*’ for the EU.

The step back involves a look at what law itself is and what it is not. As outlined in the *Irish Political Review* in March, the EU's ‘rule of law’ was summed up by it as “*government by laws not men*”: and

continued on page 10

Conduct Unbecoming

Gerard Howlin on Des O'Malley's Legacy

A contribution by Gerard Howlin to an RTE radio discussion marking the death of Des O'Malley (Today with Claire Byrne, July 21st) was extraordinary for the scale of its self-delusion. O'Malley's passing provided an obvious opportunity to bolster the official narrative of the last five decades, but Howlin brought things

to a new level. Undeterred by his own role as an O'Malley supporter who became an advisor to Bertie Ahern, helping to wean Fianna Fail in a liberal direction, he contrived to portray the collapse in support for that party in 2011 as in some way an achievement of the same O'Malley. Confused? You should be.

Howlin is a former advisor to Fianna Fail and former columnist for the *Examiner* who now writes for the *Sunday Times*. Speaking on the programme he considered that O'Malley, his hero as a student, “*changed the context of Irish politics*” and “*fractured the old order*”. In the course of breaching a Fianna Fail Whip on the question of Barry Desmond's *Contraception Bill* in 1985, O'Malley made a famous speech, ‘*I stand by the Republic*’.

continued on page 11

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
NI: Behind The Moral Veil. Editorial	1
The EU's 'Rule Of Law' Moves Up A Gear. Jack Lane	1
Conduct Unbecoming: Gerard Howlin On Des O'Malley's Legacy. Dave Alvey	1
Readers' Letters: The 'New Politics'! Malachi Lawless	
Reconciliation? Wilson John Haire	3
'Troubles'? Some Realities Behind The NI War. Wilson John Haire	5
The O'Connor Column (The Saga Of A Wartime "Eire" Neutrality Sign) Climate Change Imperialism)	6,26
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (Elizabeth Bowen, A Review Of Patricia Laurence's Biography, Part 15)	8
Naming 'The Nameless One'. Paul Hyde (an interference with a Casement archive)	12
Political Economy: Ireland: FDI At A Cross Roads? Tony Monks <i>Privatising!</i> Fergus O Rahallaigh	16
Griffith's Sinn Fein And Anti-Semitism. Manus O'Riordan	17
A Paragon Of Virtue. Donal Kennedy	21
English Soccer's Generous Spirit! (Wilson John Haire; Eamon Dyas)	22
Remembering Desmond Fennell. Brendan Clifford	23
Biteback: Not In The Irish Times ! 1. Fine Gael And The Sinn Fein Vote Abstention. 2. Fintan O'Toole And Fianna Fail. Unpublished Letters to 'Irish Times', <i>Manus O'Riordan</i>	27
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Covid 19; Economic Bubble)	28

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

The Streak Of Dawn

Saturday Herald, 9.7.1921

(back page)

What Was The Truce?

Leaflet distributed at Cork Event, with a Report of the Proceedings
(page 29)

Nicola Mallon found the proposal disgusting. She said that it would “*not be acceptable to any other democracy in the world*”. No doubt it wouldn't. But what other democracy in the world could have got itself into the situation of having a 28-year War fought within itself, in which the State at one moment had deployed an army of 28,000 troops?

And where did she get the idea from that Northern Ireland has ever been a democracy, or even a democratically-governed region of the British state?

It lies outside the institutions which make the democracy of the state work, the state political parties. It did not reject those parties, but was rejected by them. We characterised it long ago as an undemocratically-governed region of the democratic British state. It is now governed more tolerably than it was before 1998, but it remains disengaged from the democracy of the state.

Both Unionist Parties condemned the Amnesty proposal as a betrayal which

left cross-Border criminals off the hook. Sinn Fein said it left British soldiers off the hook and would “*wreck the legal system*”.

Naomi Long of Alliance said it was “*utterly shameful*” and would leave perpetrators free to boast of their deeds. We recall that the precursors of the Alliance Party in 1969-70 desired British normality, and flirted with making an issue of the abnormal way that Britain governed its Six Counties, but lost their nerve and evaded the issue, as Alliance has been doing ever since.

Michael McDowell, who was once Attorney General in Dublin, and has the famous state-terrorist Eoin McNeill in his family tree, supports the Amnesty proposal, even though—

“it is almost entirely motivated by a desire to satisfy right-wing British media and establishment guilt and shame about the spectacle of seeing old men being punished by British courts for doing the dirty work that was asked and expected

of them as squaddies from Malaya, to Kenya, to Aden, to Iraq, to Afghanistan and other places, including Northern Ireland. It is not about closure; it is all about preventing disclosure. There is something monstrous about the prosecution of the lower ranks for what Brigadier Kitson and Baron Widgery advocated, approbated and excused for so long. But there is a deeper point here which needs honest and truthful consideration. Since 1998, nobody has been investigated or prosecuted in the Republic for the murders, bombings, mutilations, tortures, robberies and extortion they are suspected of perpetrating in the Troubles and up to the Belfast Agreement...

“Ade facto amnesty has existed in these cases—but not for the dissidents who rejected that agreement and carried on their weak and doomed criminal campaign of terror and subversion...

“Does this mean that we consciously violated the constitutional rights of victims and their relatives in pursuit of some unworthy expedient? ...

“For my part I think not. There is a world of realpolitik in which statesmanship sometimes requires that a line be drawn over past events—including atrocities—in pursuit of the greater good.

“I wrote recently how the Free State government enacted legislation in 1923 indemnifying its own side from civil or criminal responsibility for things done in the course of the Irish Civil War. A year later, the logic of statecraft and fairness persuaded that government to extend criminal immunity to those who had taken up arms against them in the civil war” (Irish Times, 21st July).

And was it not the case that the Free State, as the successor state of the British Government, assumed responsibility, under the ‘Treaty’, for all that Britain had done in its attempt to prevent any Irish state from being established?

And the great British Constitutional authority, Dicey, explained how Britain after its wars usually passed retrospective legislation, legalising anything it might have done in the course of the war that might have been illegal at the time it was done. (Such is “*the rule of law*”.)

McDowell continues:

“What then do I say about cross-party unanimity among northern politicians in condemnation of Johnson's amnesty proposal? ... I am not impressed by the fact that no one will speak up for drawing a line over past criminality in Northern Ireland.

“There is an analogy in such cross-party unanimity in the North with the concept of a circular firing squad. None share the same target but all are ready to open fire.”

So the shooting is over but the conflict continues by other means. And it is not

those who fought the war who are to the fore in insisting that it must continue. The 'Constitutional Nationalists' are the most implacable. They did not fight, but when a deal was struck and the fighting stopped they lost their electoral support to the political wing of the war party. And, if the fighting is exonerated by a formal amnesty, then their virtue in condemning the fighting is slighted.

They were affronted by Blair during the peace negotiations by being told that the problem with them was that they had no army. If they were not a party to the War, how could they be a party to the settlement of it? A formal amnesty would rub salt into their injured holier-than-thouness.

The new, 'Provisional', IRA declared war on Britain in 1970. The old, and therefore 'Official' IRA, which had entered an ideological wonderland, condemned the Provisional War as sectarian, because it was based on the realities of the life of the Catholic community in the North and on the Constitutional assertion of all-Ireland nationality. The Officials also declared their own war, as a revolutionary anti-Imperialist war to overthrow the system and thus transcend the sectarian structure of life in Northern Ireland.

The Official Republican War was a war without a tangible object in the actual existence of things. It amounted to a few atrocities, the chief of which was the accidental killing of a few cleaners in Aldershot Barracks—an act which was defended in *Hibernia* by Ann Harris, later Editor of the *Sunday Independent*. During the following generation that paper was the chief organ of the anti-Provisional propaganda of the Dublin Government.

The War declared by the Provisionals quickly developed into an actual war, sustained by the actual support of the actual Nationalist minority, as distinct from its pious ghost represented by the SDLP. One could not doubt in central Belfast in the Summer of 1971 that one was living in a battlefield.

A Government on which war has been declared, one which is being waged effectively, cannot be expected just to carry on as usual. It introduced Internment in August 1971. Elements of the Nationalist population which the Government suspected of being vital elements in the War that was being waged against it were interned and subjected to intensive questioning. This publication

continued on page 4

The 'New Politics'!

Ivana Bacik, the newly-elected Labour TD, in my view, represents something new operating in Irish politics: the EU way of doing political business in Ireland which the Labour Party, and all the Irish liberal cohort has bought into—and, I suspect, especially the voters of Dublin Bay South who elected her.

Ivana Bacik is, like Leo Varadkar, a political graduate of the TCD/Labour view of Ireland as *a failed State*. That is now the triumphalist Establishment march of the Irish 'identity', toe-rag, politics—in all its shallow, LGBTI + fizz-bang, 'EU-led by decree', glory. The relatively recent Marriage Equality referendum sums it up in particular: and the way that it was manipulated via a 'Citizens' Assembly', the results of which were presented to a meek and democratic Dáil in which there was no party opposition: all this copperfastened by a cheerleading media, easy-peasy, into a subsequent "*Bart Simpson-Doh!*" referendum. The fools, the fools, swallowed it wholesale. The slaves, the slaves only know how to bend the knee to "*Black lives matter*" hysteria.

This particular *Citizens' Assembly*, now led by Catherine Day, is flushed and hot to trot! It, with Ivana Bacik now joining its agenda in the Dáil, is in a strong position now to fish around for its next Referendum topic, to demonstrate to the World the forest fire of the new "Republic", and to outwit and further befuddle an already befuddled Sinn Féin in the race to be the best little country in which to do the EU's liberal bidding.

I'm not against Citizens' Assemblies in principle. Local Government has been totally hollowed out here in this part of the globe. It would be a good thing if, particularly in rural Ireland, there were Citizens' Assemblies to assert some pressure on all this EU rule by decree.

Malachi Lawless

Reconciliation?

When elements start off articles about 'The Troubles' I lose interest. They don't have the guts to see the reality of a war, for job reasons or partisan reasons. Or for pure vileness. Therefore, these Troubles becomes criminal this and criminal that, and finding humans under stones, as if bugs are also criminals. In war people do things that they obviously wouldn't do in peacetime.

First, they don't have the mandate and secondly, it's not in most people's characters to kill or main.

This equally affects soldiery in PIRA and in the British Army.

The pressure-cooker exploded in NI and the Catholic people went to war. War is not an exact science and things go wrong. Sometimes things will go wrong deliberately, an *administrative massacre*, or two, to test the waters: like in Derry and Ballymurphy, carried out by the British Army or PIRA's Bloody Friday, on the 21st July, 1972, when 22 car-bombs exploded in 80 minutes, with nine people dead and 130 injured. Warnings were given 30 minutes before the explosions but there was too much to deal with, by those in charge. Neither side in the war gained anything morally from those actions except maybe PIRA's organisational ability showed its population that it was here to stay, and this was war.

I don't personally believe there were civilians in this war. Everyone had something to support, even children from a certain age. It would be impossible to remain neutral. Then when the war is over people become civilians again and deny their wartime *personas*. A great moral revulsion can envelop people for generations, aided by the worse elements of the media, who usually have a few people who really know how things were but decide to be devious for propaganda reasons.

So, war ran its course for 28 years in NI with the British Armed Forces gaining very little compared to the Catholic population who regained their dignity, a viable political movement and a knowledge that a small population, in its revolutionary phase, can pin down a foreign army and keep its surrogates at bay. This has been one of the great events in Irish history and will be recognised, in future, by more able people, than we have today.

So there has been a war and now it's over and everyone is civilian again and acting like civilians and calling for justice, when the war turned out to be for justice. Look at the casualties on both sides, if you wish to confirm that this was indeed a war.

Wilson John Haire

at the time described the internees as prisoners-of-war.

The essential question then as now was whether there was a War in being. We recognised that what was happening was a War, but held that it was a War for an unachievable purpose: the ending of Partition.

What we advocated was a thorough restructuring of the way the Six Counties were governed, because the existing system of government, and not Partition as such, was the driving force in the War.

The SDLP denied that what was going on was a War, and it gave absolute priority in its policy-making to the ending of Partition. And, in response to Internment, it raised the slogan of “*No imprisonment without trial*”.

The anti-internment movement launched by it was a movement for the criminalisation of military action by Republicans. The Government complied with the demand by making changes to the trial process which made conviction easier.

Mrs. Thatcher came in. The process of criminalisation was completed. Political status—prisoner of war status—was ended. The campaign for the restoration of political status began.

The leadership of the Provisionals handled all of those things to its advantage. The SDLP leadership didn't know whether it was coming or going. The Mallon element lived in a doctrinaire wonderland, and tried to oust John Hume when he collaborated with the Provisionals with a view to bringing about a pragmatic settlement—i.e., one that would work, rather than one that was ‘right’ in some other sense.

We don't know what Hume's views about Amnesty were in 1998. He was in poor health and seemed anxious to retire from it all. But Dublin was not in favour. It is probable that Charles Haughey would have pushed for amnesty, but he was no longer Taoiseach and he was being demonised.

To argue for Amnesty would involve acknowledging that a War had been fought, and that, if a War had been fought there must have been grounds for it, and that those grounds must have been located in a chasm in the legal/Constitutional arrangement of things.

“*Malaya, Kenya, Aden, Iraq, Afghanistan, Northern Ireland*”—does Northern Ireland really belong in that series? The others were all British Imperial possessions of various kinds. They were not members of the British

state in any other sense than being possessed by it. Northern Ireland was a region of the British state. The Six Counties had been governed as part of the state until the Government of the state in 1921 chose to delegate some minor powers of state to them, constituting them a devolved Government, as a devious, Pontius Pilate, way of enacting Partition—while at the same time retaining complete sovereignty over them in the Westminster Parliament.

When they were constituted into the subordinate Government of Northern Ireland, the Six Counties were excluded from the sphere of operation of the political parties of the state, and therefore of an effective input into the democratic business of choosing which of those parties should govern the state. They continued to send representatives to the Westminster Parliament but these representatives could not be Tory or Labour, or even Liberal. They could therefore only be onlookers at the process of government.

The Nationalist community could send a couple of Nationalist MPs to Westminster, but there was nothing for them to do there. Six County affairs were ruled out of order at Westminster, on the ground that the Six Counties had their own Government. But the only real matter at issue in Six County politics was whether they should remain in the United Kingdom state or transfer to the Irish state. A majority of the population wanted to remain within the UK state—though excluded from its main political institutions.

They were allowed to remain on the condition that they stuck together as a voting block and won every election—which they did. By doing so, they caused the welfare state to come to Northern Ireland without having to struggle for the reform.

The Unionist Party had not wanted to run a Six County Government in which they would have to govern Catholics, but they agreed to have it on condition that British social welfare reform would come to Northern Ireland as a matter of course, and at British expense. At a moment when Whitehall considered backing away from that deal, the Unionist leaders indicated that, unless the deal was upheld, they would hand the governing of the Six Counties back to Westminster. That was the main event in the political history of Northern Ireland, and it was transacted behind the scenes.

Unionism had to mobilise its majority at every election, leaving political and social reform to be dealt with by the

parties of the state. The only real power of state devolved to it was that of policing. Policing chiefly meant keeping the large Catholic minority down. And that power of policing had to be exercised by a Six County Unionist Party which had the anti-Catholic Orange Order as a central institution, which had to be maintained in order to bring out the Protestant majority for the Union at every election.

A more aggravating mode of government for the Catholic population would not be easy to devise.

The upshot was that the State, which was a liberal democracy, ended up fighting a war against a part of itself which it had outraged by excluding it from the democracy of the state and subjecting it to the government of a hostile local community, while supplying both communities from outside with the amenities of the welfare state.

It appears that Blair was willing to end the War by means of an amnesty. But that would have involved conceding that it had been a *war*. And how could the Government of a liberal, democratic state explain that, in the arrangements of the state, ground had been created for the waging of a war?

Dublin might have helped by insisting that, since there had in fact been a war, there must have been grounds for it. But Dublin was even more hypocritically Constitutionalist than the SDLP.

The Constitution of the state had delegitimised the Six County Government, and that must have had some influence on bringing about the conditions for war.

But Dublin did not condemn Stormont for being patently undemocratic by anybody's standards. It was the fact of continuing British government that it condemned. And, when a movement developed in the North to bring the region within the democracy of the British state, Dublin lobbied Whitehall against it.

The Constitution asserted a right of national sovereignty over the Six Counties but deferred the enforcement of national jurisdiction for the time being. This left the British State in the position of an Occupying Power in Six Counties.

The Provisional IRA likewise saw Britain as an Occupying Power and declared war on it.

The Courts of the Irish state, taking note of the Constitution, refused to recognise Extradition Warrants issued by the Occupying Power.

We do not recall that the Dublin Government ever explained what it

thought the Constitutional position was when the Provisional IRA declared war on the State which the Taoiseach was obliged by the Constitution to regard as an Occupying Power, without Constitutional legitimacy.

We campaigned from 1970 onwards for a repeal of the Sovereignty claim over the North, in order to encourage negotiations between the two communities in the North, and between the North and the South.

In 1974 the claim became crucial to the continuation of the Sunningdale Agreement. A Power-Sharing Government between the SDLP and one of the Unionist Parties was set up, and also a joint Council between the new Belfast Government and the Dublin Government. It was widely assumed in Unionist circles that the sovereignty claim was set aside by the Agreement. But that could not have been the case because the Irish Constitution was a written one, alterable only by referendum.

A Court action against the Government for breach of the Constitution was brought in Dublin. The Government pleaded that, in signing the Agreement, it had done no more than say that it was not its policy to enforce the sovereignty claim, which remained in place for any future Government to enforce at its discretion. A Unionist group, taking note of this Government statement, said that, if the setting up of the Council of Ireland went ahead while the sovereignty claim was in place, it would call a general strike against it.

Dublin refused to negotiate a deferral of the Council of Ireland or to call a referendum to repeal the sovereignty claim. The SDLP did likewise. The Strike was effective. The government pulled down the whole Sunningdale system. The situation settled down to War for a generation. The IRA fought and negotiated its way to the 1998 deal, and told Dublin that it could now repeal the Sovereignty claim.

During that 24 years the South suffered severe cultural and political disintegration. It repealed the Sovereignty claim only when it no longer mattered—the War having been fought. And, down to the present day, the Fianna Fail party—the major party during the War, though now a caricature of itself—refuses to acknowledge that the ‘Troubles’ were a War, and treats Sinn Fein as a gang of criminals.

Wars have standing in human history. ‘Troubles’ have no standing. Wars can be ended, and incidents within them can be written off. ‘Troubles’ are shapeless and ongoing.

*

Liam Kennedy from Tipperary, who is both an *Irish Times* columnist and Professor of History in Belfast, preached on July 19th:

“Disavowal of past violence key to laying moral foundation for united Ireland: Time for Sinn Fein to offer public apology for Troubles”.

Professor Kennedy apparently does not know that he is the handsomely-paid propagandist of a State which arranged for the Six County region of itself to be governed outside the democratic politics of the state. And he does not know that a War was fought there. He sees what went on from the 1970s to the 1990s as “*the most prolonged period of intercommunal violence in the North since 1700*”. He doesn’t notice that the State was a major party to it, and that the Unionist community was involved only because it would not allow its side of the conflict to be fought by the forces of the State.

The State—which was *its* State—asserted a monopoly of the use of force, but the Unionists refused to leave it to the State forces to conduct the War. It insisted on contributing its bit of communal violence to the conflict.

The Nationalist community did not see the State as its State. It had no grounds for doing so. It was not a participant in State affairs. It was an outcast of State affairs by decision of the State.

If moralising could have overcome what was an acute political problem, it would have been done in the great days of the *Peace People*. But the Peace People deliberately set aside political facts in the interest of moralising, so their movement amounted to nothing.

Professor Kennedy advocated *Truth and Reconciliation*. This is of a kind with Mrs. Thatcher’s comparison of State budgeting with Household budgeting.

Truth and Reconciliation have to do with family affairs. Wars are State affairs. And, as soon as Truth and Reconciliation were mentioned over 20 years ago, Michael Mates, the influential Tory backbencher, said there was no way the British Army would get involved in that subjectivist morass.

The great success story of Truth and Reconciliation is South Africa where, at the cost of some token admissions, the Whites were guaranteed possession of the land they had conquered and the Blacks, under ANC tutelage, agreed to make do with nominal democracy, and are now beginning to see that they were swindled.

In affairs of State, there is always something behind moral posturing.

‘Troubles’?

Some realities about the NI War.

When commentators start off articles about *The Troubles* I lose interest. They don’t have the guts to see the reality of a war, for job reasons or partisan reasons. Or for pure vileness. Therefore, these *Troubles* becomes criminal this and criminal that, and finding humans under stones, as if bugs are also criminals.

In war people do things that they obviously wouldn’t do in peacetime.

First, they don’t have the mandate and secondly, it’s not in most people’s characters to kill or maim.

This equally affects soldiery in PIRA and in the British Army.

The pressure-cooker exploded in NI and the Catholic people went to war. War is not an exact science and things go wrong. Sometimes things will go wrong deliberately: either an administrative massacre, or two, to test the waters like in Derry and Ballymurphy, carried out by the British Army; or PIRA’s Bloody Friday, on the 21st July 1972, when 22 car-bombs exploded in 80 minutes, with nine people dead and 130 injured. Warnings were given 30 minutes before the explosions but there was too much to deal with, by those in charge.

Neither side in the war gained anything morally from those actions except maybe PIRA’s organisational ability showed its population that it was here to stay, and this was war. I don’t personally believe there were civilians in this war. Everyone had something to support, even children from a certain age.

It would be impossible to remain neutral. Then, when the war is over, people become civilians again and deny their wartime personas. A great moral revulsion can envelop people for generations, aided by the worse elements of the media, who usually have a few people who really know how things were but decide to be devious for propaganda reasons.

So, war ran its course for 28 years in NI, with the British Armed Forces gaining very little compared to the Catholic population, who regained their dignity, a viable political movement, and a knowledge that a small population, in its revolutionary phase, can pin down a foreign army and keep its surrogates at bay. This has been one of the great events in Irish history and will be recognised, in future, by more able people, than we have today.

So there has been a war and now it’s over and everyone is civilian again and acting like civilians and calling for justice, when the war turned out to be for justice. Look at the casualties on both sides, if you wish to confirm that this was indeed a war.

Wilson John Haire

The O'Connor Column

The saga of a wartime “EIRE” Neutrality sign

In summer 1943 the Irish Government, led by Taoiseach Éamon de Valera, decided to delineate the coastline of the state with a series of “ÉIRE” signs so that aircraft of belligerent powers in the latest “World War”, in which Ireland had firmly declared its neutrality, would desist from encroaching into its airspace. This was done following discussion with US authorities, concerned at numerous incidents of its aircraft losing their way, encroaching into Irish airspace or crashing at or near Irish territory. The signs, eighty-three in all, were built adjacent to the “Look Out Posts” (LOP) of the *Irish Coast Watching Service* located on numerous headlands around the Irish coast. Subsequently the US asked the Government if they would identify the signs with numbers, as aircraft continued to stray and crash, and thus assist them in navigation. In November 1943 the Defence Forces directed the Coast Watchers to apply the number of their “LOP” above the signs. A total of 83 such signs are known to have been built.

The signs are large in size, with the lettering taking up a space approximately 40m long and six metres high. They were mostly built, as specified by the Army, by digging shallow trenches for the letters and the number, filling them with stones and applying a limewash finish to enhance their aerial visibility. After the war, the signs were abandoned and fell into disrepair or were

overgrown, with few now remaining intact. The pre-cast concrete LOP huts often near the signs, which were mostly connected to Army HQ by telephone, have also largely disappeared, though a number have survived. Some signs fell victim to progress, with half of the Slieve League sign in Donegal, for instance, disappearing under a carpark installed for tourists by the County Council some years ago. But about six signs have so far been uncovered and fully restored, while some others never became overgrown and survived largely intact, notably in West Mayo and other remote areas.

On Howth Head in North County Dublin, an LOP (No. 6) was established at the very start of the war, with a commanding position overlooking both Dublin Bay and also in visible connection to LOPs along the coast to the north of it. The other Dublin Bay sign and LOP were at Dalkey on the south side of the bay and between them they watched the bay area and were involved in tracking shipping and aircraft of all sides. Some of the logbooks of these LOPs have survived, containing meticulous details of shipping and aircraft entering Irish space. They also contain details of the LOP activities in trying to track and warn of the aircraft that encroached in 1941, dropping bombs on North Strand—causing much damage and killing 28 people—and the air raid fleets that bombed the Belfast

shipyards and which had flown north immediately along the Irish coast. These warnings alerted defences in both instances.

The *Coast Watching Service* consisted of full-time volunteers paid a soldier’s salary. It was stipulated that volunteers be from within a few miles of the site, know the territory well, and that men with military experience be selected. In Howth a crew of seven was recruited, several of whom had served in the Army, or in the War of Independence—as in the case of the commanding Corporal, Séan Rorke, a well-known and locally respected veteran of Howth “H” Company, 2nd Battalion, Dublin Brigade IRA. Rorke, who worked a small farm on Howth East Mountain overlooking the Baily Lighthouse, had played for Beann Éadair GAA club in the 1920s and been a Dublin football star. He was also a respected community leader, fervent in discouraging young men from drinking and promoting the benefits of sport instead. His standing is attested to by the fact that he was repeatedly elected President of Beann Éadair Club for over twenty years, and the grounds now bear his name. A staunch lifelong supporter of Fianna Fáil and de Valera, he was prominent in the Dublin Brigade *guard of honour* at the funerals of both Seán MacEntee and Ernie O’Malley. Other members of the crew, also all local and several of whom were also strong “Fianna Fáilers”, were Roger Austin, John Gallagher, Tom McLoughlin, Andy Moore, Paddy Moore, Johnnie Redmond and Tom Redmond.

Everyone in Howth in those times were known colloquially and affectionately by nicknames. Seán Rorke was known as “Darky Rorke”, because of his complexion, and Johnnie Redmond as “Fokker Redmond” because of his sighting of the first German warplane in 1939. But the work of the Coast-watching crew, who were an unarmed auxiliary service, was a deadly serious affair. In 1939-40 there was a very real threat of British naval or aerial attacks, or even of a British invasion, as Churchill darkly warned, and from 1941 of German aerial attacks. The ‘Coast Watchers’ were all men prepared to put their lives on the line to repel any such attack. Howth East Mountain was cordoned-off as an excluded military zone, with light anti-aircraft artillery and a large searchlight, manned by the Army,



Restoration of the Howth EIRE-6 sign nearing completion when halted by state executive order:

located on the East Mountain on the same site as the LOP. In 1943, as instructed, Seán Rorke's crew constructed the sign, identified by number as "EIRE 6", approximately 200m due north of the LOP at a point with a fine command of a large area of coast on the inward flightpath to Collinstown (now Dublin Airport). Remains of a previous 19th century British "semaphore" outlook post were recently discovered nearby.

These men, and many women like them, were the stuff of which the solid ground of "de Valera's Ireland" and of his party, Fianna Fáil, were composed, both of which the toilet scribe of the "Irish" Times has recently traduced in a most loathsome manner.

In 2019, the "Howth EIRE-6 Restoration Group" was formed locally to try to locate the EIRE-6 sign and reveal and restore it. It is composed of prominent members of the Howth Peninsula Heritage Society, Howth SAAO Management Committee, Howth Tidy Towns, Howth Pathways Group, Howth Coastguard, and Howth Writing Workshop, as well as the proud granddaughter of Corporal Seán Rorke himself who commanded LOP-6 throughout the war. As restoration was nearing completion in July 2021, officials of the *National Parks and Wildlife Service* (NPWS), acting on a denunciation, ordered the ceasing of all work and revoked the Ministerial Consent for the restoration, because the work allegedly breached ecological protection conditions attached to the Consent. The NPWS also had the National Heritage Council retract the substantial grant it had awarded the project. The Group are now appealing this Revocation.

The Group, all of whose members have been active over many years fighting to protect the environmental, as well as the historical and ecological integrity of Howth, were, to put it mildly, offended and outraged by the implication of the Revocation that they had wilfully breached ecological conditions and seriously damaged a protected local habitat.

The NPWS claim incorrectly that the original Consent prohibited any disturbance to the ground and only allowed for some new stone to be lightly scattered over where the original had been. The Group contend that the Consent explicitly authorised them to "expose" the stones of the sign and restore the letters while leaving the surrounding vegetation intact, trimmed to a low height. Given that the sign was completely buried in earth and that its exposure necessitated "ground disturbance", it is clear that the Group would never have accepted an absurd condition such as the NPWS now claims applied, and which would have meant no restoration at all. The Group also contends that, if anything, it went far beyond the conditions of the restoration ensuring the

protection, preservation and restoration of the local ecology during and after their work.

Seán Haughey TD raised the issue on behalf of the Group in the Dáil on 15th July, and in response the Minister responsible, Malcom Noonan, ordered the NPWS to engage with the Group to effect a resolution to enable the restoration to proceed. Other local TDs—Denise Mitchell (SF), Cian O'Callaghan (Soc. Dem) and Richard Bruton (FG)—also strongly supported the Restoration Group, with only one, Aodhán Ó Ríordáin (Labour), curiously not engaging.

Dr Michael Kennedy on the Howth EIRE Neutrality sign

Dr Michael Kennedy of the National Archives of Ireland is a leading authority on the wartime signs and the Coastwatching Service, a comprehensive history he which has published (*Guarding Neutral Ireland*). When the Howth EIRE 6 Restoration Group was formed, Michael immediately agreed to serve as historical consultant to the project. On being informed of the NPWS Revocation Order halting the restoration work, he visited the Group again and afterwards sent it the following extraordinary and evocative statement which succinctly described the importance of this historic monument:

"Wed 21 Jul 2021

Re: Howth Éire Sign

It was a great pleasure to see you again at the Howth No. 6 ÉIRE neutrality sign this afternoon and to meet again so many of the Howth ÉIRE 6 Restoration Group.

I could not but notice the care and attention the Group has given to repairing the ÉIRE sign and to ensuring that the repaired structure fits sensitively and respectfully into the surrounding landscape on Howth's East Mountain in a manner which ensures the stability and development of the local environment.

It was thus with great sadness that I learned from you that the Group are now prohibited from completing your work on the sign, and this with the task so near to completion. I do hope that this is a temporary position, and that agreement can be reached with the NPWS to ensure that this piece of internationally important heritage of Ireland's Second World War remains for all to enjoy, analyse and wonder on as a visible symbol of one of the great tests that faced the young Irish state under the leadership of Taoiseach and Minister for External Affairs Éamon de Valera.

My understanding of the situation as it currently stands is that a face-to-face meeting (online or in person) could sort out the differences surrounding questions of alleged breaches of the ministerial order allowing work on the site. If this were done in the coming weeks and ministerial authority to work restored it would still be possible to bring the sign back to its proper restored wartime condition by September 2021. Surely this is a situation where consultation and discussion can lead to a satisfactory outcome for all?

I do not understand why alleged breaches

led to work being halted and why, if there were breaches, action could not be taken to remedy them while work progressed. Surely this tactical direction and management would be more effective than the all-out measure of shutting the site down?

We will soon be commemorating and exploring the centenary of the outbreak of the Second World War. We as a state and people will be looking at how we defended our territory one hundred years ago. The Howth ÉIRE sign is a living link with the Ireland of 1939 to 1945 and 'The Emergency'. It is a historical reminder of how we as a people relied on our own resources – in this case human labour, stone and ingenuity – to communicate our desire to remain neutral in the world conflagration.

The generation of men and women who defended us during the Second World War are now almost all dead. The record they left on our landscape of their actions is not protected by legislation. It should be. The ÉIRE signs are national monuments to a time when the very future of the state was in question and the people of Ireland rose to the challenge of national defence. Just as we have recently honoured the Irishmen and Irishwomen of the 1916 Rising, the First World War and now the War of Independence, should not we be honouring the Defence Forces of 1939 to 1945 who brought Irish people from both sides in the Civil War split together in one Army to defend our land? One way to do this is to bring structures such as the Howth ÉIRE sign within the terms of the National Monuments Act.

There was a steady stream of walkers, tourists and sightseers passing by the Howth ÉIRE sign as we spoke this afternoon. They were engaged with the ÉIRE sign and stopped to read the information display panel on the structure. They could easily access the site on an existing path and all respected the integrity of the sign itself. The Howth ÉIRE sign is one of the best preserved, most accessible and indeed most visible of the remaining ÉIRE signs along the coast. It is quite unique in its location on the main flightpath into Dublin airport. It is deeply embedded within the historical memory of Howth and it is clear that the area has risen to the challenge of restoring and maintaining the sign for all the see, explore and enjoy.

It was important that Seán Haughey TD raised the issue of the work on the Howth ÉIRE sign in Dáil Éireann before the recent recess as it brings the issue surrounding completion of the restoration of the ÉIRE sign to ministerial awareness at national level. I can only hope that discussions, between the Howth ÉIRE 6 Restoration Group (perhaps involving Deputy Haughey), Minister of State Malcolm Noonan TD and Minister for Housing, Local Government and Heritage Darragh O'Brien TD will end the current impasse. Then the Howth ÉIRE sign will be completed and restored as a monument for generations to come showing one of the means by which Ireland strove to remain neutral through the Second World War. ..."

Dr Michael Kennedy, Executive Editor,
Documents on Irish Foreign Policy
Royal Irish Academy

The Gaelic Tongue

**“The Gaelic tongue is fading, and we stand coldly by –
Without a pang to thrill the heart, a tear to wet the eye;
Without one pulse of freedom stirred, one effort made to save
The tongue our fathers spoke – we lisp the language of the slave!
.... Oh, Irishmen, be Irish! and rally for the tongue
Which, like ivy to a ruin, to the dear old land has clung –
Oh, snatch this relic from the wreck – the only and the last –
The sole strong link that binds you to the glories of the Past.”**

Rev. Michael Mullin. 1833-1869. (Professor of Metaphysics and Moral Philosophy. New York.) Gill’s *Irish Reciter*. Ed. by *J.J. O’Kelly*. M.H. Gill & Son, Ltd. Dublin. 1907.

Bowen’s Court, Sunday, 2nd September 1945.

“Beloved, your letter of August 22nd came on Friday... This summer has been too long. And except for the 3 weeks that I was in Ireland in June it is a summer that I shall always remember with repugnance. ... To recollect London, as it has been for me since last January, is to recollect a nightmare... The fact is, I’ve been living in the vague hope (I mean, a hope I never openly formulated, but clung to) that this autumn or early winter might, would, somehow bring you back to Europe even for a few weeks. I expect really I’d better be realistic, write that off, and pull strings to try and get in some capacity across the Atlantic? Hadn’t I? ... I must not become inhuman. Perhaps I’m reverting to type – gaunt and solitary Protestant land-owner.

Oh Charles, I must stop. I cannot live through another autumn and winter without seeing you. Somehow I know I shall. Take care of yourself, dear dearest. To one person you are an entire world.

Love. Your E.”

[Underlinings – EB]

‘Love’s Civil War: Elizabeth Bowen and Charles Ritchie. Letters and Diaries 1941-1973. Ed. by Victoria Glendinning with Judith Robertson. Simon & Shuster. London. 2008.

Elizabeth Bowen.

A Review of Patricia Laurence’s biography.

Part 15.

In a previous article, I noted that Laurence stated—unlike all previous Bowen biographers—the amount of money Elizabeth Bowen received for Bowen’s Court in 1959: putting it at “£12,000 (*the equivalent of £360,000 today*)”. But she gives no provenance for this rather startling claim. And she then went on to make wild allegations about Noreen and Gilbert Butler being shown the door by the solicitor handling the sale. That last statement, unfootnoted, is untrue.

Bowen’s family solicitor was Edmund Carroll of Fermoy and Victoria Glendinning in her 1977 biography—the first biography—stated that it was Bowen who insisted that he was to accept “*the first firm offer*” that was submitted, “*even though, to do him [Carroll, JH] credit, he did suggest that she might do better to put the house into the hands of one of the big Dublin agents*”. And just to note that Elizabeth Bowen continued to use the services of this solicitor, having him draw up her will before she died in 1973, which shows her good will towards this most professional man.

It would seem that Laurence has little sense of how the professions are run in Ireland, especially with the kind of connections that are rife in this small country.

Of course Laurence is an American academic: and indeed we have our own who seem to have perfected the “*not looking*” technique—a Bowen phrase—at anything going on outside the university bubble. Glendinning in a throw-away phrase wrote that Bowen left her ancestral home without looking back. The fuller quotation is:

“Molly O’Brien” (the housekeeper) “closed the hall door behind Elizabeth for the last time and saw her drive away as if it were just an ordinary day—all emotion withstood, withheld or by now simply over.”

This is pure conjecture by Glendinning. Bowen could have been screaming her head off but, as she was alone in her car—well, we will never know. That stoicism has now become encoded in the myth of Bowen but again she had her two great friends Noreen Butler—her first cousin—and Lady Ursula Vernon with her, helping her “to clean up and decide what she wanted to keep”.

Glendinning also stated that Bowen went straight back to America to lecture, but all later accounts seem to suggest a ‘*lost year*’, in which close friends did not know of her whereabouts whether she was in England, Italy or the US. In fact, there was talk of someone who saw her—either Eddy Sackville-West or Molly Keane—who was so appalled by her demeanour that “*she looked as if she attended an execution—her own*”. Elsewhere Glendinning acknowledges that Bowen, after losing Bowen’s Court, came very near to a breakdown. Bowen was adrift once more, unmoored, a widow, and now aged 60 years: and the only one who really mattered totally was her lover Charles Ritchie and her hold on him was very tenuous.

In ‘*The Diaries of A.L. Rowse*’ (edited by Richard Ollard, Allen Lane, London, 2003)—the Oxford don who was “*the first working class entrant*” to “*All Souls College Fellow for fifty years*”—there is a very poignant story about a meeting with Bowen in New York on the 11th June 1959 where she asked Rowse about Bowen’s Court: “*Did I know anybody who would take it on?*”

So there was Bowen putting out feelers and getting no takers. Rowse, who had been hosted in Bowen’s Court, invited Elizabeth out to lunch and after it was

over she asked him for a loan. This is how Rowse remembered it:

"You couldn't let me have two dollars in return for a cheque, could you? I said, wouldn't she prefer twenty? Oh, of course, if you could. I don't want to appear as one of those hawks of English women for ever... I said, would she like a hundred? But, *could* you manage it? I said I was *rolling*, but she was not to mention it to anyone. ... We walked back to her hotel, and she went up to her room to write her cheque. When she came down with it and said goodbye at the door, she said 'darling'—the first time I had earned such an endearment... I was delighted with myself to think I had been able to come to her rescue... I had cleaned myself out of all my precious dollars for her... On my way back in the bus I missed my dollars rather but remained pleased that she had them."

Glendinning also noted that Elizabeth: "*offered the big house to her nephew Charles, the only male Bowen of the next generation, who was farming in Africa; he could not take it on*".

I find it is important to put this information out there because the way the new owner of Bowen's Court has been treated in academia and in the media etc.—one might think he came in and pulled a fast one over all involved. Cornelius O'Keefe was a self-made man in the economically tough time of 1950s Ireland; he worked hard and of course that got up the noses of some people in the locality. Wasn't it ever thus? But there is envy and then there is something else which Patricia Laurence locates in a letter written by a prominent Protestant clergyman to a friend of Elizabeth Bowen's:

"Rev. R. B. MacCarthy however, cast doubt on O'Keefe's character in a letter to Derek Hill, a painter friend of Bowen's:

I heard today that the ruffian called O'Keefe to whom E.B. sold the place is an illegitimate son of a St. Leger and rather specializes in getting country house (& their timber) presumably at least partly out of spite. What disastrous judgment she seems to have had in practical matters or was it a sort of death-wish."

This is a despicable slur on Cornelius O'Keefe and my wonder is that Laurence repeated it. It is so unseemly—especially given all the wide-spread publicity about those who had such labels put on them in the not too distant past. I beg Patricia Laurence to remove such scurrilous assertions in all future publications and to try and make some amends to the O'Keefe family—they really deserve that courtesy at the very least.

But who is this Rev. Robert MacCarthy whose charitable impulses so completely failed him—not to mention his overt attempt to cause reputational damage to a man whom he had never even met? He was Dean of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin from 1999-2012 and, in my opinion, he has form. One of his more alarming outbursts occurred in 2008, when in a letter to *'The Irish Times'* he accused parents of Muslims and Hindus—two ancient religions—of indoctrinating their children into "*cults*".

There was no public outcry by the media and the politicians for his removal, at the very least, from the well-paid sinecure at St. Patrick's Cathedral. He merely received censure from the Board and Chapter. Consider what would have happened if a high-ranking Catholic clergyman had been so crassly bigoted in their publicly expressed views?

And then there was the awful story of the sexual assaults on the ten-year-old Kerry Lawless (and many others) whose case was eventually heard in Court in 1987. The abuser Patrick O'Brien, who had been in St. Patrick's Cathedral for some 40 years, helping out in various capacities, was given a two year suspended sentence.

How many Irish Catholic Bishops were removed for having such people in their Churches—yet again no outcry?

Only Victoria White writing in the *Irish Examiner* in 2016 gave vent to her frustration and anguish, asking why the Irish media ignored such cases. O'Brien had 1,000 counts of abuse against him and yet why, White asked, did the Catholic majority not rise up and demand justice for their minority children?

It is a good question if somewhat naïve. There are two books I would recommend that she might read or re-read, as she is quite the intelligent voice for those of us who read her work. Both books are by Brian Inglis. *'West Briton'*, Faber & Faber, London, 1962 and *'Downstart: The Autobiography of Brian Inglis'*, Chatto & Windus, London, 1990.

I was struck once when Inglis wrote, in *'West Briton'*, about getting a job at *'The Irish Times'* and finding that the then Editor, Robert Maire Smyllie, had—

"no anti-Catholic feeling—he prided himself on not asking the religion of any aspiring member of his staff; but the kind of person he took to at an interview was also likely to be a Protestant or a *Protestant-minded Catholic*."

(Italics—JH)

And that last italicised phrase struck me greatly, because it is to be found

everywhere—in business, in golf clubs, in tennis clubs, yachts clubs etc. And, in the most amazing way, it is a growing phenomenon—no matter how other identities are now claiming their own rights in a most aggressive way. Inglis states:

"But though the caste system had now been relaxed, the relaxation had been forced through by political and economic pressures over which the old Ascendancy stock had little control; most of them, if it had been possible, would have kept the Dublin gutties waiting for the boat to ferry them into social acceptance... Our set still regarded me as a member, and they would talk freely in my company, expressing much the same sentiments about Irishmen I knew on the other side of the social fence as a gathering of London business men at Frinton-on-Sea can be heard expressing about Jews."

Inglis thought that both sets "*had achieved a tacit clubbable understanding*", but this was ever only a surface confection. Some years ago, I was at a dinner where, at the table I was at, there was also a former Editor of *'The Irish Times'*. The former Editor expressed views so intolerant of the Irish State, *our State*, that I was for once stuck for words. The view expressed was that the only good could ever come was from our nearest neighbour: and this person was a Catholic—very much in the mould of the Inglis type.

What was said about Northern Ireland quite literally frightened me and those who know me—know I don't give easily to fright—it was blood-curling stuff. So Victoria White—good Protestant (self-described) woman that you are—please know that what you request will never ever happen—the Southern Catholic is now a very frightened person and surely that must be very clear to you by our non-reaction to the travails of our minority children.

In a *Christmas Newsletter*, Parish of Kildorrery 2011, there is an article by Jane Annesley about St. Colman's Church, Farahy. She wrote about two events—the first being the Annual North Cork Classical Music series. The musicians were enjoyable and she was able to say that as the refreshments were "*kindly provided by Robert Duffy of Duffy's Pharmacy, Castletownroche, a useful sum of money was forwarded to the Trustees for church maintenance*".

Two of those Trustees are Martin Mansergh and Rev. Robert MacCarthy, as Derek Hill—the painter and friend of Prince Charles, as his biographer Bruce Arnold, OBE (Order of the British Empire

for services to journalism)—was keen to tell us—when he was alive was also a Trustee.

The other event that Jane Annesley wrote about was the Trevor/Bowen Weekend: with the American academic Susan Osborn giving a talk, as well as Cork's Mary Leland. She wrote tastefully and briefly about both. The really interesting article in that *Newsletter* was called 'Master Charles' by a Brenda Hennessy—whom on enquiry I found out was not a local but a 'blow-in', as we say here in Ireland. Hennessy gets so much wrong that I simply don't know where to begin. But there was *never* a 'Master Charles', and Elizabeth Bowen would be the first to cut the ground from under anyone who suggested otherwise. He was not a "young cousin of Elizabeth Bowen", as she states, but her nephew.

According to the tale Hennessy tells:

"In the summer of 2005 I had the pleasure of meeting Master Charles himself—Charles Cole Bowen."

Well Brenda—if he told you that—he was having you on. The last of the Cole Bowens was Elizabeth herself. The latter had some 15 nephews and nieces but never bothered with them. As Elizabeth Bowen's father was one of nine surviving children—when he married they all had to leave the Big House. Many went to the colonies but Elizabeth Bowen never spoke about them. Only her Aunt Sara, who lived in a bed-sitter over a shop in Mitchelstown, was invited now and then to Bowen's Court.

Charles claimed to have lived in Fermoy from 1929-1935 and that would tally with Elizabeth becoming the sole heir to Bowen's Court in 1930. The story continues thus: George's mother died in 1944 and his father and himself returned to Ireland and stayed at Bowen's Court for about three months in 1945/1946. Elizabeth Bowen never once in all her letters refers to this family reunion. Anyway Charles "*left the army and was farming for a while with my cousin Gilbert Butler in Kilkenny*", which has an authentic air to it.

"My next visit was in 1965 when I was working for Gallahers in Zimbabwe. I came over on a working holiday with my wife, Bernice and two sons, Sean 6 and Rory 4 to the Gallaher factories in Northern Ireland and drove down to Cork, only to find that Bowen's Court was no longer! We had been told, when we were in Belfast, that it had been taken down, but it all came as a nasty surprise.

We were delighted to see the church, which we had last seen with a hole in its roof, has been so well restored and Farrah looks so bright and cheerful".

This must be the same Charles to whom Elizabeth Bowen offered Bowen's Court but, of course, he refused the offer. But I wish Hennessy would write the name of the *big house* with the two words and have the one 'r' in Farahy.

But Charlie should have been told that it was not the Trustees who renovated the Church but *AnCo*, and as this is another whole story, it will be in the next *Irish Political Review!*

Julianne Herlihy ©

The EU's 'rule of law'

continued

the source of this view was a US Supreme Court ruling of 1803 by Justice Marshall. This is an absurd view of law, as it turns law into an abstraction unrelated to context, time and actual human beings. But law is made, administered, changed, and judged by men and is, to coin a phrase, not *a law unto itself*. If it becomes a law unto itself, it becomes something else entirely that most people do not like.

The Commission, in its *mantras* on the issue, equates *laws* with *values*. They are not equivalent. The countries concerned have had, like many countries, a wide variety of legal systems over time, and some within living memory, but these systems passed on, while the values remained.

We should know. We had a wonderful, almost perfect, legal system for over a century, famously described by Edmund Burke as "*a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man.*"

Though designed to destroy the values of the people, the laws went, but the values survived. Ever since the Irish have a penchant - shall we say—for putting all law in perspective.

What are the essential values that survive? The value of being in charge of one's own destiny and not being beholden to that of another. That is what permeated Ireland then and what permeates these countries today. If the EU cannot cope with that reality it is on a hiding to nothing.

The Commission issued its latest '*Rule of Law Report*' on 20th July. It judges

how all Member States are adhering to its concept of the '*rule of law*'. One very important *mantra* is the independence of the judiciary from Government.

Ireland is included in its chapter on "*Councils for the Judiciary and procedures for appointing judges as key safeguards for judicial independence*". It makes for amusing reading for anybody who knows anything about the fate of this attempt in Ireland:

"The 2020 Rule of Law Report noted that in a number of Member States, steps were under way to strengthen judicial independence and reduce the influence of legislative and executive powers on the justice system. The important role of the Councils for the Judiciary in safeguarding judicial independence is increasingly recognised. The new Councils for the Judiciary established in Ireland and Finland are now operational."

Shane Ross tried to create such a Judicial Council/Commission here, as he had some obsession about the appointment of judges, holding that they should be appointed 'independently' of the Government. It seemed that anybody except the Government should have a say on their appointment! And he got Government support, but the Government had to humiliatingly abandon the substance of the Bill due to parliamentary opposition.

One legal eagle put the issue succinctly:

"That proposal is unconstitutional, in my opinion. And the Bill currently before the Seanad is designed to undermine the clear constitutional function and duty of the elected government to make appointments to the High Court, the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court in accordance with the government's own discretion and judgement as to the composition, balance and outlook of those vital constitutional courts" (Michael McDowell, *Sunday Business Post*, 20/9/18.)

"During somewhat tetchy exchanges with Senators, Justice Minister Charlie Flanagan moved an amendment which reinforced the right of the Government to appoint judges without the need to seek approval from this new Commission" (Examiner, 11/12/19).

So the attempt to do what the European Commission advocates died a death in Ireland. To add to the farce, the Government actually thanked the Opposition for succeeding in destroying the Bill—which poses the question: why does the Commission not put the Irish Government in the same legal frame as the Poles for denying this crucial feature of their '*rule of law*' requirements?

Mr. McDowell was ably assisted by the hero of the LGBT movement, Senator David Norris, in destroying the Bill.

The Commission simply ignores the fate of this attempt to do its heart's desire here, which says a lot for the quality of the analysis of this much vaunted Report.

As a result, such Commission pronouncements are coming to have the air of declarations from the Soviet Politburo in its last days. They are becoming unbelievable except to ideologues.

Jack Lane

Conduct Unbecoming

continued

Later when he had agreed to form the Progressive Democrats (PDs), Howlin recalled the “*monster meetings*” across the country in which O’Malley was greeted “*like a messiah*”.

By forcing Charles Haughey to admit the PDs into a Coalition in 1989, O’Malley “*fundamentally fractured the political system*” by “*bending Haughey to his will*”. All of this duly bore fruit in 2011 (the year of the General Election in which Fianna Fail support dropped from 71 to 20 seats).

This really is fantasy stuff. *Standing by the Republic*—upholding the political order established by de Valera—and fracturing the old order, are opposites. O’Malley was unwittingly instrumental in wrecking the political system, not in standing by it. His references in the debate on Barry Desmond’s Bill in 1985 were merely rhetorical. Here is the key statement from that less than inspiring speech:

“The politics of this would be very easy. The politics would be, to be one of the lads, the safest way in Ireland. But I do not believe that the interests of this State, or our Constitution and of this Republic, would be served by putting politics before conscience in regard to this. There is a choice of a kind that can only be answered by saying that I stand by the Republic and accordingly I will not oppose this Bill.”

O’Malley had no idea of standing by the Republic; actually, he was expressing apolitical sentiments; he was pandering to a popular misconception that party political discipline is a bad thing. In opposing the Desmond Bill, Haughey was fulfilling the role of Leader of the Opposition in a matter where public opinion was evenly divided. O’Malley, possibly for reasons of personal egotism, was obstructing the normal political process. Haughey took advantage of the breach to rid

the party of an irritant and O’Malley was duly expelled for “*conduct unbecoming*”.

As for the monster meetings, these were a transient phenomenon which gave the PDs 14 seats at its highpoint in 1987. In the General Election of 1989 O’Malley’s party won only six seats. The neo-liberal vision which he represented found lasting support only in the upper reaches of society and among a small band of influential ideologues.

Howlin’s point that O’Malley bent Haughey to his will by forcing Fianna Fail to enter a Coalition arrangement, is nonsense. Both Haughey and O’Malley acted responsibly by adapting to the result that the electorate had returned. O’Malley, much less than Haughey, might be open to criticism in some quarters for providing his arch-opponent—by his rhetoric a danger to the public interest—with access to the reins of power.

That Gerard Howlin remains in denial about the causes of the Crash is the stand-out revelation from the discussion. Rather than facing up to the failure of the liberal God—the role that free market policies played in inflating international finance—he prefers to blame it all on Fianna Fail cronyism. Like others in the liberal camp, he chooses to see the 2011 Election result as an invalidation of the State that had been developed mainly by Fianna Fail; he sees no connection between that electoral collapse and liberalisation/globalisation. Whatever about the scale of destruction wrought by ideologically-driven banks, or the economic evidence, he must keep faith with the liberal creed of the hero of his youth.

At the heart of the 2008 Crash in Ireland was the fact that the total revenue of the banks operating in the Irish market was considerably larger than the Government’s total revenue; the Irish State had become dwarfed by the rapidly increasing size of the banking sector; and the activities of the banks—their business model—followed that of Wall Street and the City of London.

Critically, it was the international consensus and international factors that provided the necessary cover for the practices fuelling the Irish boom; right up until 2008, prestigious international bodies like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) consistently gave the Irish economy a clean bill of health. The European Central Bank (ECB) failed to exercise supervisory oversight over what was happening in Ireland and Spain, being itself party to the international consensus regarding liberalisation.

In Ireland the liberal lobby, represented by the Progressive Democrats, gave uncritical support to the international consensus; it contributed little by way of original ideas of its own. But the causes of the Irish Crash involved national as well as international factors. In the 2002 Budget *buy-to-let* landlords were allowed to write off mortgage interest payments against rental income for tax purposes, thereby preventing a needed recession in the property market. From that point on, a property market bubble began to steadily expand.

What is noteworthy in that development is that it arose from a key political relationship in the FF/PD Government of the time: that between the PDs and the liberal Minister for Finance, Charlie McCreevy. It was this liberal axis within Bertie Ahern’s 1997-2002 Government—really between the single PD Minister, Mary Harney, and McCreevy—that determined fiscal policy. It was they, with support from Ahern, who drove the Government’s economic agenda.

Gerard Howlin is not a disinterested observer of the political decisions that contributed to the Celtic Tiger bubble; according to his LinkedIn account, he was a Special Advisor at the Department of the Taoiseach from 1999 till 2007. Given his support for the Progressive Democrat mission, his appointment by Bertie Ahern must have reflected the shift inside Fianna Fail away from the Statist orientation of Charles Haughey towards PD-style economic liberalism.

If that is the case, Howlin is now trying to run with the hare, having run with the hounds at the critical time. His narrative of O’Malley’s contribution to politics is nothing short of brazen effrontery.

But Howlin’s way of thinking is representative of the views of many of the pundits and politicians who participate in political debate in the Irish media. The loudest supporters of O’Malley’s pro-globalisation policies did a sharp U-turn when those policies ended in the banking collapse. They then set about pre-empting the inevitable blame game by fingering traditional Fianna Fail, while engaging in dark mutterings about Ireland being a “*failed state*”. A common argument to be heard from Fine Gael politicians like Regina Doherty is that the Crash happened because the banking regulator failed to do his job; so, it was all the State’s fault!

Of the other contributors to the discussion, Noel Dempsey and Mary O’Rourke praised O’Malley’s courage and otherwise had little to say. John Bowman opined that O’Malley transformed Irish politics and that in the three big areas in which he chal-

lenged Charlie Haughey: the economy, the North, and the liberal agenda, he had been proved right. Really? When O'Malley becomes the subject of a serious biography, it will be interesting to see exactly what contributions he made that could be described as enduringly positive. With the passage of time, it will be even more interesting to see whose reputation fares better, O'Malley's or Haughey's. In this magazine our money would be on the latter.

Michael MacDowell also contributed. In traditional Fine Gael terms he singled out O'Malley's action in introducing the *Offences Against the State Act* as necessary to the security of the State. The subtext here is that we were inches away from a "fascist Provo" takeover. Like Howlin, MacDowell saw O'Malley as having "revolutionised Irish politics" and broken the mould of "the civil war antagonism". It seems unmentionable to point out in the present state of political discourse that the civil war divide provided a stable and representative cleavage, mirroring the actual divisions in society. Are we really better off with the present volatility, the glut of independent Dail Deputies and the succession of Coalitions with varying degrees of stability? The only bright spot is the success of Sinn Fein in last year's General Election. Should O'Malley be given credit for that?

At one point MacDowell said that O'Malley deserves to be remembered in the list of genuine statesmen that served the country. His list comprised Sean Lemass, Garrett Fitzgerald, Liam Cosgrave, Jack Lynch and Des O'Malley. He then said he would stretch things and add Charlie Haughey. What an ill-considered list! Apart from Haughey, only Lemass might barely make the cut. And no mention of de Valera! What is to be made of politicians who claim to be conservative and make extravagant professions about defending the State, and who then blot out the memory of the statesman who established its sovereignty?

The mainstream narrative of Irish history since the Arms Crisis of 1970 becomes more threadbare by the day.

Dave Alvey

[This article draws from a long review by Dave Alvey of "The Fall of the Celtic Tiger – Ireland and the Euro Debt Crisis" by Donal Donovan and Antoin Murphy (Oxford University Press, 2013). The article is titled 'Lessons of the Irish Crash' and was published in *Irish Political Review* (March 2018, vol 33). It can be accessed online at at <https://independent.academia.edu/DaveAlvey/The-Irish-Crash-and-the-Euro-Crisis>]

Naming 'the nameless one'

PROLOGUE

On 28th April 1957 the Belfast Unionist MP, H. Montgomery Hyde (1) published a lengthy article in the *Sunday Times* arguing strongly for the authenticity of the Black Diaries. His article was intended as a review of a new book by Alfred Noyes entitled *The Accusing Ghost or Justice for Casement* which was due on sale the following day. Noyes argued that the diaries which he had never seen were forgeries. His was the first book to make the case for forgery since William Maloney's 1936 volume *The Forged Casement Diaries*. M. Hyde's review article presented evidence aimed at refuting the arguments set out by Noyes and closed with the following comment:

"Finally, there is in the National Library of Ireland the manuscript of a poem by Casement, entitled "The Nameless One". In my view it betrays strong homosexual feelings in its author. Those who may read it below can judge for themselves of this."

The published poem consists of seven quatrains and does bear the interpretation indicated by M. Hyde. By simple inference readers would conclude that the author of the poem must also be the author of the diaries.

Only five days after publication, the *Sunday Times* Editor who commissioned the article contradicted M. Hyde's published claim that there was such a manuscript in The National Library of Ireland (NLI). On 3rd May Leonard Russell, the Literary Editor, wrote "My information is that Casement wrote two poems under the same title, and that the one we published is on microfilm in the National Library of Ireland – it was given to the Library by the New York Public Library." In fact, M. Hyde did not state he had seen a manuscript; he alleged only the presence of a manuscript which he had not seen. In historical research and in legal procedures it is axiomatic that the provenance of disputed or contentious documents be securely established beyond all reasonable doubt.

1

Alfred Noyes was a retired Professor of Literature, a former Nobel Prize nominee and a respected poet and author. His name had been linked to the diaries controversy

since 1916; while working in the News Department of the Foreign Office, he had seen the police typescripts at the height of the smear campaign. As an Englishman, a distinguished professor, and well-known author, his voice could not be ignored.

Far from being ignored, Noyes' book provoked extensive press attention with articles and letters in *The Nation*, *The Economist*, the *New Statesman*, *The Tablet*, *The Sunday Press*, the *Observer*, *The Spectator*, the *Evening Herald* and not least in the *Sunday Times*.

On the day following publication of M. Hyde's article, a Dublin doctor, Herbert O. Mackey, visited NLI in Kildare Street and asked to see the manuscript of the poem published by M. Hyde. Staff brought him a manuscript of a poem entitled *The Nameless One*, the text of which referred entirely to the Hamidian massacres of Armenians in 1895-6. (2) The poem consisted of six stanzas of six lines. Dr. Mackey was assured that this was the only manuscript poem of that name in the library.

Dr. Mackey was well known to library staff on account of his frequent visits to research Casement matters. He was Chairman of *The Casement Repatriation Committee*, which for years had sought the return to Ireland of Casement's remains. On that Monday, 29th April, Dr. Mackey hand-copied the text of the manuscript and also obtained a certified Photostat copy of the manuscript. He then wrote a letter to the Editor of the *Sunday Times* enclosing the hand copy of the poem and explained that this was a copy of the only manuscript in the library of that name. The letter was posted immediately.

Russell wrote on May 2nd to M. Hyde advising him of the letter and poem sent by Dr. Mackey and asking "What do I tell him?" On the same day he replied to Dr. Mackey: "The only thing I can do is to pass your letter on to Mr. Montgomery Hyde, and write to you again when I have his answer." The answer came only a day later, as cited above, but the locution "my information is ..." conceals the identity of who gave Russell the information.

It follows from the letter of 3rd May that M. Hyde did not take his version of *The Nameless One* from a manuscript when he

visited NLI some ten days before publication of his article. Nonetheless, his article attests to the presence of a manuscript (A) while Russell's letter of 3rd May attests to the presence of a different manuscript (B) of the same name. However, manuscript (A) was not present on 29th April when Dr. Mackey enquired for it. Therefore M. Hyde's claim in his *Sunday Times* article is false.

It is an undisputed fact that the purported NLI manuscript of the published poem has never been seen by anyone at any time. It remains to determine the provenance of the published text.

Two years after the *Sunday Times* articles, the M. Hyde text of *The Nameless One* was published by Singleton-Gates in his *Black Diaries* of 1959, citing M. Hyde as source. The same text was republished by Brian Inglis in 1973, citing Singleton-Gates as source. Neither had seen a manuscript in NLI nor did they refer to a microfilm. This latter is explained by the fact that the purported microfilm source, cited in Russell's letter of May 3rd, remained private with Dr. Mackey and was discovered by this author only in February 2021.

Three microfilms of Casement documents in the Maloney collection were indeed made by NYPL in 1946 and were sent to NLI. Obviously, the poem published by M. Hyde did not come from either of the sources cited at the time. The fact that the source of the published poem was concealed in 1957 indicates that there was no option but concealment. It follows that there are solid grounds for suspicion that the published poem was not written by Casement.

2

The question which imposes itself at this point concerns the true provenance of the poem published by M. Hyde. The Ransom Centre at the University of Texas holds the papers of M. Hyde and these reveal the provenance to be former senator Frank MacDermot (3), barrister, and journalist with the *Sunday Times* from 1938 to 1950. The poem, typed on a single A4 page, was sent from Dublin by MacDermot on 13th April directly to Leonard Russell at the *Sunday Times*. Therefore M. Hyde had no role whatsoever in sourcing and providing the poem for publication.

The papers in Texas also reveal that in early April 1957 MacDermot informed Russell of a "homosexual poem" which he could provide for the proposed article. MacDermot did not give Russell the source of the poem and this fact made Russell

somewhat suspicious. On 15th April Russell wrote to M. Hyde confirming receipt of the typescript poem from MacDermot but asking M. Hyde to "authenticate its presence in the Casement material" on his visit to NLI. Obviously M. Hyde could not do this because there was no such manuscript in NLI. Nonetheless, and without having seen any manuscript, Russell published the poem as a prize exhibit; it was a 'scoop' for the *Sunday Times*.

The Hyde papers also reveal that the proposal for the two *Sunday Times* articles came from MacDermot, not from M. Hyde, and that MacDermot did not wish his name to appear in print: "information is offered freely and gladly ... provided my name is not mentioned". Nowhere in those papers is there an indication of how MacDermot came to be in possession of the text of the poem. However, the reference in Russell's letter to Dr. Mackey of 3rd May to a microfilm sent to NLI from New York Public Library can safely be attributed to MacDermot since, in a letter sent from his Paris address dated 15th January, 1960, recently found in Dr. Mackey's papers, he stated that the source of the poem was a microfilm in NLI:

"The poem I referred to was "The Nameless One" – not that given by Dr Mackey but that published in the Sunday Times by Mr. Montgomery Hyde. You can find it on one of the Casement microfilms in the National Library."

This establishes as fact that MacDermot knew in April 1957 of these microfilms in NLI but did not inform M. Hyde of their existence and deceived him into believing the source was a non-existent NLI manuscript. It also establishes that MacDermot knew of the existence of a manuscript of the same name in NLI (the Ottoman poem) and also knew of the existence of a manuscript poem in NYPL with the title *The Nameless One*. The question which imposes itself at this point is very obvious: why before May 3rd did MacDermot conceal from Russell and M. Hyde the existence of the NY manuscript?

A poem of that title was indeed listed in the file of Casement poems donated to NYPL by Dr. Maloney in December 1940. That MacDermot made no reference to it requires explanation and the only explanation which satisfies common sense and probability is that MacDermot knew the NY manuscript was another copy of the same Ottoman poem held in NLI. Casement often made more than one manuscript of his poems and manuscripts of several poems in NLI can also be found in the NYPL file.

MacDermot could not have foreseen the intervention of Dr. Mackey in NLI on 29th April, or that he would send the Ottoman poem to Russell. This predicament constrained MacDermot to invent the implausible remedy of two poems with the same name. It is simply not credible, far less probable, that Casement wrote two poems with radically different themes and gave them the same title. They have nothing in common. There is no reason why any poet would do this, anymore than a novelist would publish two utterly different novels with the same title.

3

In 1946 three microfilms of Casement documents in the *Maloney Historical Papers* were made by staff in New York Public Library. These were sent to NLI. A collection of poem mss attributed to Casement can now be found on one of the microfilms which are not listed in the main catalogue. Among these is a photograph of a ms poem with the mis-spelled title *The Namless One*. It is recorded that Dr. Maloney donated most of these mss to NYPL in December 1940. A typed contents list with the file in NY records a poem called *The Nameless One* as being part of the original donation. Other mss were added to the file on later dates.

Today in that NY file there is a ms of *The Nameless One*, with the title misspelled, and on the reverse of the ms there is a handwritten inscription which gives the date and place of composition which seems to authenticate the ms as being written by Casement. The NLI microfilm does not contain a photograph of this reverse inscription. The text on the NLI microfilm corresponds to the ms held today in NYPL but neither corresponds to the text printed by M. Hyde in the *Sunday Times*; there are several differences, although they do not alter the overall meaning of the poem. The reverse inscription was not published by M. Hyde, and his line 18 differs from that line in both the NLI microfilm and the present ms in NYPL.

The text published by M. Hyde was sent to him by Russell of the *Sunday Times* who had received it in the form of a typed A4 page from Frank MacDermot who by then was a retired journalist living in Paris. Much of the mystery about this poem and its suspect provenance arises from MacDermot's enigmatic role in its publication. It follows that MacDermot did not obtain his text from either the microfilm or the ms now in NYPL.

Where MacDermot obtained his text remains a matter of speculation.

MacDermot had long nourished an

antipathy towards Casement which he himself admitted. “*I dislike and disapprove of Casement quite apart from his sex life*” (Letter of May 5, 1956 to M. Hyde). According to his letter to Russell of 13th April 1957 his interest in the diaries “*began with the publication of Maloney’s worthless but mischievous book*”, in 1936 when he contacted Malcolm MacDonald, then Dominions Secretary, asking him to verify that the diaries were authentic and received “*a written assurance (marked private and personal)... but he did not say that he had seen them or that they still existed*”.

This was reported in MacColl’s 1956 book (page 290) without naming MacDermot who was described as “*...a former member of the Dail. He has an unimpeachable record for disinterestedness and honesty*”. MacColl cited the un-named MacDermot: “*But it enrages me that in Ireland and the U.S.A. the diary is now frequently referred to as an ignoble forgery*”. It was this antipathy which induced him to give credibility to the preposterous allegations made by Serjeant Sullivan whom he interviewed more than once.

Here are some of the anomalies in MacDermot’s role.

Although MacDermot proposed the articles and poem to Russell, and although he was an experienced journalist known to *Sunday Times* readers, he was reluctant to write the articles and preferred M. Hyde as author.

He did not name the poem when promising to supply it and referred only to a ‘homosexual poem’ which he allowed Russell to infer was a manuscript in NLI.

Although MacDermot already knew of the 3 NLI microfilms of Casement documents, he did not mention a microfilm as the source of the poem.

He made it a condition of giving the poem text for publication that his name would not appear.

MacDermot knew there was no ms of the poem in NLI but he did not tell Montgomery Hyde.

In his letter of May 5 in the *Sunday Times* he did not comment on the false claim about a ms source in NLI.

Only when asked on May 2nd about provenance did MacDermot tell Russell about a microfilm.

It is clear from these verified points that MacDermot intended to conceal his source from both his former colleague and his “*old friend*” M. Hyde. That he did not name

the poem when discussing the articles with Russell can only be explained by his not knowing the name. Since it is unthinkable that MacDermot had seen the poem he was proposing but had forgotten its name, this implies he had not seen the poem *at that time*. It follows that, if he had not seen it, he could not know that it was a “*homosexual poem*”, unless someone had told him of its topic. That unknown someone was almost certainly the person who gave the text to MacDermot. Unsurprisingly Russell was suspicious about its provenance but he managed to set aside his suspicion in order to obtain a ‘scoop’.

Two further facts must be considered. Before April 1957 there is no evidence that anyone had ever heard of this poem in any form and MacDermot was the first to refer to it. Secondly, Russell claimed in his letter of May 3rd, “*Casement wrote two poems under the same title...*”; the other poem is the Ottoman poem of 1898. But this is very unusual. Without Dr. Mackey’s intervention, MacDermot would never have made the improbable claim about two poems of the same title and the microfilm. Even then, only Dr. Mackey was informed—privately—of the microfilm and no other researcher since 1957 has been aware of it. It requires to be explained why MacDermot intended to conceal the microfilm as his source.

There are strong reasons for thinking that, when MacDermot first proposed the unknown poem to Russell in late March, he was proposing a ‘work in progress’—bait for a ‘scoop’. Indeed the second article filled an entire page of the newspaper and provoked dozens of readers’ letters. Among the very few published were two from MacDermot, printed on 5th and 19th May. The first referred to the article of 28th April. In neither letter did this man with the “*unimpeachable record for disinterestedness and honesty*” correct M. Hyde’s false claim about a manuscript in NLI. Nor did he refer to a microfilm from NYPL as source of the poem. Instead he allowed the falsehood to deceive hundreds of thousands of readers worldwide.

At this point one question imposes itself upon the rational inquirer; why did MacDermot not give as his source the ms entitled *The Nameless One* now held in NYPL?

The published poem did not come from a ms in NLI as alleged. It did not come from a microfilm in NLI as alleged. It did not come from a ms in NYPL. Therefore it came from somewhere else and its true

provenance in 1957 was concealed and this concealment was intentional and therefore necessary. There is only one explanation for the necessary concealment of its provenance—the poem was not composed by Casement. It follows that the ms entitled *The Nameless One* now in NYPL was not written by Casement.

The mss on the microfilm are accompanied by anonymous handwritten notes which purport to authenticate the calligraphy as Casement’s hand. This writer has inspected many hundreds of Casement mss over several years and none of them bear any note purporting to authenticate the handwriting. It is a fact that archives do not assume responsibility for the authenticity of the documents deposited with them. Their task is simply to conserve and make them available to the public. Therefore, these side-notes on the NLI microfilm deserve the maximum suspicion *because they are unique*.

Some special circumstance attaching to these poems made it necessary to add the side-notes. Since the notes are intended to authenticate the mss on the microfilm, that circumstance was the apprehension by the writer of the notes that some of the mss might arouse suspicion that they were not genuine. The notes were intended to respond to anticipated suspicion about the poems in the future. Therefore some circumstance was *known* to the writer of the notes when they were written. But since the notes are unsigned, the writer remains unidentified, therefore without authority to authenticate anything.

Indeed, not only are the notes worthless as authentication but their presence itself signals that at least one of the mss will come under suspicion as not genuine. The poem which did come under suspicion from 1957 onwards was *The Nameless One* and that suspicion arose from its publication in the *Sunday Times*. Prior to publication that poem was unknown. There is evidence in the side-notes on the microfilm that this poem deserved ‘*special attention*’.

The notes referring to the other poems simply claim the ms is in Casement’s handwriting. But the note for *The Nameless One* gives the following: “*The Nameless One. lines written in very great dejection at Genoa, Nov. 15, 1900 by Roger Casement in Casement’s handwriting.*” These twenty words about time, place and mood cannot be derived from the text of the poem. This side-note is almost twice the average length of the notes for the other mss.

This ‘authenticating’ detail did not appear with the *Sunday Times* version, which

demonstrates that MacDermot did not obtain his text from the NLI microfilm.

Since it is unthinkable that MacDermot would have concealed or ignored these 'authenticating' details, it can be deduced that he had not seen these details when he sent his text to Russell. Nonetheless, a version of this 'authenticating' side-note does appear on the reverse of the ms now held in NYPL. That version concludes with the words "*before sailing on "Sirio" for Barcelona*", which are missing from the microfilm.

It can be reasonably concluded that the note-writer's apprehension of suspicion concerned *The Namless One* rather than the other mss. That particular apprehension can only be explained by the writer's awareness that a version of this poem was intended for publication as a prize exhibit in the *Sunday Times*. Thus it became necessary before publication to 'authenticate' all the poems on the microfilm.

Staff in NYPL have verified that none of these side-notes purporting to authenticate the mss can be found today in NYPL.

There is, therefore, no evidence today that the side-notes existed in 1946, when the microfilms were made. Library staff today have never seen them. Readers must decide if they find it credible that curators of the Casement papers in NYPL were authorised to destroy documents which purport to authenticate the poem mss entrusted to their care. If a credible motive for this extraordinary destruction cannot be found, it follows that the side-notes were not destroyed and could not be destroyed because there were no side-notes in NYPL.

This leaves only one explanation for their existence today on the NLI microfilm. In 1957 the microfilm was manipulated to include the forged side-notes and the forged version of *The Namless One*.

Some readers will understandably find this exposition challenging and perhaps confusing. They might attribute this to human weakness, indeed to a certain carelessness on the part of the principal actor, MacDermot, whose behaviour is difficult to rationalise. But MacDermot was an Oxford-trained barrister, a banker, journalist and a politician who founded a very successful political party and whose Dail and Seanad orations were considered models of lucidity and coherence, as were his journalistic writings. It is unlikely that his anomalous conduct was due to mere carelessness.

Whatever the motive for MacDermot's conduct, publication of the poem in a mass-circulation newspaper reaching over a million readers in single day clearly served to overwhelm the arguments in Noyes' book. This result would have been shared by British Intelligence with considerable satisfaction. It can be reasonably discounted that MacDermot, a seventy-one-year-old retired journalist living in Paris, acted entirely on his own initiative. Moreover, there is no evidence that MacDermot had the literary skills and experience required to compose a well-made poem. Those who doubt that British Intelligence was capable of producing the twenty-eight lines of the poem seriously underestimate their ingenuity, experience and *modus operandi*.

It seems improbable that MacDermot was motivated exclusively by his acknowledged hostility to Casement and his lifelong pro-British sentiment. Certainly he was close to the British Establishment, and MI5 would not have felt awkward about approaching him. His undercover role in providing the poem and the timing of its publication strongly suggest that this was an Intelligence services exercise.

The anomaly of two very different poems with the same title is resolved as follows. It was necessary to give the false poem the name of a ms already listed in the NY Casement file so that it would appear to be part of the original Maloney donation. The Ottoman ms entitled *The Nameless One* seemed appropriate and this ms was removed and the forged *Namless One* was inserted where it remains today.

Now at last the nameless one has a name—Frank MacDermot. No doubt he knew the names of other 'nameless ones'.

The author wishes to thank Dr. Philip O' Connor for his vital research in NLI and Meredith Mann for his extensive and

patient research in NYPL. Thanks are also due to the Mackey family for permitting access to their grandfather's papers.

NOTES

1 – Montgomery Hyde (1907-1989), born in Belfast to a merchant family, was schooled in England, took a history degree at Queens, Belfast before studying law at Magdalen College, Oxford. He worked as a barrister and a private librarian until WW2 when he became an Intelligence Officer operating in New York, Gibraltar and Bermuda. From the early 30s he was a prolific author. After a false start, he won the North Belfast Unionist parliamentary seat in 1950 which he held for nine years. He became active in law reform, particularly homosexual law reform and published on Oscar Wilde, the Casement trial, homosexuality, pornography and on his Secret Service experiences. He had a long term interest in the Casement story and was a steadfast proponent of the authenticity of the diaries even before he saw them on August 10, 1959 when invited by the PRO along with René MacColl to witness the 'first' viewing.

2 – *The Nameless One* (the Ottoman poem) was written by Casement in November 1898 and the manuscript is held in NLI. Readers are referred to Dr. Pat Walsh's explanatory article in *Irish Foreign Affairs* Volume 14, Number 2, June 2021, which elucidates the somewhat obscure references.

3 – MacDermot (1886-1975), described as an anglophile cosmopolitan, was born in Dublin, a son of the Attorney General of Ireland. He was educated at Downside School in Somerset and studied law at Oxford. During WW1 he served in the Royal Army Service Corps and reached the rank of Major. After several years as a banker in New York, he returned to Ireland and entered politics, becoming founder and co-leader of the National Centre Party which merged with Fine Gael of which he became Vice-President. Despite his opposition to Fianna Fáil and to De Valera, he joined Fianna Fáil in 1937, becoming a Senator in 1938. He opposed the new Constitution, the official status of Irish, and was a critic of Neutrality during WW2. In 1938 he became US correspondent for the *Sunday Times*, later moving to New York where he spent the remaining war years. In 1945 he became Paris correspondent for the *Sunday Times* where he continued to live after his retirement in 1950.

Paul Hyde

IRISH FOREIGN AFFAIRS, SEPTEMBER 2021

EU Expansion into the South Caucasus: Ukraine II?	Pat Walsh
Why Germany invaded Poland.	John Wear
A narrative of the Anglo-Irish negotiations in 1921	(Part three)
De Valera, DIAS, the Polygamist, and the Red.	
	Introduced by Pat Muldowney
De Valera – an appreciation.	J. L. Synge

Subscriptions: 4 issues. Electronic €10 (£8). Postal Euro-zone and World Surface: €24; Sterling-zone: £15
from the addresses on the back page by cheque to *Athol Books*, or online from:
<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>

Electricity Supply

Ireland: FDI at a cross roads?

This Summer saw a number of stories in the press referring to problems emerging with the security of supply of electricity in the Republic. In particular, my attention was drawn to two stories in the *Irish Times*. The first story related to plans to bring in temporary generation capacity in the Autumn, following a series of system alerts about supply levels beginning last November.

Stories like this date back a long time. I first came across the issue in another *Irish Times* story back in 2001. This reported that the Electricity Supply Board had imported 5 generators from the US to temporarily boost supply over the Winter. A couple of months after reading that story, I joined the civil service, where my first job involved preparing progress reports on the *Economic and Social Infrastructure* chapter of the *National Development Plan 2000-2006*. The reports synthesised State infrastructure investment across Departments and Agencies, covering things like roads, rail, waste water, housing, health etc. To my surprise, the only mention of electricity in the whole chapter was in relation to some small sustainable energy initiatives.

Development of new generation capacity was being left to the market. Not only that, the ESB was precluded from developing new generation capacity, as that would interfere with the objective of fostering competition in supply. Also surprising was the fact that the only people trying to make an issue of it were the ESB Unions.

I eventually came to the conclusion that the IT reporting had been essentially alarmist and that, if there was a real and imminent threat to the security of electricity supply, Ireland would never have attracted the massive level of foreign direct investment it has over the last 20 years.

However another story in the paper a few weeks later was of a different order entirely. The bones of the story was that the IDA [Industrial Development Agency], in a submission to the *Commission for the Regulation of Utilities* (CRU), said there was emerging "disquiet" in the foreign direct investment sector in relation to the electricity supply.

The CRU's stated mission is "to protect the public interest in Water, Energy and Energy Safety". It also forecasts demand for electricity and organises the market to meet demand forecasts. In the latest forecasts it predicts that, on an All-Island basis, the growth in energy demand for the next ten years varies between 17% in a low demand scenario, to 41% in a high demand scenario.

It also says that analysis shows that, in a median demand scenario, there may not be adequate generation capacity to meet demand from 2026 in the Republic, should the Moneypoint Generator close. (Moneypoint in County Clare is primarily coal-fired and is by far the largest generating plant on the Island. The Government has committed to ending the use of coal in Moneypoint by 2025.)

There is a single energy market established on the island of Ireland but it relies at present on three small capacity interconnectors. There is also an interconnector between the Republic and Wales. A much higher capacity North/South Interconnector is

planned, but this is not likely to be live before 2024, as planning has not yet been finalised in Northern Ireland.

Plans for a proposed Interconnector between Ireland and France are also being progressed, with a view to coming into service in 2026/2027. While interconnectors can alleviate supply problems, they are not a solution to the energy security situation the Republic is facing into.

The long-term demand forecast in Ireland continues to be heavily influenced by the expected growth of large energy users, primarily Data Centres. These need a lot of power and each one can require the same amount of energy as a large town. One estimate shows that demand from data centres could account for 27% of all demand in Ireland by 2029 in a median demand scenario.

The Republic has a real dilemma in reconciling its climate obligations with its current policy of maximising foreign direct investment. The climate obligations mean that Peat-, Coal- and Oil-fired Generators are being progressively decommissioned, with natural gas from the Corrib field taking up the slack for the moment. Wind, solar and tidal power are expected to eventually provide the bulk of generation capacity. The *Ireland Climate Action Plan 2019* states that 70% of electricity will be generated from renewable sources by 2030. It is currently in the region of 40%.

It may be that the only options available in the short term are: either to renege on the targets for reduction of emissions from electricity generation, or to curb the growth of large energy-consuming FDI projects.

Tony Monks

Privatising!

There are three ways to organise electricity generation. One is DIY, have your own water wheel, windmill or solar or whatever, to power your generator or dynamo and (literally) take it from there. This is the sole (these days solar) option, self-sufficient and as they say, off-grid—and free (apart from the capital cost). It is the way eccentric progressives used to do things in the nineteenth century—and again today.

The other two models are versions of social provision—organised on the basis of networks, centralised generation and distribution grids and all of that. One version is to organise the delivery of electricity through an engineer-based, centrally planned system (such as the old ESB).

This is a system-management and cost recovery exercise (with, obviously, through accounting policy, renewal and replacement built into 'pricing', the billing cost to the customer or consumer). There is no market, there is centrally-managed and—historically—State-provided, electricity: organised according to engineering precepts of efficiency (as opposed to economics)—and as part of a great project for prosperity through modernisation, in Ireland encapsulated in the State's project of rural electrification realised through the ESB. Lenin once observed, "*Communism equals Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country*". Irish

Governments since the 1920s were and are far from Leninist but there was a bit of Leninist thinking in the national dream of electrification as was imagined by the Free State and adopted by all Governments afterwards through the vehicle of the ESB (and its main partner from the beginning, Siemens).

The second social version is market-based and is today an almost universal model. This is ideologically different to the State-organised project for progress. It also generally, where practised (as in modern Ireland), makes a mess of things: except that Profit—rather than Progress (and society)—is protected and so accumulation (through dividend or capital gain or a mix of both) is in effect guaranteed.

It makes a mess of things in three ways:

- * the cost to the consumer (in market terms 'price') goes through the roof;
- * continuity of supply (including long-term) is not guaranteed;
- * and capitalism is exploitatively happy.

There is a fourth factor in the market model: it creates a large army of 'technocratic' and administrative ignoramuses, talking market-speak and economic theory—and, at the expense of everyone—Chundering up their pensions. The engineers are locked up in a cupboard (with the key thrown away).

Some years ago the EU Commission decided to adopt and apply across the union the market model. It is a disaster. And now, according to the *Irish Times*, this:

"...the Coalition [government] is steering a legislation through the Dáil so emergency generators can bypass planning laws. "The Government has approved amendments to the Planning and Development Act... to ensure temporary generation could be permitted in a timely manner if required", said the Department of Environment, Climate and Communications."

The authorities fear there may be power shortages in the coming Winter, if it is at all harsh:

"According to a senior electricity market source, the ESB plans to install temporary generators at the North Wall in Dublin on a brownfield site. "Within the industry, we're all very exercised about it, and understandably so. It's going to be a very hard winter", the source said."

And of course not a dicky bird from Labour, the Shimmers, or even FF, about what is going on. Mary O'Rourke, to be fair to her, when she found herself Minister

for Energy (or whatever it was then called) did express amazement and deep puzzlement that as minister, she was required to sanction price increases in order to 'lower prices', as part of the civil service drive to abolish the ESB and have market forces unleashed. While smelling a rat, she didn't quite get what was going on—the binning of Central Planning in electricity supply and its replacement with the private market model and thus for capitalists the license to accumulate, accumulate, accumulate. The brain drug delivered to electricity users was and is 'freedom of choice'.

If you want to see what a market-based electricity model looks like, if you want to see where Ireland (and Europe's EU) is headed, look at New Zealand. Here we

have a complete market model—as Irish (and EU) civil servants wish to inflict on Ireland's electricity users north and south in conformity with the EU Commission's ambition to have the entire market model imposed throughout the EU (including NI as part of the EU): the Single Electricity Market (SEM).

Auckland's supply of power seems permanently on an edge. Fuel poverty in Winter is acute. Children die of cold in Winter, people suffer freezing conditions in sub-standard homes and the Government now spends a fortune paying subsidies ('Winter allowance')—ultimately into the pockets of Capital. There is more that one could say, but that's perhaps a matter for a detailed piece.

Fergus O'Raghallaigh

Griffith's Sinn Fein And Anti-Semitism —A Bloomsday Question

"Joyce and some Jewish Questions in pre-independence Irish politics"

I was born on 30th May 1949, in a South Circular Road nursing home which in 1918 had been the first Dublin home of Chief Rabbi Isaac Herzog, father of the future President of Israel, Chaim Herzog, and grandfather of the new President elect Yitzhak Herzog. As a child of the 1950s and 60s, and reared in Victoria Street in a neighbourhood still known as Dublin's "Little Jerusalem", I would sometimes be asked to perform the *shabbos goy* function of switching off the electric lights in the neighbouring Lennox Street synagogue, whose street entrance remained unlocked throughout Friday nights in those innocent and peaceful times of low crime.

One late Saturday afternoon in the mid 1920s, that synagogue almost went up in flames. But here I must allow the facts get in the way of a good story. This was NOT an attempt at arson. Four playmates, wishing to bring *Shabbos* to a prompt conclusion, had sneaked into the synagogue, but accidentally dropped a *Havdalah* candle they had just lit, which set fire to the cloth on which it fell, and which required the alerted synagogue *Shamas* (beadle), living on the same premises, to take swift action to extinguish the flames. The culprits were three Levitas brothers and the aforementioned Chaim Herzog.

The purpose of this presentation is to interrogate some Jewish questions in pre-

independence Ireland, and how they were handled—or not handled as the case may be—in Joyce's *Ulysses*. For silences may have as much significance as expressive narrative, since appearances can also be deceptive.

With the turbulent birth of the Irish Free State, and its Civil War of 1922-23, two former neighbours, who both resided close to the synagogue at 32 Lennox Street on the occasion of the 1911 Census, would find themselves murdered by Free State Army officers: one victim a Catholic from number 26, and the other a Jew from number 36; one a civil servant and the other a tailor. Confounding the stereotypes, it was the Anti-Treaty Irish Republican leader Harry Boland who was both a Catholic and the tailor in question; while the Jewish victim—Emanuel Ernest Kahn—was a civil servant in Ireland's Department of Agriculture.

Yet questions need to be asked about what Joyce himself and some Joycean scholars, chose to say, or not say, on certain Jewish subjects.

In the *Circe* episode, when Bloom is hallucinating about being condemned to death by Bella Cohen, Joyce relates: "*Darkshawled figures of the circumcised, in sackcloth and ashes, stand beside the wailing wall*".

Joyce proceeds to list nine authentic members of the 1904 Dublin Jewish com-

munity, culminating with “*the Reverend Leopold Abramovitz, Chazen*”. In his 1972 history, *The Jews Of Ireland*, Louis Hyman (d. 1981) commented:

“The Reverend Leopold Abramovitz, Chazen, is identical with Abraham Lipman Abramovitz (d. 1907), Reader (*Chazan*) of the Lennox Street synagogue.”

Hyman proceeded to make the following reference to a descendant of Abramovitz: “*He was the grandfather of Robert Kahan (1893-1951), a Dublin civil servant and a keen student of Joyce.*”

Indeed he was, and no doubt Hyman, the Joycean scholar, had many exchanges with his good friend Robert on their shared enthusiasm. But there was a yawning gap in this biographical note on Abramovitz’s family—what might more accurately be called a deadly silence—concerning Robert’s brother and fellow civil servant, Emanuel (1899-1923).

On the night of 24th November 1923, Emanuel had been playing cards with three friends in a Jewish Social Club. One friend continued up the South Circular Road, while the artist Harry Kernoff bade good night at his Stamer Street home, before Emanuel and David Miller continued up the street—where they were being followed in a car by three Free State Army officers. As Emanuel was about to turn left at the corner towards his Lennox Street home, and his companion to turn right, they were accosted. Emanuel was murdered, and Miller wounded, by Commandant Jimmy Conroy, who a decade later would be a Blueshirt Fascist activist. The mortally wounded Emanuel crawled around the corner before finally expiring only yards from both his home and his synagogue.

As they made their way to primary school the following morning from their home in the adjoining Warren Street, the horror of seeing a trail of Emanuel Kahn’s bloodstains curving round the pavement of that Lennox Street corner, remained the all-too-vivid childhood memory of my good friends, comrades and lifelong anti-Fascist activists, Max Levitas (1915-2018) and his brother Maurice Levitas (1917-2001).

The then teenage Louis Hyman would have been all too well aware how much the whole Dublin Jewish community had been convulsed by Emanuel’s murder, so his silence on the murder of this grandson of *Chazan* Abraham Abramovitz was deafening.

That indeed is a Jewish question concerning one Joycean scholar. But there are also significant Jewish questions to

be asked about some silences on Joyce’s own part, particularly with respect to Arthur Griffith.

Hyman’s own history first alerted me to Griffith’s championing of the anti-Semitic Redemptorist preacher, Father John Creagh, and the resulting 1904 boycott of Limerick’s Jewish community which that priest had incited. And, of course, there was also Hyman’s chapter, “*Jewish backgrounds of Ulysses*”.

But, while Hyman did refer in passing to the intensely bigoted anti-Semitic outbursts that Bloom had to endure from the ‘Citizen’ in the *Cyclops* episode, he did not otherwise explore his character. Nor did he examine any primary sources for Griffith. Indeed, Hyman’s chapters on Limerick and Joyce largely inhabit parallel universes.

Beyond a passing reference, Hyman did not explore in any detail whether there was something more than coincidence involved in chronicling those racist outbursts on a date in 1904 when the boycott of Limerick’s Jewish community remained a current and burning issue.

This was the connection to be addressed by myself two years later in an article written to mark the 70th anniversary of what had become known as “Bloomsday”. “*A National Question on Bloomsday*” was its title, and I took as its terms of reference the *Cyclops* exchanges on the question, “*But do you know what a nation is?*” [*Communist Review*, July 1974, monthly magazine of the Dublin Branch of the British & Irish Communist Organisation].

In 1978 I met Louis Hyman on a visit from his Haifa home to his native Dublin, and a correspondence followed. Hyman encouraged me to explore Griffith’s anti-Semitic writings in greater detail, both before and after 1904. This I did, over the course of 1979 and 1980. I found that, prior to the Limerick boycott, anti-Semitism in Irish politics had been expressed in coverage of foreign affairs, whether the Dreyfus Trial in France or the Boer War in South Africa. But Limerick was the first time that the Jewish community in Ireland itself came under political attack, most notably by Arthur Griffith. [“*Sinn Féin and the Jews*”, *The Irish Communist*, March, May, June, July, October and December 1980, theoretical journal of the British & Irish Communist Organisation.]

In January 1904 Griffith expressed his loathing for 75 percent of the Jewish community in Ireland, and by April 1904 this had risen to 90 percent. A misreading

of a February 1919 statement by Griffith had led me to conclude in 1980 that this had risen to 100 percent. This error on my part was due to my failure to adequately address the evolution in Griffith’s outlook during the 1910 to 1917 period.

In his 2006 book *Jewish Ireland in the Age of Joyce*, Cormac Ó Gráda argued:

“James Joyce’s Leopold Bloom—the atheistic Everyman of *Ulysses*, son of a Hungarian Jewish father and an Irish Protestant mother—may have turned the world’s literary eyes on Dublin, but those who look to him for history should think again.”

In Joyce’s treatment of anti-Semitism in Ireland, the reader is in fact misled by the distorted characterisation of one particular Irish historical personality.

As to the Irish Jewish community itself there is, in effect, an absence of history.

Hyman wrote that, “*it was in Trieste and Zurich that Joyce mainly came in contact with Jews who helped him to write about the Jewish and Zionist themes in Ulysses*”.

In 1914, when Joyce began writing *Ulysses* in Trieste, he may well have been previously told by his friend John Francis Byrne of the September 1908 lecture the latter had given to the Dublin *Young Men’s Zionist Association*, in which discussion one Joseph Edelstein participated. If so, Zionism remains the only manifestation of political activity among Dublin Jews to which *Ulysses* alludes.

Thom’s Directories may well have aided Joyce in stringing together a list of Jewish names from neighbouring addresses. But there was a whole cohort of Jews whose names were not deemed worthy of inclusion in those Directories, the Jewish residents of the three blocks of Dublin Artisan Dwellings (DAD) between Lennox Street and the Grand Canal, Portobello—those dwellings being in Kingsland Parade, Martin Street, Warren Street, Lennox Place and Lennox Street itself.

There is, accordingly, no indication in *Ulysses* that there was any class conflict underway within the Jewish community, with Jewish workers establishing their own unions for cabinetmakers as well as tailors and pressers, and embarking on strike action against their Jewish employers.

Nor is there even a whisper of the fact that, when the Socialist James Connolly stood against the Redmondite Home Rule candidate in the Dublin Municipal Elections of January 1902, he issued a Yiddish language appeal to Jewish workers, only two years before that first Bloomsday.

Connolly subsequently exposed the

dirty tricks that had been employed by the successful Home Rule candidate, the Nationalist songwriter, P.J. McCall.

Catholic voters had been told that Connolly was a Jew, and Jewish voters that he was an anti-Semite, and it is not difficult to see the hand of one Joseph Edelstein in canvassing towards the latter end.

Edelstein emigrated to South Africa later that year, but was back in Dublin by 1907, with a surge in his own levels of activity. An ardent campaigner against moneylending, his novel *The Moneylender* was first published in 1908, going through four further editions until 1931, and with a cover that graphically portrayed a very dark-bearded and hook-nosed Jew, surrounded by a shower of cascading coinage.

Edelstein had been born in an artisan dwelling in Warren Street, and yet I know of no evidence of hostility from the Jewish inhabitants of that artisan dwelling neighbourhood on the occasion of that first publication of *The Moneylender*. Indeed, Edelstein was to be made most welcome when he organised a meeting in that neighbourhood a year later, although on a different issue.

Robert Briscoe, Jewish I.R.A. veteran of both the the War of Independence and the Civil War, a Fianna Fáil TD and twice Lord Mayor of Dublin, related in his 1958 autobiography, *For The Life of Me*, that while his own Home Rule-supporting father had named him after Robert Emmet, and an older brother after Wolfe Tone, the political outlook of the Dublin Jewish community at the turn of the 20th century was predominantly Unionist. Indeed, Briscoe's own father-in-law, Joseph Isaacs, sat as a Unionist councillor on Dublin Corporation right up to 1920.

But a decisive shift by the Jewish community towards support for Home Rule began in 1908, while a further shift towards support for Sinn Féin would occur in 1918. In 1908 it was Joseph Edelstein who became the founding Secretary of the Judaeo-Irish Home Rule Association, which held its inaugural meeting in the Mansion House on 10th September 1908. "*Angry Scene*" and "*Dissenter Ejected*" were subheadings to the Unionist *Irish Times* account the following morning. When Edelstein's motion of support for Home Rule was put, the report maintained that:

"The resolution was met with cries of 'Aye' and 'No', which seemed about equal in volume. The Chairman declared the resolution passed... When the audience was dispersing, a fight, in which a

dozen persons participated, took place at the door. It appears that some of the Jews who were not in sympathy with the object of the meeting proclaimed their views rather loudly, with the result that they were rather roughly treated by their co-religionists, who were supported by a number of United Irish Leaguers."

On Sunday, 16th May 1909, a provocative coat-trailing meeting of the *British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel* among the Jews was held by the Canal bank at Martin Street, where two-thirds of the inhabitants were Jewish. It was an aggressive act of Protestant proselytism, organised by the Rector of St. Kevin's Anglican parish, and having as its 'star' speaker, one Isaac Luft, a Jewish convert to Anglicanism.

A counter meeting was organised by Joseph Edelstein. The *Irish Times* headlines on the following day read, "*Mission To The Jews*", "*Noisy Meeting At Portobello*", and "*Jewish Speaker Charged*". The report opened:

"Unusual scenes were seen yesterday on the bank of the Grand Canal at the end of Martin Street. The district lying between this reach of the canal and the South Circular Road is largely inhabited by Jews."

Only three yards separated the rival meetings, with Luft and Edelstein speaking in Yiddish and English, respectively, and simultaneously trying to drown each other out, along with much shouting also emanating from the crowd of 200 to 300 people present. Edelstein deliberately threw a glass tumbler at Luft and cut the back of his hand, whereupon he was arrested and subsequently convicted of assault.

In July 1910 James Connolly returned to Ireland after seven years spent in the USA, becoming National Organiser with the Socialist Party of Ireland, which had Frederick Ryan as its National Secretary and Walter Carpenter as Secretary of its Dublin Branch. In February 1911, and over the following few months, it was decided that Carpenter should hold SPI public meetings on the previously mentioned Canal bank at Martin Street, where, out of 301 residents of that street's artisan dwellings, as many as 195 were Jewish.

In those days, a number of those in the leadership of what had become known to Dubliners as '*the Jewish Union*', founded in 1908, were among those residing in Martin Street, while others resided in the adjoining Warren Street. Links between the 'Connolly Socialists' and the 'Jewish Union' were further developed during 1913, when Walter Carpenter and other

SPI activists spoke at a public meeting organised by the International Tailors', Machinists' and Pressers' Trade Union itself. When its founding secretary, Harry Miller, resigned through ill-health in December 1913, it was the Gentile socialist Walter Carpenter who was invited to become the Jewish Union's new General Secretary.

At that time the Union's headquarters were at 52 Lower Camden Street, a premises shared with the local synagogue. A case of Jerusalem on one floor and the New Jerusalem on another!

These were the Jewish people disregarded by Thom's Directory, and the sharp Jewish Questions which found no place in Joyce's *Ulysses*.

The issue of anti-Semitism in Ireland is, however, addressed in *Ulysses*, but in such a manner that, what might be considered an enlightening characterisation in one episode, is later offset in another episode with a characterisation that is quite misleading.

Joyce, of course, cannot be blamed for those commentators who have misconstrued what he actually wrote in the earlier *Ulysses* episode. In an article entitled "*When Irish eyes weren't smiling*", for the June 2006 issue of the *Journal of the Association of Jewish Refugees*, Anthony Greenville wrote of what he maintained was—

"the somewhat neglected subject of Irish attitudes to the Jews—neglected because Jews in Ireland were so few. In the most famous Irish text of the twentieth century, James Joyce's *Ulysses*, Mr Deasy asks Stephen Dedalus if he knows why Ireland has '*the honour of being the only country which never persecuted the Jews*', then answers his own question: '*Because she never let them in*'."

And in article for the April 2007 issue of the *Journal of Gilded Age and Progressive Era*, entitled "*Hibernians versus Hebrews*", one Edward T. O'Donnell quoted Deasy as the prime literary example of what he referred to as '*Irish Catholic anti-Semitism*'...".

But, as anyone who has actually read *Ulysses* knows very well, Mr. Deasy was anything but a Catholic Nationalist. He was in fact a self-proclaimed British Tory and a bigoted Orangeman. And, when Deasy addresses Joyce's own *persona* of Stephen Dedalus as "*you Fenians*", a race memory is triggered in Stephen no less painful than that triggered in Bloom by the 'Citizen':

“Glorious, pious and immortal memory. The lodge of Diamond in Armagh the splendid behung with corpses of papishes. Hoarse, masked and armed, the planter’s covenant. The black north and true blue bible. Croppies lie down.”

A pioneering scholarly examination of Joyce’s treatment of anti-Semitism, was an essay for the 1982 Joyce centenary, entitled “‘Ireland is the only country ...’: Joyce and the Jewish Dimension”, which was authored by Gerald Y. Goldberg, subsequently the first and only Jewish Lord Mayor of Cork.

Goldberg made a particular point of firmly locating Deasy’s set of prejudices: “*Mr. Deasy, Orangeman, and Christian gentleman, mounts the back of his favourite horse and flogs it*”.

Moreover, it was not in Ireland’s gift whether or not to admit Jewish immigrants. This was a UK-wide issue under the control of the British Government. That is why, as part of their own agitation against Jewish immigration, the British Brothers’ League enthusiastically congratulated Limerick’s Father Creagh. The League got its way the following year with Prime Minister Arthur Balfour’s *Aliens Act*.

The original Bloomsday of Joyce’s *Ulysses* was contemporaneous with the 1904 anti-Semitic agitation and boycott in Limerick, but, while this was not specifically referred to by Joyce, the prejudices behind it are found in the character and utterances of the ‘Citizen’.

These were not, however, the views of Michael Cusack, founder of the Gaelic Athletic Association, as many misled by Joyce’s 1959 biographer Richard Ellman have believed. Ellman wrote of Cusack that “*Joyce liked him little enough to make him the model for the narrow-minded and rhetorical Cyclops*”; and again, “*Cusack ... the militant nationalist whom Joyce called ‘the Citizen’.*” But, while the ‘Citizen’ physically resembled Cusack, there was not one iota of anti-Semitism in his *persona*, as thoroughly investigated and demonstrated in that 1982 essay by Gerald Goldberg for *The Crane Bag* magazine.

Goldberg confronted Ellman’s errors head-on:

“The voice may be the voice of Cusack but the hands and the heads and the thoughts are those of Griffith and Gogarty... Those who regard Michael Cusack as the prototype of the character travel a road that leads to nowhere: the ‘Citizen’ is a composite re-construction by Joyce, of thoughts and sentiments expressed from time to time by Griffith and Gogarty, through their respective writings.”

The anti-Semitic outbursts from the ‘Citizen’ do indeed echo articles in Arthur Griffith’s newspapers, *United Irishman and Sinn Féin*, between 1904 and 1906, and penned by both Oliver St. John Gogarty and Griffith himself.

“*We are made the victims and tools of the most Jew-ridden government in the world. (Cheers)*”, proclaimed Gogarty at the founding Conference of the Sinn Féin Party on 28th November 1905. (*United Irishman*, December 5, 1905).

A year later, he wrote:

“The Jews are upon us! ... Her (Israel’s) death is upon us. Devourer of the world, she must die from a surfeit undigested. Her grave is open ...” (*Sinn Féin*, November 24, 1906). “I can smell a Jew, and in Ireland there’s something rotten.” (*Sinn Féin*, December 1, 1906).

The question that must be put, however, is why, when Griffith’s own anti-Semitic diatribes against Limerick’s Jewish community were still being voiced only weeks before that first Bloomsday, Joyce let Griffith himself completely off the hook and instead foisted those sins on a Cusack-like character, when Cusack was demonstrably innocent of any such anti-Semitism.

The answer may very well lie in the high regard Joyce felt not only for Griffith personally, but also for Griffith’s own Sinn Féin programme and project itself. As Colum Kenny pointed out in his 2020 biography, *The Enigma Of Arthur Griffith—‘Father Of Us All’*, Joyce considered Griffith’s writings to be the only Irish journalism worth reading.

But we should never forget just how vicious Griffith’s own pronouncements had been in 1904:

“Protest against the usuriousness and notoriously dishonest business methods of **three-fourths** of the Jews of Ireland (my emphasis- MO’R), and lo! the flabby Press shrieks — ‘Intolerance. Anti-Semitism!’ — No thoughtful Irishman or Irishwoman can view without apprehension the continuous influx of Jews into Ireland ... strange people, alien to us in sympathy ... Our sympathy goes wholly to our countryman the artisan whom the Jew deprives of the means of livelihood, to our countryman the trader whom he ruins by unscrupulous methods, to our countryman the farmer whom he draws into his usurers’ toils or drives to the workhouse or across the water” (*United Irishman*, January 23, 1904).

Those who try to defend Griffith against charges of Anti-Semitism, cite his simultaneous expression of strong support for Zionism:

“For the small minority—the Zionist Jews—the patriotic ones who desire to

reconstruct the Jewish nation, and who feel bitterly the humiliation of their race through the sordid pursuit of gold by the majority— we have the same esteem we have for all patriotic and lofty minded men.”

Three months later, Griffith further wrote:

“The Jews of Great Britain and Ireland have united, as is their wont, to crush the Christian who dares to block their path or point them out for what they are—**nine-tenths** of them (my emphasis- MO’R)—usurers and parasites. In this category we do not include the Zionist minority of the Jews, who include those honest and patriotic Jews who desire the reestablishment of the Hebrew nation in Palestine—the last thing on earth the majority desire. Attack a Jew—other than a Zionist Jew—and all Jewry comes to his assistance.... The Jew in Ireland is in every respect an economic evil.” (*United Irishman*, April 23, 1904).

At long last, in the *United Irishman* for 28th May 1904, the Socialist Frederick Ryan protested that Griffith’s diatribes represented “*the very spirit of race prejudice*” and that “*the Limerick disturbances began in an incitement against Jews as Jews*”, with Father Creagh working up his congregation with descriptions of the deaths of St. Stephen and St. James. In the same issue, Griffith countered with the charge of deicide:

“(All are) aware that the Jews slew a much greater than St. Stephen or St. James... So far as Ireland is concerned, she sees the Jews swarming in while her children are going out... When a priest is courageous enough to sound a note of alarm, and in consequence assailed by all the ramifications of the Jewish bond—it is, we firmly hold, that Irishmen stand by him, and we only regret, that in other cities in Ireland, suffering from the Jewish usurers, priests as courageous as Father Creagh, have not warned the unthinking people on whom the harpies prey.”

These were the words of that “*kindly*”—Joyce’s own epithet—and friendly acquaintance whom Joyce chose to let off the hook, opting instead for a character assassination of Michael Cusack.

Silence AND cunning in his Joycean exile.

“Arthur Griffith: More Zionist than anti-Semite” was the title of a 2006 *History Ireland* article by Griffith’s most recent biographer, Colum Kenny, as if one attribute offset the other. As we know from present day politics in both the USA and Central Europe, militant support for Zionism and Israel can co-exist with the espousal of anti-Semitic conspiracy theories or hostility to Jewish immigration to one’s own country, other

than to Palestine.

And so it also was in Griffith's own lifetime. The *Balfour Declaration* was the November 1917 public statement issued by UK Foreign Minister Arthur Balfour to the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland, announcing the British Government's support for the establishment of a "national home for the Jewish people" in Palestine. Yet this was the same Arthur Balfour who, as UK Prime Minister in 1905, was responsible for the anti-Jewish immigration *Aliens Act*, when he argued that Jews should be prevented from arriving in Britain because they were not "to the advantage of the civilisation of this country", and who described Jews as—

"an immense body of persons who, however patriotic, able and industrious, however much they threw themselves into the national life, they are a people apart and not only had a religion differing from the vast majority of their fellow countrymen but only intermarry amongst themselves."

Just like Arthur Balfour, Arthur Griffith had been a pro-Zionist anti-Semite in the first decade of the 20th century. I had, however, failed to properly explore his evolution during the second decade. It was Brian Maye's 1997 biography of Griffith that did much to change my mind, which I acknowledged in my 2007 essay *GAA FOUNDER NO BLOOMIN' ANTI-SEMITE!* for *An Fear Rua—the GAA unplugged* website.

A change undoubtedly occurred from 1910 onwards, when Griffith encountered Michael Noyk, a young Dublin Jewish solicitor, who was to become one of his principal aides, particularly during the War of Independence. I concurred with Maye's judgement of Griffith that "perhaps a growing acquaintance with members of Ireland's Jewish community, and an especially close friendship with one of that community, purged him of the prejudice acquired in his youth".

Michael Noyk's *Witness Statement* to the Bureau of Military History bears still further witness to just how deep such friendships had become at a vital stage in Irish history. When Michael Collins insisted on putting the Republican prisoner Joe McGuinness forward in the South Longford by-election of May 1917, it was a member of the Jewish community, Philip Sayers, who offered his own car to personally chauffeur around Mrs. McGuinness, Griffith and Noyk throughout the course of that election campaign. Furthermore, when Griffith himself was jailed as part of the 'German Plot' hysteria of May 1918, and his name was put forward for the East Cavan by-election, not only did Noyk himself spend a week canvassing in Bailie-

boro, but another member of the Jewish community, William Sinclair, canvassed for a week to ten days and neglected his family business affairs, to such an extent that his own brother dissolved their partnership. It is doubtful if such sacrifices would have been made by Noyk, Sayers and Sinclair on behalf of an inveterate anti-Semite. But Griffith had ceased to be that. Incidentally, it might be of interest to note that, like Leopold Bloom's father and Bloom himself, William Sinclair was in a mixed marriage, his Protestant wife being Samuel Beckett's Aunt Cissie.

But back to Griffith. In his 2020 biography, Colum Kenny was to point out how, during the First World War, and quoting Israel Zangwill as an authority, "Griffith also published reports (in January, February and September 1915) highlighting the plight of persecuted Jews in Russia, now an ally of England". (*Scissors and Paste*, January 23 and 27, 1915, and February 20, 1915; and *Nationality*, September 25, 1915.)

It was in his 2015 biography of Griffith that Owen McGee first brought to light the lead article by Griffith in *Nationality* on 25th December 1915, entitled "Irishmen, Jews and 'Imperial' Patriots", a vehement denunciation of Redmondite anti-Semitism. A Redmondite town councillor, on the appointment of Sir Mathew Nathan as the British Government's Under-Secretary for Ireland, had called for all Jews to be barred from employment in government service. Griffith denounced such a call: "We do not know of one Nationalist Irishman who objects to Sir Matthew Nathan because of the religion he professes, or who holds the creed that an Irish Jew should be ineligible for any office he was competent to fill in an Irish government." A very firm statement of principle indeed!

Yet all three biographers—Maye, McGee and Kenny—failed to notice a 1919 statement by Griffith in *Nationality* which I had chanced upon in 1980, but had misinterpreted in my then ignorance of Griffith's explicit denunciation of anti-Semitism throughout the course of 1915.

In the wake of the 1917 Balfour Declaration, Griffith now turned against Zionism, denouncing it in the following terms in *Nationality* on 15th February 1919: "The Jews are reported to want England to act the guardian angel over Palestine for them."

Griffith had come to view Zionism—post the *Balfour Declaration*—as a combined British Imperialist/colonialist

project. Over the course of fifteen years Griffith had turned into his opposite on such issues. The champion of both anti-Semitism and Zionism in 1904 had, by 1919, now become the denouncer of both.

And so, this presentation concludes with yet another National Question on yet another Bloomsday!

[Paper read on Bloomsday, June 16, 2021, to an International James Joyce Symposium, hosted online by the Trieste Joyce School, Università degli studi di Trieste, with the support of the English Department at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.]

Manus O'Riordan

A Paragon Of Virtue

A Thatcherite Rabbi (later knighted by Thatcher), who became Chief Rabbi told Black Britons that they should behave as the Jews had always behaved in Britain, as *paragons of virtue*.

When Moslem extremists planted bombs in London, Brendan Behan's niece, Rosemary Behan, wrote in the *Daily Telegraph* that the Irish had at all times behaved as model Brits and that Moslems should imitate them. The *Irish Independent* reprinted Rosemary's piece, with

"Those who have enjoyed. . ."

HUBERT LANE AND THE PARAGONS OF VIRTUE

Those who have enjoyed Richmal Crompton's 'William' stories—(and who, having read them, did not?) may recall Hubert Lane.

For those unfamiliar with the stories, William was a 'Huckleberry Finn', translated to commuter belt Kent: an eleven-year-old scapegrace and leader of a gang rejoicing in the name of *The Outlaws*. If they had been Irish, they would probably have called themselves, *Beyond the Pale*.

In these stories, Hubert Lane was the leader of another group—whose laces, collars and ties were never undone, whose shoes never lost their shine, noses were never bloodied nor eyes blackened. Indeed they showed clean pairs of heels at the slighted rumour of danger.

They were sneaks, informers and double-dealers, anally retentive and nauseous—the kind who deceived William's parents, who in turn held them up as models for emulation.

I can recall hearing, in 1981, when riots broke out in Liverpool's Toxteth and London's Brixton, a Thatcherite Rabbi, since knighted, suggesting that Blacks should emulate Jews—who had always been law-abiding, never mitched from school, and were all destined to be concert pianists, doctors of medicine, lords chief justices and Nobel Prize-winning scientists and the like.

No anti-Semite ever so dehumanised the Jewish people, who, from Old Testament times to the present, have had as high a proportion of flawed individuals as any other. Sergio Leoni's film *Once Upon a Time in America*, depicting Jewish gangsters, is a welcome corrective to that Rabbi's rose-tinted vision.

Back in 1981 no Irish person would have made such a claim for the Irish in Britain. Republican prisoners were then dying on hunger strike and their comrades striking back at their enemies while Catholic civilians, even children, were considered legitimate targets for crown forces' exercises in musketry and rifle marksmanship.

But it seems the time has become ripe for the Irish in Britain to claim the mantle of Hubert Lane.

Following the suicide bombings in London in July 2005, an Irishwoman named Rosemary Behan lectured Muslim immigrants, so that they would, like the Irish before them, be paragons of British virtue. Apparently the Irish had never caused England grief, and had always smelt of roses.

That Hibernophile organ, the *Daily Telegraph*, published her piece and that Anglophile organ, Sir Anthony O'Reilly's *Sunday Independent*, copied it.

I seem to recall some unflattering remarks about the mass of Irish in England by Frederick Engels, who hoped to channel their unruly energies into Socialist upheaval. And, in South London, where Ms Behan lives, a rather obstreperous Irish family gave their surname to the phenomenon of *Hooliganism* in the first decade of the 20th century.

It's as well the Houlihans got there first, as otherwise the phenomenon might be called *Behanism*. For I can recall, in the 1960s, a gent of that name being called before a Beak in London, charged with thrusting a beer glass in another gentleman's face.

It seems another youth of that name had conspired some decades before to blow up Camell Laird's Shipyard in Liverpool

and done time in Borstal for it, and had occasionally thereafter been before Beaks both sides of the Irish Sea—while having no political or ideological motives to plead in mitigation for his misdemeanours.

Surely they had no family connections with Rosemary Behan?

An uncle of the obstreperous Behans wrote *A Soldier's Song* in the spirit of *The Marseillaise*—which became and remains Ireland's national anthem. It promised that Ireland would no longer shelter despots or slaves.

This anthem never found favour with Ireland's *Hubert Laneites*, and one sport-

ing body even commissioned a ditty to supplant it.

But the prescient Peadar Kearney anticipated them and wrote their real anthem too:

WHACK FOL THE DIDDLE

Now Irishmen forget the past
whack fol the diddle, fol the did doh day
and think of the day that is coming fast
whack fol the diddle fol the di doh day
when we shall all be civilised
neat and clean and well-advised
won't Mother England be surprised!
whack fol the diddle fol the did oh day.

Donal Kennedy

English Soccer's Generous Spirit!

INTRODUCTORY:

It was a strange expectation on the part of the *Irish Times* (2.7.21) that success of a "multi-ethnic" football team in Europe would run counter to the "narrow mean-spirited conception of Englishness" expressed by the Brexit Government, and would contribute to "the battle for a more progressive and generous idea of England". Success was certain to have added glory to Brexit. Winning is all that matters.

"Taking football as a proxy", it was somehow arranged that all the vital England games were played at home. The home crowd booed the rival national anthems, and shone a laser into the eyes of the enemy goalkeeper in the game with Denmark—and yet the final was still played at Wembley. And England got through to the final by means of a multi-ethnic dive that was awarded a penalty.

England, since it asserted itself as an Empire, has been effectively assimilative of elements which it has drawn to itself from other cultures which it has broken, and has been effectively destructive of forces in the world which resist it.

It remains to be determined whether the post-1945 European development, which it joined in order to subvert, and then left under the pretext that it had somehow been conquered and oppressed by it—and in order to help it to fall apart—will be able to succeed without it and against it.

The leader of Fianna Fail, the Party which gained under five per cent of the vote in the Dublin Bay South By-Election, has declared for England against Europe in the final of the European Cup. Foreign Minister Simon Coveney, Fine Gael, tweeted before the Final: "Good Luck

to [England] Tonight. Best team in the tournament so far, we wish our neighbours well! (IT 11.7.21). That is the kind of generosity which England appreciates and sees no need to reciprocate. And so much for EU solidarity!

Editor

WEMBLEY SHENANIGANS

There have been incidents around Wembley after the England-Denmark match. Some of the England fans were dressed as Crusaders with mock chainmail and helmets. The English flag is seen by Muslims (those that know) as the flag of the Crusaders. The district around Wembley Stadium is composed of quite a number of Indian-Pakistan-Afghan people. There have been clashes with some of the more drunken English fans that haven't been reported in the media.

Some of the fans are members of old army comrade clubs, and some are of the far-right organisations.

But of course the majority are just plain English, having their day. A minority are going over the top, and that includes Boris Johnston, plus the media.

I suppose you have to be black or brown, or whatever, to appreciate the uncomfortable situation at the moment of raising English nationalism through football. I know it will go away after the Sunday final, win or lose for England, but, take one incident involving a niece of mine who had an Indian Muslim father. She was born in Derry and educated in a Protestant primary school and went on to a Protestant college and, though registered as a Muslim, practices no religion, and is politically Sinn Fein.

Going to catch the train at Liverpool Street Station in London, an inebriated English fan suddenly shouted and sang *God Save the Queen* in her ear, while nearby a couple of policemen smiled and didn't intervene. A frightening moment for her: made to feel an alien because of her skin colour. So, like many others, she's waiting for Sunday to come and go and for normality to return.

So where do you go if the slogan is: 'It's our day so stay away!' Every dog must have its day, I believe.

Wilson John Haire

Eamon Dyas comments:

Taoiseach Martin supports our "*near neighbour*"—that has not only burgled our house, stolen our food in times of adversity and murdered many of the occupants.

On the other hand, the other finalist, Italy, is a co-member of a European Union that has helped to repair and redecorate the house, as well as enabling us to install the 72-inch TV screen on which we can watch the match without having to listen to all the shouting and screaming from our noisome "*near neighbour*".

What a joke this man is.

was a big stone cross with what seemed like a giant sunflower attached to it. The appearance was bizarre. But Joe explained that the sunflower symbolised the sun, that the sun was the centre of the Mithraic religion, that the Mithraic and Christian cults were merged by the Emperor Constantine to produce Roman Catholicism. And the sunflower had pride of place in the accoutrements of the religion, in the form of the golden monstrance which is used for displaying the Host on ceremonial occasions.

But, according to Desmond, there was much more to it than that. Mithraism had a very extensive presence indeed in the blend with whatever Christianity had been before Constantine established it as the religion of the Empire. And he seemed more interested in the sites of Mithraic temples and the details of the Mithraic rituals than in pre-Establishment Christianity. I don't know whether that was just his preoccupation of the moment, or had a larger significance.

I don't think that his ideal Ireland had ever existed as definitely as Nietzsche's ideal Germany. It can only have been Ireland as it was in the De Valera period. And that Ireland did exist, and was good to live in—and to have lived in—as I know from experience. But it lacked a dimension of existence, and that missing dimension proved to be its undoing. It had no intellectual force. In Schopenhauer's terms, it was a world of sheer will, but was inarticulate in the sphere of ideas. It had music, song and dancing, and in recent decades there has been an increasing willingness to take up Irish again—but on the intellectual side it was chiefly engaged with religion, and the religion has proved to be brittle.

The only heartfelt appreciation of Desmond Fennell seemed to be that of the President, whose status depends not on the Presidency but on his founding of a Gaelic television channel as a politician. And Desmond retired to the Connemara and the Gaelic atmosphere. But, in the actual present, intellectual development must occur in the imposed language. The reviving native language still seems to be more in the nature of song than of metaphysics. Thought can be expressed in it, of course, but a much stronger revival must occur before it becomes the medium from which thought springs.

Sixty years ago we published a Gaelic journal about current affairs in Gweedore, but found that people whose domestic language was Gaelic refused to discuss business affairs, including Trade Union

Remembering Desmond Fennell

Desmond Fennell somehow developed to become an intellectual amongst the academics and journalists of post-Free State Ireland. He was well connected with the Establishment of that brittle and pretentious world. He was at home in it. He was skilful at making use of his connections with it. But he was aware of its insufficiency, and he became aware that, if he was a citizen of it, he was also an alien within it, and so the title of his last book was *About Behaving Normally In Abnormal Circumstances*.

He was the normal person. It was the circumstances, with which he was increasingly out of joint, that were abnormal. And of course he was right. And he proved it by remaining what he was while the surrounding circumstances, which had once seemed fixed and certain, went into flux.

Circumstances parted company with him in the end. They would no longer publish his books. They could no longer recognise that he was the best thing that was in them, and so they became a morass, while he turned to the outcast publisher Athol Books for publication, even though he knew very well that there would be few reviews, if any.

I doubt that he was at all in sympathy with Nietzsche, but his final account of himself sounded much like Nietzsche's entirely eccentric autobiography, *Ecce Homo*: "*I am what normality ought to be; let the world turn on me, or it will not turn at all—because it has exhausted itself.*"

Nietzsche's ideal world was destroyed. It had actually existed. It was the world

of the German petty kingdoms. They had been obliged to melt themselves down in the process of formation of the German state, made necessary by the action of the surrounding states.

Nietzsche served in the resistance to the French invasion of 1870, but he hated the outcome and predicted dire consequences. The insight came to him that "*The State is the coldest of all cold monsters*". But the State had come to stay, even in Germany. And the insight had come to him that God was dead. He was not a deicide. He was the son of a Lutheran vicar. He felt the impact of the death acutely, announced it, and tried to figure out the consequences. And he was scathing about the character of a God who had died so easily.

I have not read most of Desmond Fennell's books. I knew him briefly from the early 1970s, when he was a columnist on the *Sunday Press* (RIP, and later when he turned to Athol Books for publication twenty years ago. The longest discussion I ever had with him was about ten years ago, when he lived in Italy. We used to visit a relative in Northern Italy and one year we went down to Rome and camped near the village where he lived and spent a few days talking.

He showed us around Rome about whose history he was very knowledgeable. I was curious about how Christianity had gained a foothold in the life of the city, but what Desmond wanted to talk about was *Mithra-ism*.

I know very little about Mithraism. I had once gone to look at Hitler's house on top of a hill in Berchtesgaden, along with Joe Keenan. Close to the house there

affairs, in anything but English. (This was the absolute reverse of something we learned in Luxembourg: that the most serious business affairs amongst the elite were discussed in a native patois.)

I referred above to the remarkable fact of Desmond Fennell developing as an intellectual in the medium of the post-Free State academics.

The Free State had an intelligentsia, as had the Redmondite Home Rule movement before it.

The Free State development displaced Redmondism and it was itself displaced by Fianna Fail Republicanism. The Redmondite intelligentsia became British Imperialist, through internal development as much as under external pressure. The Free State intelligentsia became Fascist, also through the development of what was inherent in it. Fianna Fail held the ring against it, and marginalised it, but did not bring a fresh intellectual development with it to take its place.

Fianna Fail's expertise was political. It was founded on the democracy which had sprung into existence in 1918. Democracy was its medium of existence, but it was a democracy without intellectual antecedents. It had, of course, a remarkable intellectual at the heart of it for a generation but it did not have an intelligentsia as part of it.

The antecedents of the Free State were conspiratorial. The conspiracy had played a part in bringing about the situation in which the democracy erupted, but it did not then subordinate itself to the democracy.

De Valera, the surviving Commandant of the Insurrection, took command in prison of the captured Volunteers. When Eoin MacNeill turned up in prison for no good reason, Dev ordered the Volunteers to salute him. MacNeill, a Professor, was founder of the Volunteers, in response to the forming of the Ulster Volunteers, in December 1903. In April 1916 he was head of the conspiracy to launch an insurrection at Easter. He called off the insurrection at the last minute because substantial German support had not arrived, with the result that the insurrection went off at half-cock. Affairs passed out of his control. The weakened Insurrection lasted for a week, and that was enough to set in motion the movement for open democratic action.

De Valera, no doubt, had sufficient reason in tactical considerations of the moment, for welcoming MacNeill to prison as if he had been one of them in Easter Week, and restoring some of his prestige.

In December 1921 precipitate action by the conspiratorial element, in defiance of instructions from the Dail Government, hastened and maximised divisions in the Dail, and in the national movement in general, over the document that is called *The Treaty*. The conspiratorial group was established in power by the British Government, under British legislation, as the Provisional Government of the Free State.

In June 1922 the Provisional Government held an election, under an agreement reached with Anti-Treaty members of the Dail that conflict should be minimised and that they should form a Coalition Government in the new Dail.

Whitehall condemned the Agreement as undemocratic, but it went ahead. However, before the new Dail could meet, Whitehall ordered the Provisional Government to make war on the anti-Treaty IRA, threatening that, if it failed to do so, the British Army, which was still in the country, would take over.

The Provisional Government went to war at Whitehall's bidding by attacking the Four Courts with artillery loaned by the British Army. Republican leaders in the Four Courts were taken prisoner and were held in prison while the Provisional Government set about conquering the country.

Five months later, with the conquest still not completed. Eoin MacNeill, a member of the fully-installed Free State Government, took four of the prisoners who had been in custody ever since the capture of the Four Courts and shot them. The four were murdered as representative figures in the interests of morality. De Valera was not available for shooting.

That killing, on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, was a memorable event and it stimulated the otherwise rather dull poet, Austin Clarke, to write a memorable verse:

“They're high and mighty now,
Prating of law and honour:
But we remember how they shot
Rory O'Connor.”

Of course MacNeill did not act alone. He shared with a few others the arbitrary power of making a moral point by killing people who could have played no part in stirring up the resistance sparked off by the shelling of the Four Courts. But he was the intellectual amongst them, with the mental resource for abstruse justification of such things.

So the Free State necessarily had an

intelligentsia. And some high-powered intellectuals were involved in it.

The Free State, having established itself in 1922-23, gained the acquiescence of a reduced and chastened electorate in the Election of 1923. However, as the moral influence of the State terror diminished, the Republican sentiment of the populace revived. The State sought to block the Constitutional political expression of the Republican revival by requiring that the Treaty Oath be taken as a precondition, not only of entering the Dail, but even of standing for election.

But this authoritarian ploy did not work for long. In 1932 Fianna Fail became the major party and, with the support of the Labour Party, it became the Government. A year later it called another election, won it outright, and abolished the Treaty Oath.

The Free State Party, *Cumann na nGaedheal*, declared that the State was in danger. It reorganised itself into a Fascist Party, with the name of *Fine Gael*, in order to meet the danger, absorbing in the process a minor party of Treatyite Constitutionalism, called *The Centre Party*.

The transfer of power from Treatyite to Anti-Treatyite in 1932-3 happened peacefully. The circumstances did not favour Treatyite resistance. The Anti-Treaty IRA had been defeated in war in 1923 but had not surrendered. It had dumped arms. Much of it had taken part in the creation of Fianna Fail, but much of it had not.

The draconian Law and Order policies of the Free State between 1927 and 1932 had stimulated, rather than deterred, the IRA. There was an anti-Treaty Army in being in 1932 to support the anti-Treaty Constitutional Party, and the British Government, a Labour/Tory Coalition, was in a demoralised condition in the face of the economic crisis and was in no position to intervene, as guarantor of the 'Treaty', in support of its Irish creation.

The Free State Party, in becoming a Fascist Party, reasoned that the simple-minded democratism of Fianna Fail was not a viable form of state. All of history showed that Democracy was a fragile thing, which encouraged forces it could not control. And in Ireland the party of Parliamentary democracy had close hereditary connections with the IRA, which was itself coming under Communist influence.

De Valera was depicted as the Irish Kerensky—the too-conscientious democrat who did not act authoritatively against Lenin and ended up being overthrown, as de Valera would be by the IRA.

Since that did not happen, it can be

presented as having been an absurd notion, but it seemed to be a real prospect in the 1930s to men who were not without experience in the world.

If Fine Gael had succeeded in putting an end to what it saw as the anarchic flux of party politics in the medium of Parliamentary democracy, and had established a Corporate State in its place, Ireland would have become a normal European country.

Fascism was then the European norm.

The disorderly array of states, thrown together by Britain (the Super-power of the time) after it had wilfully broken up the 1914 order of Europe, did not work. Most of the states in the Versailles system were Anglo-French concoctions, chiefly Anglo. They had not come about through internal development. They had not felt their way to Parliamentary democracy by party conflict. They were the inventions of a powerful outsider.

Party-political democracy in an open Parliamentary system is essentially divisive in its action. Britain, its inventor, had felt its way towards it over a couple of centuries, under the containing influence of an aristocratic ruling class capable of eliciting a large measure of deference in the populace. But Europe consisted of newly-created states which had no development behind them. They overcame the inherent divisiveness of party-political democracy by means of the Fascist State, which stabilised internal development with extensive popular support. (And, in Britain itself, party-conflict was suspended in 1931 by Labour-Tory collaboration in National Government, and it was not restored until 1945.)

The Irish development, where a strong Fascist development was stifled by liberal Parliamentary democracy, was the abnormal development of the 1930s in Europe.

*

Desmond Fennell became very critical of the European Union, and he worried about what had happened to European civilisation. But, as far as I know, he never wrote about what Britain did to Europe in 1919, and how Europe had coped by becoming Fascist.

The crust of European civilisation was broken by the way Britain managed the War in 1914, by the way it fought the War, and by the disintegrative peace that it imposed. The procedures of what had been European civilisation were shattered. The elements of society were set against

one another. The Bolshevik force in Russia had become adept at handling elemental forces and re-ordering them. It seemed to be inevitable that it would take the broken European civilisation in hand and re-order it. But the Fascist combination, developed by Mussolini in his close relationship with Britain, proved to be effective in warding off Bolshevism and preserving something of what Europe had been. Europe became Fascist. And it cannot be said that Fascism failed, in the sense of breaking down and being cast aside.

There was no democratic revolution against Fascism in Europe. European Fascism was destroyed by the Power which it had been formed to defend Europe against: Bolshevism. And then the Power that saved Europe from its native Fascism was declared to be an even greater menace to Western civilisation than Fascism had been. The saving of Europe from its Fascism was instantly depicted as a conquest of Europe by an alien Power.

Is it surprising that Europe is not able to think about itself in its Fascist and post-Fascist era—its Versailles era? It is damaged goods. Only Britain, the manipulator of the whole affair, has retained the existential integrity necessary for effective thought.

Desmond Fennell asked why the Irish are incapable of thinking coherently about their affairs. I did not notice that he ever asked that question about Europe.

In conclusion about Fascism: the two Fascist states which declared neutrality in the British War on Germany—but were supportive of the Fascist War on Bolshevism—and which were out of reach of Bolshevik power in 1945, continued in existence for a further generation. Portugal and Spain established national cohesion before returning to representative government by parties.

Fine Gael would probably have done similarly in Ireland, if it had established nationalist dominance over Fianna Fail liberalism in the mid-1930s. When it returned to power eventually in 1948 it was no longer formally Fascist, but it was narrowly nationalist, and it applied itself as best it could to tightening up the nationalist character of the state, beginning with the British intrusion in central Dublin, Trinity College—which it starved of funds in order to induce it to merge with the National University. It was thwarted by the return of Fianna Fail, with its approach of liberal nationalism—an approach which led to national collapse in the face of the

War that developed out of the situation in Northern Ireland.

A Fascist development would have been appropriate for the Irish State, whose business was to give functional existence to Irish society as it emerged from centuries of British destructive activity. But the Fascist development was prevented by Parliamentary democracy.

If the maintenance of Parliamentary democracy is an unconditionally good thing, regardless of circumstances—and is, indeed, the only good thing—then Ireland did the right thing in the 1930s when most European countries were doing the wrong thing.

But then the Irish state refused to take part in what purported to be a war against Fascism, and it dared Britain to try forcing it. It was sceptical of professed British intentions for making war on Germany yet again—after having collaborated with Fascist Germany for five years in breaking the Treaty conditions imposed on democratic Germany in 1919.

Having been one of the few democracies to ward off Fascism, it now became the only English-speaking state to refuse to take part in the War on Fascist Germany. It upheld its neutrality against Churchill's threats. It expressed its condolences with Germany on the death of its leader in 1945. And it gave an unembarrassed reply to Churchill when he jibed at it.

Europe was messed up by the War and Ireland had not been. It could be said that Ireland incurred a moral obligation to give an account of the War which defended the scepticism with which it had regarded British conduct. That would have been a service to itself, and also to Europe, and would have made it a European state at a moment when Europe dare not think about itself.

It did not do so. And, because it did not do so, the moral position which it had established for itself was eroded by the relentless British war propaganda.

I forget which philosopher it was who said that to define is to negate. (Possibly Leibnitz.) You establish what you are, not by abstract positivism, but by determining what you are not. And the most effective way of doing that in the case of Ireland would have been to produce a history of the Imperial enemy from which it was extricating itself—not an Anglophobe rant but a cool, detached, impartial un-English history, such as Canon Sheehan might have

written, or his associate William O'Brien — or my Culloty grandmother, from whom I think I got much of my attitude: if she had not been content to be the wife of a small farmer and raise a family.

But there is no Irish history of England. England wouldn't like it. And there is no Irish account of the World War. England does not like anybody to be neutral in its Providential wars. It would have been very displeased indeed if an Irish account of the War had appeared to challenge the Churchill volumes which were deluging the world. And it ensured that no such thing was attempted in Ireland.

Desmond Fennell's major work, *The Revision Of European History*, was published about twenty years ago by Athol Books. At its launch in Dublin, Fennell was challenged by Manus O'Riordan to explain why he had dedicated it to a British spy. He was taken aback by the charge. He looked bewildered. The book was dedicated to T. Desmond Williams, who had been Professor of Modern History at the National University. Williams was a British agent, Manus said, and so he had not read the book beyond the Dedication.

Desmond looked confused. It seemed to me that he both knew and did not know that Williams had served in the most secret of all British Intelligence services, at Bletchley Park, before becoming Professor of Modern History in Dublin.

Nevertheless there was interesting material in the book, despite its Dedication. But, at a critical point, it was flawed by a blind spot in Desmond's mind about Britain — which seemed to have been cultivated by Williams in the whole generation of elite academics that had come under his influence. (Some information about Williams will be found in the reprint — the first publication outside the University — of his *magnum opus*, *The Genesis Of National Socialism* — written while he was a child prodigy.)

Fennell's contention was that America undermined European culture with its nuclear bombings of Japan. Jack Lane disputed the matter with him, arguing that the nuclear bombing was only the culminating event in a mode of warfare inaugurated by Britain in 1914.

Sir William Beveridge — founder of the Welfare State to secure the future of "the British race" — published in 1939 an *Oxford War Pamphlet* defending the Starvation Blockade enforced by the Royal Navy against Germany in the Great War, and looking for its repetition in the new

war. The Blockade had caused the death by starvation of hundreds of thousands of German civilians. Beveridge held that the distinction between soldier and civilian had become obsolete. It had been abolished by the mode of "totalitarian war" inaugurated in 1914.

The bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were incidents in a war, and their purpose was to save the lives of American soldiers by killing Japanese civilians. The British Starvation Blockade was an incident in a war until 11th November 1918. But the Blockade was intensified for seven months after the end of the War, and its enforcement was actually tightened up. During the War the Royal Navy did not have access to the Baltic, so German imports from Scandinavia were possible. The German Navy surrendered in November 1918, leaving the Baltic open to the Royal Navy. The denial of food to Germany was tightened. Even German fishermen were constrained.

The purpose of continuing the Blockade was to exert pressure on the new German Government to sign a confession of exclusive war guilt on behalf of the German people. That was *the* radically new departure in the conduct of warfare, and it was the cause of much that followed.

But this kind of reasoning passed Desmond Fennell by.

I had only two real discussions with him, one in Dublin and one in Italy. On both occasions he urged me to start behaving like an intellectual. I tried to explain to him that I wouldn't and couldn't because I wasn't.

I was an unskilled labourer who wrote about the world. I lived by working for a wage as an unskilled labourer. Intellectuals performed a function in public life for which they were paid. Nobody had ever offered to pay me for writing (not in Ireland anyway), and I had never tried to sell anything I wrote because I saw that the literature market was a rat-race within a closed shop.

An intellectual was a product of an educative process of production which implanted certain parameters of thought in him, and also gave him a network of contacts by means of which he could make his way in the world. I had none of these patterns of thought and none of these contacts. I was uneducated, without even the simplest certificate of competence such as is given to children. And I tried to explain that I was not even self-educated, but I don't think he grasped the difference

between being self-educated and being uneducated. But he did get the point that I was a hopeless case

I was about seventeen when I read Plato. On the whole I found him tedious, and usually resorting to rigged arguments. But, in one of the Dialogues, Socrates talks about education in a way that set me thinking. He said that education consists of drawing-out, rather than putting in.

A couple of boys I knew had been sent away to be educated — none being available locally in those days — and I talked to them about it when they were home on holiday. And it seemed to me that what they were subjected to was entirely a process of putting-in and then being questioned about what had been put in. Later observation confirmed that that was the case. The clincher was when I found Bagehot doing his best to say that it was something else — but implicitly conceding that *regimentation* was at the bottom of it. And Desmond Fennell had been effectively regimented by T.D. Williams into not being able to see Britain.

Education involves mental training to occupy a place in a system, and to see and not see as the system requires. But, when a system goes haywire, there is some advantage in not having been educated for it.

Brendan Clifford

Climate Change Imperialism

Until about ten years ago, homosexual propaganda was banned in British schools. Once this was reversed, Britain became the leading advocate for its opposite, and led the crusade pressurising nations where an identical ban has been maintained.

Britain rose to be the dominant world power through the creation and exploitation of a vast slave trading and labour camp empire. When, after a few centuries, these were no longer required, it reversed its stance and became the world advocate in a moral crusade to outlaw the slave trade and attack nations that persisted in it.

Britain became a mighty industrial power through massive exploitation over several centuries of fossil fuels. Now Well, we see the threatening moral campaign beginning. A piece in an English newspaper, *The Irish Times*, on 24 July, on a visit to London by US President Biden's Climate Supremo John Kerry, reports that "...*Extinction Rebellion ... has a clear message for John Kerry ... and it's along the lines of 'make all nations decarbonise now' ...*"

The O'Connor Column

Not In *The Irish Times* !

Neither of the letters below were published! We leave it to readers to judge on their merits!

(1) FINE GAEL AND THE SINN FEIN VOTE ABSTENTION

Sinn Féin TD Maurice Quinlivan is quoted as saying on Limerick local radio that "in hindsight" members of his party should have recorded their abstention in a Dáil vote on extending the powers of the Special Criminal Court. ("Party should have recorded vote, says TD", June 25). I quite agree.

You further report Fine Gael Minister of State Patrick O'Donovan as maintaining that what happened "was a walkout of a democratically-elected parliament – a 1930s-style walkout", with Mr Quinlivan telling Mr O'Donovan to "cop yourself on" in relation to comparisons with Germany in the 1930s.

On February 28, 1934, voicing his opposition to the Fianna Fáil Government's Wearing of Uniforms (Restrictions) Bill, the Fine Gael TD and future Taoiseach John A Costello proclaimed that "the Blackshirts were victorious in Italy and the Hitler Shirts were victorious in Germany, as, assuredly, in spite of this Bill and in spite of the Public Safety Act, the Blueshirts will be victorious in the Irish Free State".

The only threat to the democratically-elected Dáil of the 1930s came with this Fine Gael invocation of Hitler's victory in Germany.

Manus O'Riordan, (SUBMITTED JUNE 28)

(2) FINTAN O'TOOLE AND FIANNA FAIL

I agree with Fintan O'Toole that the Fianna Fáil of today faces an existential problem which cannot be "solved by replacing Micheál Martin with Jim O'Callaghan or Michael McGrath" (July 13). The Taoiseach's response (July 15) confirms my view. I differ, however, with O'Toole in his narrative of what he calls Fianna Fáil's "two long lives", de Valera's Ireland and "the Whitaker-Lemass revolution of 1958".

These lives were not hermetically sealed from each other, and the securing by Fianna Fáil of the sovereignty of this "Republic in all but name" on the eve of World War Two was surely revolutionary in itself. It was Lemass who had been the the economic architect of de Valera's Ireland, realising that protectionism was the only sensible policy to pursue in the era of the Great Depression followed by World War. Lemass would say of the Anglo-Irish "Economic War" that it did not matter who started it, "the main thing is we won it".

As soon as Lemass himself concluded that economic protectionism had run its course, Dev gave him his head, with an election programme that saw Fianna Fáil replace the incumbent Fine Gael / Labour Government in 1957. And it was in his final year as Taoiseach that Dev himself fast tracked Whitaker's Economic Development through Cabinet "as a matter of urgency". For me, Lemass's finest moment came in 1966, when he threw his weight behind Donogh O'Malley's revolution in secondary education and faced down the obdurate obstructionism mounted by both Whitaker and Jack Lynch.

Fintan O'Toole writes that "there will not be a third act". But there was in fact a third act that characterised the 1990s, that of social partnership on the one hand and the peace process on the other. Taoiseach Albert Reynolds was this Republic's true hero of the peace process. I must agree with Dr Vittorio Bufacchi in his response (letters, July 16) to the Taoiseach's boast of the non-ideological character of present day Fianna Fáil: "A party without ideology is a party without principles, and interested only in power." It was Reynolds' commitment to the ideology of Wolfe Tone Republicanism that led him to doggedly pursue that peace process through all its ups and downs, securing the December 1993 Downing Street Declaration from the British Government and the August 1994 ceasefire from the IRA. The removal of Reynolds as Taoiseach and the myopia of the Rainbow Coalition would, however, derail that peace process for a painful two and a half years, before a return to a Fianna Fáil led Government could pave the way for the 1998 Good Friday Agreement. When Albert Reynolds comes under direct personal attack in O'Toole's article, the failure of our non-ideological Taoiseach to respond with even the merest reference to his heroic place in the history of the peace process does indeed convince me that there will indeed be no fourth act for Fianna Fáil the Republican Party, and that it is rapidly going nowhere.

I hold no brief for "shenanigans in the beef industry" or for the behaviour of Albert Reynolds before its tribunal of inquiry in 1992, which is the only thing that stands out about Fianna Fáil in the 1990s for the purposes of O'Toole's article. He relates an anecdote of how, with Reynolds worried about being cross-examined by the late Adrian Hardiman - "then a senior counsel, later a Supreme Court judge" - one of Reynolds' lawyers "explained to Hardiman's wife" that it would be a good idea for him to absent himself on the day. It would have been both more gallant and more enlightening if O'Toole had not treated that wife as an unnamed appendage of the Supreme Court judge. For she herself would carve out a notable place in society in her own right, serving as a judge of the Circuit Court from 1998 to 2012.

A leading player in how twenty first century Ireland is viewing its past, that judge's 2009 report on clerical child abuse in the Archdiocese of Dublin and her 2011 report on the Diocese of Cloyne were both highly praised. It has been otherwise with this year's Report of the Commission of Investigation into Mother and Baby Homes, which she chaired. As your correspondent Jennifer Bray put it on June 11: "At the heart of the controversy since the publication of the report has been a simple question: why are the main findings so divorced from the evidence that survivors and their families gave in painstaking detail?" "The commission was unable to reach factual conclusions that many people apparently wished", argued Ms Justice Yvonne Murphy in her letter of refusal to appear before the Oireachtas Committee on Children, "in the absence of evidence that would withstand scrutiny and cross-examination". Ms Justice Murphy is, of course, Fintan O'Toole's otherwise unnamed star witness in his case against Albert Reynolds.

Manus O'Riordan (SUBMITTED JULY 16)

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

Covid-19.

The Covid pestilence continues. It is a serious danger to health and in some cases, leads to fatalities. It is proving to be similar in its effects to a bad case of influenza and people are not so much dying **from** it but dying of other ailments together **with** Covid which weakens a person's immune system.

Undoubtedly, vested interests such as the Information Technology (IT) and Pharmaceutical industries have exaggerated the dangers and intensity of Covid-19 for their own purposes. And they have also used propaganda to strike fear into everybody and huge profits have been made as a result. Across the whole world lifestyles have been changed. Whether people liked it or not, they have been compelled to use computers so as to avoid, as far as possible, direct contact with other human beings.

This has been an enormous benefit to the IT industry. It is changing the way we live and the way we do business. We do not yet know how far the changes will reach because the Lockdowns are ceasing bit by bit and it is only when things get back to a 'new normal' that business owners and managers will be in a position to see fully where we are all going.

Many owners of small businesses have got used to living on the small income provided by the State to people who became unemployed by the Lockdowns and many employees likewise have got used to a much less expensive model of lifestyle and they may opt for part-time working or not to work at all in future.

It is very interesting to contemplate the lives of those working for Local Government and Central Government—the Public Service. They continued to receive their full salaries during the Lockdowns.

They even received a substantial increase in pay, because the pay of County Councillors and the TDs and Senators is related to Public Service pay. The elected representatives wanted an increase and so all the Public Service was given an increase too.

It was just pure greed and avariciousness that was on show. It just does not stack up! And the persons employed in the Public Service know that they did not do much work during the Lockdowns. Their office doors were closed and supervision was lax and forgiving. Advantage was taken of the public purse and the public knows it but does not know what to do about the whole situation.

"Where is all the money going to come from?" people ask and no one has the answer except everybody knows that in the end of it all, there is ourselves, the taxpayers.

ECONOMIC BUBBLE

Can the taxpayers of the future pay for the enormous expenditure of the present? It seems unlikely. The money being spent now is being borrowed. The lenders will not want their money back what else would they do with it? But they will want interest on their money and, while rates of interest are low at present, the rates will go up.

Many people who are worried about where the money is coming from are trying to buy houses and land: and their demand is raising the prices, making it almost impossible for ordinary people to buy a house. Going on past economic experience, we are in an economic bubble. A crash seems inevitable.

Are those in the European Central Bank (ECB) any wiser than the rest of us? Recently the ECB has announced it is considering the introduction of a 'Digital Currency'! Don't we all know that, since most payments are now made by electronic means, therefore, we have a digital currency already? The Euro, and in the UK the GB Pound, are digital currencies now.

The problem with Digital Currencies—and with everything digital—is that it all depends on a reliable supply of electricity.

If the electricity stops—then everything stops!

What is most alarming is that this is a known fact and yet it is denied by all. No one wants to confront this obvious fact.

The only country in Europe with a really reliable electricity supply is Switzerland, where much of the electricity is generated from water flowing from melting glaciers in the Alps.

Wind generation is not reliable, nor are other forms of electricity generation—except nuclear and even that has its own problems.

But the real danger is the susceptibility of electronic networks to being hacked. A hacker can get in through any electricity supply sub-station. It is only a matter of time.

Wise governments would take steps to reduce our dependence on electricity but most governments are going in the opposite direction.

Like lemmings rushing over a cliff, Governments are very actively promoting damaging policies such as the electrification of transport and the environmental policy of de-carbonisation.

It has been proved conclusively that diesel engines are more economical with energy than engines using any other fuel.

Not only are electric cars using power that is quite dirty to produce, because most generating is still done from fossil fuels, but the whole design and manufacture of an electric car constitutes a dirtier process—in particular the production of the batteries.

And so, taking all of these factors into account, an electricity-powered car has to run for 65,000 kilometres before it achieves the environmental efficacy of a diesel-powered car of similar size.

And that does not take account of the problem of the eventual disposal of the batteries and the electric motors.

As for de-carbonisation—this is real madness. Carbon is one of the basic building blocks of the universe. And it is not capable of being destroyed. It is said that the carbon is in the wrong places but where are the wrong places?

This type of wrong-headed thinking on the parts of the Governments of the world (obviously not all—basically we are talking about the West) will lead us very much astray.

Michael Stack ©

AVAILABLE FROM ATHOL BOOKS
About Behaving Normally In Abnormal Circumstances, Essays Marking The Author's 75th Birthday by Desmond Fennell. Index. 200pp. €18, £15.
Desmond Fennell: The Revision Of European History. 122pp. Bibliography. Index. €12, £10
Ireland After The End Of Western Civilisation by Desmond Fennell. 102 pp. Index. . €10, £8

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

OR WRITE TO:
athol-st@atholbooks.org

WHAT WAS THE TRUCE ?

War by other Means!

The Truce occurred because the British were not winning the military war against the IRA and they were clearly losing the war for 'hearts and minds'.

This was confirmed by the results of the two local government elections of 1920 when Republicans won the overwhelming majority of seats. And the more overwhelming victory of Sinn Fein in the General Election of June 1921 when it won on every single electable seat uncontested in the 26 counties. These election results confirmed the unshakeable commitment for independence that the people had voted for in 1918 and whose rejection of that Election result by Britain had caused the war in the first place.

But the shooting war was only suspended on the British side on 11 July 1921. There is no state more experienced at war than Britain and they never see the end of shooting as the end of a war if their objective has not been attained. And the objective was not attained by July 1921 which was not 'to lose Ireland' and to keep it within the British Empire by some means or other.

The World War that Britain launched in August 1914 to destroy Germany did not end on 11/11/1918. It ended when Germany was starved into submission by the food blockade — killing about ¾ of a million Germans - and thereby laying the basis for the next war.

The negotiations that followed the Truce were a continuation of the War against Independence by other means and succeeded in splitting the Independence movement under the threat of renewed war and a so-called Treaty that abolished the Republic that had been voted and fought for.

Britain insisted that the shooting war be resumed in June 1922 to ensure the military defeat of those who wanted to maintain the Republic and the Independence movement.

Leaflet distributed by

Aubane Historical Society

<http://www.aubanehistoricalsociety.org/>
at St. Peter's Church, Cork, 9th July 2021

Public Meeting On The Truce: *Labour Comment reports:*

On Friday, July 9, '21, St. Peter's Church in North Main St., Cork city, hosted an evening of history featuring historians Dr. John Borgonovo, UCC, and Dr. William Sheehan, a military historian with the Open University in the UK.

The event was to mark the centenary of the Truce between Britain and Ireland in July 1921. The topic under discussion was "The War of Independence in Cork from both sides of the conflict".

The discussion was chaired by Cork military historian and former Defence Forces member, Gerry White.

The acoustics within the church made it difficult for the 40 or so people in attendance to get a proper hearing of the speakers' contributions.

Conspicuous by its absence from the discussion were the four Elections, starting with 1918—the first election on an extended franchise, and then the two Local Government Elections of 1920 when Re-

publicans won the overwhelming majority of seats. And the more overwhelming victory of Sinn Fein in the General Election of June 1921, when it won on every single electable seat in the 26 Counties. The seats were uncontested, as public support for Sinn Fein was so overwhelming. These election results confirmed the unshakeable commitment for the independence that the people had voted for in 1918 and whose rejection of that Election result by Britain had caused the war in the first place.

The Chairman made mention of the 1918 Election, which may well have been provoked by the distribution of a leaflet by members of Aubane Historical Society reproduced above, but it was ignored by the main speakers in their initial introductions.

The present writer expected Dr. Sheehan to put forward some defence of British Government policy for the period, alas, his perspective was more military than political.

A contributor from Aubane highlighted the neglect over years by journalists and academics of the importance of the elections and the overwhelming support by the people for an Independent Ireland.

The same speaker, mentioned how supporters of the Treaty fell back on Lloyd George's threat of "Immediate and terrible war" only to end up themselves creating "immediate and terrible war" between Republicans.

There was a time in Cork when such a gathering would have produced a fine healthy robust exchange of ideas and opinions but not in St. Peter's on that night.

One couldn't imagine such a discussion taking place in Millstreet in such a tepid environment—sparks would still fly after a 100 years—but then Millstreet is in County Cork. The Rainbow metropolis of Cork City hasn't the stomach for that.





The Streak of Dawn

Saturday Herald, Dublin, Saturday, July 9, 1921

In accordance with the Prime Minister's offer and Mr. De Valera's reply, arrangements have been made for hostilities to cease from Monday next, July 11, at noon.—*Official.*

The events of yesterday as developed in our Mansion House, were wonderful, truly, and—whatever may be the ultimate outcome—the 8th July will always remain a memorable day in the history of Ireland.

Mr. De Valera, accompanied by any colleagues he may choose, goes to London fettered by no conditions imposed by the Cabinet. Furthermore, in his capacity as negotiator, he acts on an equality with the other side.

This is the good news which to-day rejoices the hearts of the people and warrants them in hoping for a just and honourable peace, and the end of all the sad troubles of recent years.

A word of caution at this critical juncture may not, however, be out of place. While conceding that all the omens appear to be favourable, and that it does really seem to be the case that at long last the English Government is acting (so far), as if it genuinely meant business, it is still necessary to remind the public that a long road has yet to be travelled before the goal of peace is finally reached. It would in the circumstances, be a mistake to feel too optimistic. Under the most favourable conditions, some time must elapse before we can feel that we are out of the wood, and that this tormented land has seen the end of its sufferings.

The leaders are on the road. Their followers must not get too far in front.

Second Editorial:

The "Democracy" Tosh

—A leading supporter of the Coalition Government [G.B.] asks us and all the world to believe that:

The honestly-organised democracy of England can do no wrong; will do no wrong; will always insure peace among nations; will always keep, and make others keep, pledges and treaties; and will always, as in the past, respect the rights and freedom of all peoples, great and small.

Last week there died outside London the widow of an esteemed citizen. She had reached the age of 103 years. Within the lifetime of this venerable lady and her mother the "honestly-organised" democracy of England has at different times made war upon France, Germany, Austria, Russia, Turkey, Spain, Portugal, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Italy, the United States, China, Egypt, India, Persia, the Boer Republics, Afghani-

stan, Burmah and dozen of little feeble peoples in Asia, Africa, and the islands of the seven seas.

In the course of these wars—most of which were flagrantly unjust—England has violated treaty obligations with France, with Holland, with Denmark, with the Boer Republics, with Turkey, with Egypt, with Persia, and with Spain; has violated the neutrality and destroyed the fleets of Denmark without warning or declaration of war; has held Malta in violation of a Treaty engagement to surrender it to France; has violated the neutrality of Egypt, and annexed Egypt and seized the Suez Canal in violation of repeated public pledges to France and other powers that she would not do so; had violated and still violates Spanish territory by holding Gibraltar; has destroyed the Orange Free State and the Transvaal Republic; has seized and holds Chinese territory at Hong Kong; has dismembered Holland; has held in subjugation and oppressed the Irish people and —

But need we continue?

(*Saturday Herald*, Dublin, Saturday, July 9, 1921)

(*Saturday Herald* was that day's edition of the *Evening Herald* which was controlled by William Martin Murphy, also proprietor of *The Irish Independent* and *Sunday Independent*. Murphy backed the Treaty.

Independent News and Media is now a subsidiary of Mediahuis. Mediahuis is a newspaper & magazine publishing, distribution, printing, TV, radio and online media company founded in 2014 with assets in Belgium, the Netherlands, Ireland and Luxembourg.)

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>