

norms in elections. But that cannot be said of Poland so that argument is set aside and the state is criticised for its value system. Democracy by its very nature is conservative. People vote for whom they know and trust which is based on what they have done and are known for and how they plan to improve what exists. Revolutions are not voted into existence.

The European project itself was not voted into existence. It was and is a revolutionary concept—the replacing of the Europe nations with a single political entity or demos. The basic reality of that new entity has to be created, recognised and trusted before a government of that entity can be seriously voted for. Debating chambers like the present European Parliament are a world removed from that and discredits the objective.

To create that new European entity the Commission was created and has in a formal sense what is pejoratively called a 'democratic deficit': but it is not anti-democratic, it is just a democratic for the purpose it was

created to achieve and has to be so.

The project was created by the Christian Democracy of Europe—and not by the Liberals of Europe, who have since pushed themselves to the fore. And the more the latter dominate, the more problematic the project becomes.

Poland is a test case of where Christian Democratic Europe meets the value system of Liberal Europe, a system which finds the traditional values to be an anathema.

These contradictions illustrate anew the very issue the European project was conceived to resolve – the acceptance of national differences in Europe and how and why they could be integrated into a new political entity.

The conflict with Poland shows that the jury's still out on a resolution of that issue. One thing is certain; the Poles do not consider themselves less European than anybody else whatever others may think of them.

Jack Lane

Northern Ireland Centenary—A Celebration?

We are on the eve of the centenary of the setting-up of part of Ulster as a very unusual form of devolved government within the British state. Preparations to celebrate the event are hard to find.

On its half-centenary Northern Ireland was a battlefield. It had also been a battlefield in the year of its birth. It had been founded in war and it led to war. Between these two wars there was an interval of about forty-seven years which might be called peaceful.

If peace is unconditionally better than war—and there is a widespread bias which says that it is—then tribute should be paid to Lord Craigavon and Lord Brookeborough for maintaining Northern Ireland in a peaceful condition for so long. They achieved this by stifling political activity, reducing it to a routine in which nothing happened. They understood what Northern Ireland was and they governed it accordingly.

That routine has been ignorantly dismissed as "tribalism" by commentators who would not trouble their heads to understand what Northern Ireland was. One of the things it was a war that was waiting to happen. It happened when a Northern

Ireland Prime Minister came along who thought he was governing a democracy in which the electors were, for some peculiar reason, failing to participate as they ought to, and a Taoiseach came along who encouraged him in this attitude, and the established routine of inactivity was broken. Then things began to happen.

We gather that Lord Bew has been appointed expert adviser on historical matters for the Centenary Celebrations, but we have not seen what advice he is giving, or who he is giving it to.

Meanwhile we notice that there is a letter in the academic pop-history magazine, *History Ireland*, by Jeffrey Dudgeon OBE, a former Ulster Unionist Party Councillor, on the 1920 Belfast pogroms.

Dudgeon OBE, like Lord Bew, is a fundamentalist upper class Unionist. His letter is about whether the early 1920s random killing of Catholics is rightly called a pogrom, what the numbers were, and whether the number of Catholics killed in the rioting was disproportionately high, given that there were twice as many Protestants as Catholics there to do the killing.

It would have been relevant to discuss

the rioting in connection with the setting up of the Northern Ireland system, and the Anglo-Irish War, but Dudgeon does not do so.

The closest he gets to political comment is this:

"The assassination of the Woodvale MP, William Twaddell, in May 1922 in Belfast and of Sir Henry Wilson MP and former chief of the imperial general staff, in London, in June accelerated the introduction of the Special Powers Act and internment. It was effective then but not in the 1970s. However, as the *History Ireland* editorial points out, northern nationalists were essentially abandoned in the 1920s, not least by Michael Collins, and again in 1969, when Jack Lynch's broadcast promise to not stand idly by turned out to be a hollow, if destabilizing statement. The Civil War ultimately put paid to the northern IRA's campaign and the 1920s troubles came to an end". Though their memory lingered on.

The Northern Ireland Catholics were not merely abandoned by Collins. They were called upon to rise up by him, before he abandoned them to launch the 'Civil War'; on Whitehall instructions, leaving them at the mercy of the Ulster Unionist forces.

And they were not abandoned only by him. They were abandoned much more consequentially by the British State in which they were required to continue to live. And that was what led to the War in the 1970s against which Internment proved to be ineffective—a fact which Dudgeon once seemed to understand.

He says nothing about what caused the Protestants to go on that killing spree in the early 1920s.

It was clearly connected with the politicking of the 1920 Bill which set up Northern Ireland.

Carson had in his 1918 Election campaign demanded the exclusion of the Six Counties from whatever arrangements were made by the Government for the rest of Ireland. In 1916 the Ulster Unionist Party had withdrawn its opposition to the Home Rule Act on the Statute Book on the condition that the Six Counties were excluded from it and were governed as an integral part of the British state.

When the 1920 Bill was published, it was an all-Ireland Bill, but with a provision enabling the Six Counties to secede from all-Ireland Home Rule by setting up of a Home Rule Government of its own.

Carson said that Ulster Unionists did not want a Government of its own in which they would have to govern a large Catholic minority. What they wanted was to be governed along with the Catholics

as an integral part of the British state. But Westminster insisted that the Six Counties could only be excluded from Irish Government if they operated a Home Rule system of their own, which would be connected with the Dublin Government by a Council of Ireland.

If Westminster had conceded Carson's demand for a simple Six County exclusion from the Bill, it is improbable in the extreme that the 'pogrom' of the early 1920s would have happened. The Protestants would have had no reason for it.

But, instead of doing that, Westminster created uncertainty in the minds of the Protestant population of what was in store for them. This climaxed in assurances given to Collins by his new friend Birkenhead—the famous Galloper Smith of the 1912-14 agitation—that if he signed the Treaty, the Northern Ireland body would be whittled away by the Boundary Commission.

The setting up of Northern Ireland had nothing whatever to do with 'good government' in the Six Counties. The best possible government of the Six Counties would have been government within the political system of the state.

Around 1973-4 Athol Street arranged for a number of meetings to be held at the Students Union in Belfast to discuss the 'pogroms'. We produced documents with detailed information about engagements in the Anglo-Irish War which, combined with the political uncertainty produced by State arrangements in 1920-22, seemed to give sufficient reason for the blind rage that drove Protestants on a Catholic-killing spree. We were hoping for what might be called a secular discussion of the matter. But next to nobody turned up. Lord Bew didn't.

Possibly he had already enlisted in the Official IRA by then. He subsequently became an expert adviser, along with Eoghan Harris, to the Ulster Unionist Party Leader, Lord Trimble.

Jeffrey Dudgeon probably was at those meetings. At that time, and for many years afterwards, he appeared to agree that erratic Protestant behaviour resulted from the uncertainty caused by the 1920 arrangements. He was a member of the cross-community Campaign for Labour Representation which, under the direction of David Morrison, was steadily increasing pressure on the British Labour Party to end its boycott of the Northern Ireland region of the state.

Then, around 1990, he acted with Kate Hoey to break up the CLR on sectarian lines. Hoey was a London Labour MP

of Ulster Protestant origin who joined the CLR and became its President. In 1990, with Dudgeon's assistance, she attempted to siphon off Protestant members into an organisation called Democracy Now, which was launched with lavish expenditure, backed by a London newspaper millionaire.

It had purportedly the same purpose as the CLR, but being clearly Protestant Unionist in style, it subverted that purpose. For a couple of years it put on well-funded events on the fringe of Labour Conferences.

The CLR disbanded. Hoey was rewarded with a Junior Ministry in the next Labour Government. Dudgeon joined the Ulster Unionist Party and was elected local Councillor, and was awarded the OBE. He appeared to be satisfied with his success in getting a number of Protestants to free themselves from Fenian enchantment and return to their roots.

We will be interested to see how he and Lord Bew celebrate the centenary of the event that took 'Ulster' out of the political life of the British state by giving it its catastrophic little statelet. It does not seem that any Catholic body, not even the remnant of the SDLP, is willing to celebrate it with them.

Brexit: Insights

continued

blocs, and as the EU contemplates its future without the debilitating influence of British Euroscepticism, the current Fine Gael/Fianna Fail leadership continues to cast Ireland in the role of piggy-in-the-middle—an entity pulled in two directions—probably a minor irritant to both.

DEPENDENCE ON THE UK 'LAND BRIDGE'

It is sometimes the case that problems at the level of high politics are only revealed in the way that practicalities are handled. That seems to be what is happening in Government efforts to develop an alternative to use by Irish road hauliers of routes through Britain as a land bridge to the Continent. Using trucks to transport goods to and from Europe via Britain is cheaper and quicker than the direct route to France by sea, but after Brexit there will be too many hold-ups and checks for the British route to be viable. This was quickly recognised in the Irish Brexit debate, and indeed has been consistently highlighted in this journal beginning with an editorial in early 2017 (*Brexit: Irish fudge*

undermines EU solidarity, Irish Political Review, March 2017).

Superficially it looks as though the Irish Government has made the necessary arrangements through capital investments in Dublin and Cork Airports and in the ports of Dublin and Rosslare. In his introduction to the debate on the omnibus Bill, Foreign Affairs Minister Simon Coveney stated:

"Our ports and airports are well prepared for the new realities. Provision has been made for some 1,500 additional staff to support and carry out customs, sanitary and phytosanitary, SPS, and food safety checks and controls. The State has spent over €30 million making Dublin Port ready and fit for purpose for the new realities of 1 January next year. The decision of the European Council to approve the €5 billion Brexit adjustment fund is also welcome. We are working closely with the European Commission to ensure the fund targets the sectors and member states most disproportionately impacted by Brexit." (Dail Debates, 11/11/20.)

However, that statement provides little concrete information about the adequacy of shipping capacity for replacing the UK land bridge. As the Debate progressed contributions from a number of Deputies gave grounds for doubting Government claims on the issue. The first came from Brendan Howlan (Labour Party, Wexford), who had held discussions with a body that the Government is depending on, the *Irish Maritime Development Office* (IMDO).¹

"I have received from the Department of Transport the Irish Maritime Development Office analysis report to the Department of Transport on a reassessment of Ireland's maritime connectivity in the context of the Brexit and Covid-19 challenges. I have discussed this report with the Irish Maritime Development Office since its publication last week. I have to say I am not entirely convinced. Its basic conclusion is that we have enough capacity, even in the event of there being a fundamental disruption of the land bridge, to continue to import and export. The mechanism that is envisaged is that vessels that are currently used on the Irish-UK line will simply be repurposed to European ports. I am not sure that is as simple as is believed and set out in that process. In any event, it would have implications for our exports directly into Britain if those vessels were no longer available to bring our biggest trading partner, the goods from Ireland, to the United Kingdom. The same vessels cannot be used on two separate routes at the same time; that is not possible" (Dail Debates, 11.11.20).

Deputy Howlan's view was that relying on the word of the ferry companies that all will be well falls short of proper contingency planning. Concern about the

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR · LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Casement: 'Insider Knowledge'?

In his mammoth 7-page article in November 2020's Irish Political Review entitled 'Insider Knowledge', Paul Hyde inflates a second-hand remark from one Sidney R. Clipperton: that Captain Blinker Hall of Naval Intelligence fabricated the Casement diaries.

His 'proof' is a document listing Room 40 operatives—wherein Clipperton does not figure—a list originating, according to Hyde, from Admiral William James, occasional deputy to Captain Hall. It was typed by Kevin MacDonnell from his notes of talking to Clipperton in 1965, which in 1998 he sent to Angus Mitchell whom he had recently met.

The list was headed with the words, "B. R. Clipperton MVO, DSC, RA eventually commanded H.M.S. Violent".

This is trebly unconvincing. The first initial in that heading is wrong as Paul acknowledges, while the RA may be a mistake for RN. However the other two decorations are senior and quite distinctive. An MVO is a personal award from the King. The Distinguished Service Cross (DSC) was a military decoration awarded only to officers. Clipperton retired in 1938 as a chief petty officer, a rank equivalent to sergeant major, and could not have been so decorated. Anyway, both would have shown up in the 'UK Naval, Medal and Awards Rolls' in Clipperton's record. They don't.

He was a Leading Telegraphist on HMS Violent in 1918 when he was only 20, not then in command of the ship, nor later, it not being mentioned in 'Forces Records', as Hyde admits. But by twisted, circular logic he also writes that, "The reference to HMS Violent refers to his command of that vessel, albeit perhaps nominal, as confirmed in the copy list obtained from Admiral James."

In the event, it all boils down to a remark in 1965 by someone who at best had tenuous connections to Naval Intelligence, indicating Hall fabricated Casement's diaries but who added he was about to charge his son with homosexual offences before he was killed in a 1942 German air raid in Aberdeen.

There is a whiff here of modern public health practitioners devoted to evidence-based medicine when we know they only seek out evidence that justifies their existing opinions. In this case, Hyde believes he has proved all parties are otherwise

telling the truth and in Clipperton's case he had the ability to be aware of fabrication. Ergo, fabrication occurred.

Paul makes much of proving the likelihood that Kevin MacDonnell did speak to Clipperton, who then said what he said, but that is hardly worth bothering about when what Clipperton said was so insubstantial and unevicenced.

On a couple of points I can confirm Hyde's speculations, 'Essie' in Hall's letter on the death of his son was Blinker's wife, Ethel Abney, the mother of their three children. The 'Mary' mentioned was indeed divorced from their son, John Abney Hall, so Blinker was effectively his young grandson's nearest Hall relative and had therefore to arrange John's burial.

Hyde seems unaware that a new biography, 'Blinker' Hall – Spymaster, written by David Ramsay was published in 2008, although as I wrote in my book's 3rd edition it was something of a hagiography with a less than accurate segment on Casement.

I had come across the Clipperton material in the NLI and wrote this in 2002:

"When de Valera was told, third-hand, in 1966, of one Commander Clipperton who could attest to Naval Intelligence fabrication (by Blinker Hall), he wisely replied 'the important thing is to get some positive proof. Nothing else will suffice.'" None appeared. (NLI MS 18776).

Clipperton's story that "much later on in the last war Intelligence put me on the job of bringing a charge against Hall's son who was mixed up with a group of other young officers" and which involved phone tapping is all wrong for several reasons. Lt. Commander John Hall was 44 and not 'young'; he was based far away in Aberdeen when killed; and hunting down gay sailors would have been a naval or possibly civilian police job, yet Clipperton was in the Home Guard in the south of England during the war, not the police or intelligence.

The only mystery is why Clipperton should have been so aware of the death of Hall's son.

That Hyde on the strength of his legalistic and mechanical deductions can announce there is "no reasonable doubt that the Black Diaries were fabricated and that Hall was the mastermind behind the plot" is masterful nonsense.

The words of George Bernard Shaw in a 1934 letter to Gertrude Parry, Casement's

cousin, on similar efforts are advice that should be followed:

"I have read Dr Maloney's book (The Forged Casement Diaries). It is a monument of zealous industry; but it does not clear the ground: it rather overcrowds it. It takes more trouble to put the British Government in the wrong than to put Roger in the right."

Maloney, he wrote, uses Casement—

"as a stick to beat a regime which has been extinguished by the establishment of an Irish Free State, and which is consequently regarded by the reading public as a back number. The book that is needed to rehabilitate Roger must be written on a carefully cleaned slate. Dr Maloney has written his on one crowded with old sums." (NLI MS 17601-12-3)

Jeffrey Dudgeon

(author of Roger Casement: *The Black Diaries—With a Study of his Background, Sexuality, and Irish Political Life*), 6.11.2020

Paul Hyde Replies

I am grateful to Mr. Dudgeon for drawing more attention to *Insider Knowledge*, published in November *Irish Political Review*. His inevitable dudgeon will convince many that my rigorous research is impartial and sound.

I will respond to three irrelevant points first. I read the Hall biography by Ramsey some years ago, found it disappointing and gifted it to a friend.

I cannot understand Mr. Dudgeon's reference to public health officials.

His citation of Shaw's perceived shortcomings of Dr. Maloney's 1936 book have nothing to do with the Clipperton story about which Shaw knew nothing.

Mr. Dudgeon has identified the nature of the offences alleged against Hall's son in 1942. I was unable to identify these and did not speculate. Mr. Dudgeon may well be right in saying they involved what he has described in his own book as "vigorous anal sex". I cannot say because I lack experience, not being an old naval man. But, whatever the offence, it is axiomatic that, when it is of a criminal nature, the evidence gathered must be presented to the police for possible prosecution. That evidence must convince the police that a crime has been committed. In this case, Naval Intelligence had no power to prosecute offences already covered by the criminal law of the state.

Mr. Dudgeon writes that Clipperton "...was a Leading Telegraphist on HMS Violent in 1918..." This is not true because his service record lists several onshore establishments and vessels covering 1914 to 1920, wherein there is no mention whatsoever of HMS Violent. Clipperton's record shows that in 1918 he was on HMS Queen Elizabeth.

Mr. Dudgeon questions the document which lists Clipperton as MVO. I merely reported the document as typed and cannot prove the award. That it does not appear on his naval record is curious but that record is incomplete in other respects. Concerning the DSC award also listed on that page, Mr. Dudgeon states that Clipperton "could not have been so decorated" because he was not an officer. This is incorrect. Clipperton was a warrant officer, a leading telegraphist, a communications specialist. Research into the DSC reveals that in October 1914 eligibility for this award was extended to all naval officers (commissioned and warrant) below the rank of lieutenant commander. During WW1 officers of the Merchant and Fishing Fleets were awarded the DSC. Therefore Clipperton was indeed eligible.

I have demonstrated that the source of the information on that typed page was Admiral James, Hall's biographer, and Mr. Dudgeon has not questioned that attribution. Therefore he insinuates that Admiral James provided false or unreliable information to MacDonnell concerning the awards and Clipperton's rank as commander of HMS Violent. This is simply not credible.

Mr. Dudgeon writes "He was a Leading Telegraphist on HMS Violent in 1918 when he was only 20, not then in command of the ship, nor later, it not being mentioned in 'Forces Records', as Hyde admits." However, Hyde admits no such thing. On the contrary, he writes "Forces War Records online provides the following information: 'Sydney R Clipperton J31169 1914 Royal Navy Leading Telegraphist 1918 Hms Violent'. Since Clipperton was on the Queen Elizabeth in 1918, it follows that he was not on HMS Violent at the same time.

Mr. Dudgeon agrees that Clipperton stated that Hall fabricated the diaries but claims this is insubstantial and without evidence.

The statement rests on Clipperton's word and there is no evidence he was lying. Without proof that Clipperton was lying, the revelation statement entails that he was in a position to be aware of the fabrication. But fabrication did not occur because Clipperton was in that position as Mr. Dudgeon claims.

Mr. Dudgeon questions Clipperton's remark that Hall's son "was mixed up with a group of other young officers" and claims that, at age 44, he was not young. Clipperton was aged 67 at the time and a 44 year-old is certainly young to a pensioner of 67. But the locution can also mean other officers who were young and younger than 44. That Mr. Dudgeon seizes on such a feeble point demonstrates that he is unconvinced by his own position. He also accuses me of "twisted, circular logic..." I do not accuse Mr. Dudgeon of logic at all, twisted, circular or shapeless. Mr. Dudgeon is in dudgeon because he is confused and shaken by *Insider Knowledge* and justifiably so.

For 5 years I have hunted for evidence of Casement's authorship and I have failed to find any. I did find abundant deception, innuendo and manifest lies. Since publication of my book, *Anatomy Of A Lie*, I have completed four research articles which expose further deceit (www.decoding-casement.com). I suggest Mr. Dudgeon takes stock of his indefensible position and reflects on the following.

The present attribution of authorship would not stand in a court of law because:

- 1 – there is no witness evidence to support the attribution,
- 2 – there is no scientific evidence to support the attribution,
- 3 – there is no evidence of any kind which proves the material existence of the bound diaries during Casement's lifetime.

It follows that reasons for the present attribution lie outside rational and impartial analysis and belong to the grey zone of opinion-making and political-historical priorities.

Attribution of authorship implies uncertainty and is therefore provisional rather than a statement of fact. Such an attribution can be amended in the light of new research and new facts. In the present case there is new research and new facts have been presented which demonstrate that there are no good grounds for the present attribution. Chief among these new facts is number 3 above.

This fact is supported by HM Government papers and by all of Casement's numerous biographers.

In the extensive literature of decades not a single instance is cited of the bound volumes being shown to any independent witness in 1916.

Official papers cite no such instance and officials at UK National Archives confirm they have no knowledge of any such showing.

It follows that there are no grounds which prove that the bound diaries existed during Casement's lifetime. The present attribution is a prejudicial statement of belief, not of knowledge and, as such, it inevitably conditions the individual's freedom of belief. The fact is that no-one knows who wrote the diaries. Therefore the attribution is self-evidently unsafe and it follows that the diaries are of unknown authorship.

Part Three

In Defence Of Dorothy Macardle

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH CONTINUED

After the signing of the Anglo-Irish Treaty on December 6th 1921, the national movement began to fracture between pro- and anti-Treaty camps. The division eventually erupted into violent conflict on 28th June 1922 when, under pressure from the British Government and with artillery borrowed from that Government, Free State forces bombarded the Four Courts then occupied by anti-Treaty IRA forces under Rory O'Connor. The conflict ended less than a year later on May 24th when, following an earlier cease fire instruction, Frank Aiken commanded the anti-Treaty IRA to dump arms.

As a Republican opponent of the Treaty,

Dorothy Macardle was imprisoned by the Provisional Government from 9th November 1922 until sometime in May 1923. From the time of her release right up until the completion of *The Irish Republic* in 1937 and later, the Treaty division remained a main focus of her political writing. A firm ally of de Valera, she expressed the Republican view but she did more than articulate a partisan position. She brought an intellectual rigour to the anti-Treaty case such that it could not be easily dismissed or misrepresented.

Among her writings on the Treaty division, some are well known like *Tragedies of Kerry*, a short pamphlet published in 1924, and *The Irish Republic*—both still in print and highly regarded—but other