

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

February 2026 Vol.41 No.2 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.40 No.2 ISSN 954-5891

Rogue States!

The idea that the United States is a rogue State is being flirted with in England. The reason for this is that President Trump is seen as breaking up the established order of the world put in place in 1945, and is thus endangering the West.

Where did this "West" come from in 1945? It did not exist in 1944, or for many years before that.

The free states of Western Europe in 1944—the states that were not engaged, in one way and another, in the War to destroy Russia—were Spain, Portugal and Ireland.

Spain and Portugal were free fascist states, in the sense that they were independent fascist states. They were not members of the European alliance that was trying to destroy Russia.

Spain deplored the British war on Germany as a European civil war, and refused to take any part in it. When Britain lost that war and Germany established the New Order in Europe, Spain did not participate.

When the New Order of Europe attacked Russia, Spain sent a token force to take part in it—just to show which side it was on—but it still maintained its neutrality as between Britain and Germany: and for people escaping from the New Order it still represented freedom.

Freedom has no general meaning. It has meaning only as freedom from, or for, this or that; or freedom to do this on the condition that you do that.

The West is now lamenting the destruction by Trump of the supposed rules-based order which was freedom. Every rule is a limitation of freedom, and order is a system of limitations.

But that system of limitations might enable things to be done that could not be done without it. And what is prevented by the system of rules might be experienced as freedom no less than what is made possible by it.

continued on page 2

Casement:

*Character Assassination
By An Expert!*

Review: *Roger Casement* by Brian Inglis, Penguin Books, 2002 first published 1973.

It is widely believed that Brian Inglis's biography of Roger Casement is the standard biography from which other biographies take their cue.

Although Inglis did not receive cooperation from the Casement family, the book could also be described as an "authorised" biography. That is to say: it was the British State that authorised him to have access to what have come to be called the Black Diaries in the late 1960s—at a time when such access was routinely refused.

But, while Mr. Inglis was granted privileged access, he says in a footnote at the beginning of the book that the Home Office did not allow him to reproduce a specific page from the diaries. So, what Inglis could quote from the diaries was strictly controlled.

Inglis came from a Protestant background in Dublin, but there the similarities with his subject end. Unlike Casement, he

continued on page 7

Trump Retreat From The Brink In Iran

A second US/Israeli attempt, in 6 months, aimed at regime change in Iran has failed.

The last attempt, made during June 2025, involved an Israeli sneak attack followed by a 12 day War on Iran. Iran responded with a defensive war that hurt Israel so much that Trump was forced to intervene on its behalf. And Trump launched a piece of theatrics that drew a line under the conflict and enabled a swift US exit before things became very serious.

But the unfinished business of the US/Israel in Iran resulted in a renewed attempt at regime change using different means in January 2026.

The US has been fomenting discontent with the Iranian economic situation by means of its punishing Sanctions regime. Economic hardship produced the protests. Trump has been particularly responsible for the Iranian economic crisis because he ripped up Obama's nuclear deal of 2016,

and imposed tough economic sanctions. The US President ratcheted these up to unprecedented levels in 2025. Europe, in its present slavish state, followed suit—despite knowing better—kow-towing to Trump.

As a result of the US Sanction regime, Iranian oil sales' revenue declined by two-thirds: and the resulting dollar shortage produced inflation of around 50 per cent in the country.

On the 28th December, as Trump met Netanyahu at Mar-a-lago, the Iranian

continued on page 4

C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Rogue States! Brendan Clifford	1
Casement: Character Assassination By An Expert. John Martin	1
Trump Retreats From The Brink In Iran. Pat Walsh	1
Readers' Letters. Russian Tankers: Some Shadow Boxing! Eamon Dyas	3
Trump: A Democratic Fallacy? Jack Lane	4
Biteback: Child Killing In Gaza. Edward Horgan	6
The "Black Diaries"—A Catalogue Of Lies. Paul R. Hyde	11
Casement And Emotion (Some Thoughts On <i>Broken Archangel</i>) by Roland Phillipps). John Minahane	12
New Year's Greeting by Roger Casement (poem)	13
The Brian Murphy osb Archive , Series 9, Part 24: <i>The Evolution Of British Policy And The Emergence Of A Sinn Fein Publicity Department In The Years After The Easter Rising</i>	14
Some Thoughts On Events In Venezuela. Pat Walsh	16

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

The Northern Standard
Ceases Publication

(back page)

Organised Labour:

Tax Rises; CareDoc Workers Settle Claim; Home Care Workers Vote For Strike;
Bus Eireann Workers Settle Claim; Pensions And Early Retirements;
TikTok And Trade Unions; Tusla: Pat Rabbitte Stands Down As Chair;
James Larkin's *Farewell Message To ITGWU Members*
(page 19)

Irish Political Review: Subscription by Post:
12 issues: Euro-zone & World Surface: €60; Sterling-zone: £45
Electronic Subscription: **€ 15 / £12 for 12 issues**
(or € 1.30 / £1.10 per issue)

You can also order from: [**https://www.atholbooks-sales.org**](https://www.atholbooks-sales.org)

This is something that should be well understood in Ireland if it reflected with a degree of objectivity on how the two peoples who live in it experience things. Protestants and Catholics are, on the whole, uneasy in the presence of the culture of the other and experience freedom in their own.

Sartre had the idea that Hell is other people. Or Hell is the other religion.

Or, since the Catholic religion—which was experienced as freedom by the overwhelming part of the nationalist population fifty years ago but now collapsed—Hell is religion.

The state of mind that fills the vacuum created by the collapse of Catholicism can only understand what nationalist Ireland

was in those ancient times (within the living memory of many) as a kind of tyranny imposed by a despotism that came from God-knows-where! But what was actually experienced by the general population about that aspect of things in the 1950s was contentment. The way *Faith Of Our Fathers* was sung at all-Ireland finals left no doubt about that.

Of course it would be nice if this or that rule could be bent a little on this particular occasion—which was often done without any challenge to the rule itself—but the order on the whole was considered fine. There was certainly no desire to be free of it. It had been well worth preserving against the English. Celebration of it was the real national anthem: "*Faith Of Our Fathers*".

We celebrated our 'debasement' by a religious tyranny. And we were so debased by that tyranny that we experienced it as freedom!

How could it be that we experienced things so falsely?

We were indoctrinated by the tyranny?

But it was a very different Freedom that the English tried to indoctrinate us into! Indoctrination by tyranny failed. It was through our own will that we became what we were.

If we were so thoroughly indoctrinated against truth by ourselves that our natural feelings were over-ridden for centuries and we experienced the world falsely, then we are in a bad way, since knowledge begins with experience.

And the tyrants who messed up so thoroughly could only have been ourselves.

We have now shrugged off all of that and joined the Free World, the 'West'. We are no longer "the aliens of the West"—as the Young Irelanders put it. We now get our feelings and experiences from outside ourselves. But we seem to have joined the West at a moment when it has become uncertain about itself.

The West is not Europe: that much is clear. Historical Europe—a loose configuration of dynamic cultures—was undermined by the British 1914 War against it—Casement's Crime Against Europe. It was destroyed by Britain's 1939 War against it.

Britain's European wars were "balance-of-power" wars, the purpose of which was to prevent an evolutionary development of Europe through the interaction of the major forces within it. Europe had to be kept at war with itself so that Britain could conquer the world. But Britain was so badly damaged in its wars on Germany that it had to concede primacy to its offspring, the United States.

What has been clarified during the last few years is that the West is now the United States—and that both Britain and Europe are its dependencies.

The US has never been anything but capitalist, democratic and militarist.

It was founded as a new society of militant migrants from Britain and Europe—who cleared space for themselves by comprehensive genocide—in the culture of which they still revel. Its social culture is extreme individualism. In the economy it accepts the discipline of the market. In

the army it takes the form of rigorously regimented individualism—which gives it immense power. In foreign affairs its guiding notion is Manifest Destiny—which means grabbing whatever is there to be grabbed.

The British—and the Europeans, who are the battered casualties of Britain's two World Wars—like the illusion of International Law in a rules-based order of the world since 1945. The US knows that that is make-believe. The US, until recently, tried not to deprive them of the comfort of that illusion: but now thinks they should be made to grow up and face realities.

When the US engages in a blatant breach of the 'rules-based order' by killing or kidnapping the leader of another state, the UK/EU leaders say they shed no tears because he was a bad man and leave it at that.

The US is now deciding whether Manifest Destiny obliges it to destroy Iran as a favour to Israel—while Israel is wondering whether Iran, in the course of being destroyed, could still inflict sufficient damage on Israel to put its future in question.

There is disagreement between the US and EU/UK over Russia. EU/UK want Russia to be destroyed by the European war in the Ukraine—which was its intent in provoking it. The EU thinks it could remake itself into something viable by means of winning such a war. At the same time it knows it could not undertake such a war without the US. But the US has its mind on China.

China has become a major economic Power by means of a free capitalism within a framework tended by the Communist Party. That is how has defended itself from the destructive power of the West—a destructive power that has littered the world with casualties.

Britain has forgotten that it forced China into the world market by means of the Opium Wars—wars of one-sided slaughter by means of which Liberal Britain compelled China to open itself to the sale of British opium—which had been kept out by the State. Opium was the point of leverage in the Wars that opened China to Western markets.

If course it is wrong for China to remember such things, as the West would rather that they were forgotten—and that is what counts as morality in the post-religious era.

But China does remember, and seems to know that its only actual means of defence against the West is by acquiring the power to destroy the West.

Russian Tankers: Some Shadow-Boxing !

According to a report by George Allison in the UK Defence Journal (UKDJ), published on 23rd January 2026, it appears that the Royal Navy "and its NATO allies" were monitoring the Russian tanker, General Skobelev, during a two-day operation as it sailed from the Mediterranean on its way to the North Sea. The UKDJ report also confirms that the tanker was being escorted by the Russian Navy corvette, Boikiy.

"Royal Navy ships and aircraft were activated to monitor Russian naval movements in the English Channel during a two-day operation conducted in coordination with NATO allies.

"Portsmouth-based patrol vessels HMS Mersey and HMS Severn were deployed alongside a Wildcat helicopter from 815 Naval Air Squadron as Russian corvette Boikiy and the accompanying oil tanker MT General Skobelev sailed toward the North Sea after returning from the Mediterranean"

<https://ukdefencejournal.org.uk/british-vessels-shadow-russian-warship-off-coast/>.

This is the context of the events of the seizure of the oil tanker, Grinch, by the French and British forces, as provided by the Facebook page of Emilius George Ades Georgiades:

"The capture of the Russian lone oil tanker Grinch, which occurred on January 22nd through the joint efforts of France and Britain, is being hailed in Paris and London as a "brilliant military operation".

"However, the Russian oil tanker General Skobelev, sailing through the English Channel was not alone. It was escorted by the Russian corvette Boikiy. In this case, a "brilliant military operation" by the British vessels HMS Mersey and HMS Severn, accompanied by a Dutch vessel, was "not an option".

"The "bravery" which was displayed by the French and British Navies when they jointly carried out their act of piracy against an unarmed tanker the previous day, suddenly abandoned them. Instead, they opted for the next "bravest act". That of "shadowing" the two Russian vessels... from a safe distance.

"N.B. The Dutch contribution to this "show of strength" was a vessel belonging to a private company and 'leased' by the Dutch Navy: as there is a "shortage of ships" in that NATO member's Naval fleet.

" "Bravery" is such an unstable thing. Under unfavourable conditions, it turns "yellow"..." (25.1.26).

'Nuff Said!

Eamon Dyas

The post-religious West sanctifies all that it has done to the world by calling it Progress—as if progress was not just what it did, but was a transcendental force directed on the world by the Heaven which it has abolished.

The West has been continuously at war during the long period since its 1949 defeat the Chinese Civil War. The Chinese Army has had little experience of warfare, except in skirmishes, since Korea. It has built an apparently powerful Navy but it has no battle experience. It has never been engaged in warfare around the world, as the Army of the West has been. It is by comparison a mere home defence force.

If the West continues on the course upon which it set itself four or five centuries ago, it will be obliged to engage in a final contest with China. And the home-bound Chinese

Army can only hope to survive by means of nuclear weaponry.

When Russia tried to supply Cuba with effective (i.e., nuclear) means of defence sixty years ago, and Washington threatened nuclear war, the Chinese view was that it should not have offered those weapons to Cuba—though it was no more than the US had done with states bordering on Russia—but that, once the threat of nuclear war was made against its Cuban ally, Russia should have responded in kind.

That is presumably be what China will do if necessary.

And the odds are that the West, in the grip of its obsessive Judeo-Christian mentality—which survives the decay of belief—will bring about that necessity.

Brendan Clifford

Trump: A Democratic Fallacy?

Politicians and Governments in the West are becoming and more beholden to the 'markets' as to how their policies are to be made and judged, particularly by the financial markets. The same politicians are those who have given more power to the financial markets by making central banks independent—which for the vast majority of people means the responsibility they are given to set interest rates.

One of Trump's new assaults on the 'rules based order' is to counter this and give responsibility back to Governments for this crucial aspect of economic life. It has been met with howls of anger and incredulity that such a thing should even be considered.

A recent outburst has come from the European Social Democratic think-tank on the EU, 'Social Europe', and the argument is made on very curious, and very interesting grounds.

It is what a contributor calls the "51 percent fallacy" about Democracy, ie:

"This conception of democracy lies at the heart of contemporary populist illiberalism: whoever secures 51 per cent of the vote possesses all rights. Such leaders feel entitled to imprison their enemies, silence critics, rewrite the rules of the game as they see fit, pardon friends caught with their hands in the till or, worse still, those who stormed the nation's parliament"

and he concludes that—

"The person who won 51 per cent of the vote does not—and should not—have all the rights" (Why the Left should defend Central bank independence, 'Social Europe,' by Guillaume Duval, 26.1.2026—who is adviser to the great and the good in the EU!)

Duval's case assumes that only bankers can be trusted with behaving properly in administering Finance, which is such a crucial element of society. Otherwise, the Democracy and their Governments are inevitably liable to succumb to the temptation to abuse money by printing too much of it to satisfy the whims of the electorates and thereby cause inflation, which is the road to ruin! The author elaborates on this thesis at some length.

The basic message is that the Democracy is not to be trusted: however, just one element in the democracy, bankers, can be regarded as sensible, rational etc.,

etc. This is akin to regarding the military as the best authority on War!

This view poses some serious question about how society can be run if the Democracy cannot be trusted—which, of course, we are constantly told is self-evidently the only way on which society should be run: and even world wars can be contemplated to ensure it does.

This 'conception' leads to an inevitable conclusion that too much democracy can be a very bad thing: if it is based on 51% of votes—or even a greater percentage. On this logic: more democracy is worse again: as it becomes an ever greater expression of "populist illiberalism"—which is equated nowadays with fascism or worse.

Where is the dividing line to be drawn between 'acceptable' democracy and this democratic illiberalism leading to God knows what? And who is to decide? As democracy is promoted as so evidently a good thing, ever more democracy should be better again rather than worse. This would mean a 100% vote for a government would make it totalitarian: and the opposite of Democracy as understood. Democracy leading to Totalitarianism?

For example, one question this conundrum poses: where does this leave minor-

ity governments? It could mean they are a very good thing, if the right people are in charge. But how much of a minority should they be to qualify as the best type of government? And again, who decides on this?

And this comes to the crux of the issue—it is really all about who is entitled to run society for society's own best interests if voting is not reliable for the purpose!

The problem arises when government of society is regarded as a scientific matter. In this case a mathematical matter. Mathematically, more is better than less: because it is more, it is bigger. But, as the author rightly says: in his view more can be worse than less on the issue that matters to him.

But again where is the dividing line for being less, and therefore better, to be drawn? And, again, who is to decide?

It is a real problem but an insoluble one from a scientific/mathematical view of society.

The fact is society, and its human content, are not scientific/mathematical entities—they are organic living entities and their functioning is governed by laws unto themselves and certainly not by simple maths.

In this situation, politicians have to make it up as they along: and hopefully a leader with the virtues of Plato's "philosopher king" will occasionally arise, as does a black swan!

Jack Lane

Trump Retreat From The Brink In Iran

continued from page 1

currency suddenly suffered a 30 per cent drop in value on the international markets. This resulted from a concerted attack on the rial by Western traders who engaged in 'short-selling'.

The resulting fall in the value of the currency caused consternation in Iran, set off bazaar protests: lighting the fuse.

The bazaar element had always been a strong supporter of the existing regime—pictures of the original Ayatollah Khomeini always adorn the shops there. But, historically, when the Bazaar went on strike, it was seen as serious for any administration.

A deal would surely have been done to quell the discontent if it had not been for the activation of the US/Zionist part of the plan. The plot was to turn a commercial protest into a violent insurrection—which

could not be just left with no response: the plan was to get enough people killed to justify a US intervention and "regime change" in the classic way.

There is ample evidence that both the US and Israel began stoking insurrection in Iran out of the protests. Israel, in particular, is known to have plans and agents in place in several states to take advantage of such events.

It has emerged that 40,000 Starlink terminals were found to have been imported into Iran. These provide a satellite connection for high-speed internet in remote areas, by-passing more regular means of connection.

The capture of these terminals, and the Iranian neutralisation of Musk's Starlink through Chinese technology, disrupted the planned insurrection; and the Internet

was immediately shut down by Tehran for security reasons.

Netanyahu and Trump had evidently given the plan the go-ahead on New Year's Night during the former's visit to Trump's Mar-a-lago resort. Israel wanted the exercise US military power to destroy Iran's air defences and ballistic missiles, in order to leave it defenceless. After all, Israel had learnt in 2025 that it could not attack Iran with impunity. To do this it needed Iran's defences removed some-way or another.

The Israeli press has admitted that Mossad and its agents were involved in this project of social disruption. When the protests began in early January, the former US Secretary of State and Director of the CIA, Mike Pompeo, tweeted on X:

"The Iranian regime is in trouble...Happy New Year to every Iranian in the streets. Also to every Mossad agent walking beside them..."

Alistair Crooke, former British diplomat, also revealed that a large force of Iraqi-based Kurds, trained by the US, simultaneously crossed the border toward Kermanshah to foment trouble in Iran. And Turkish Intelligence, monitoring the movements of the Kurdish force, informed the Iranians—enabling them to destroy the incoming army, killing over 200.

The US/Israeli-manufactured 'insurrection then took the form of the provocative burning of private property, bazaars, hospitals, schools, along with 25 mosques. It was the paid activists of the US/Israel who killed over 200 police, and shot civilians—with Israeli-supplied small arms—with the object of provoking the clampdown by the authorities: as the Iranian administration attempted to calm protests and ameliorate the situation.

Wild casualty figures allegedly resulting from the disturbances in Iran were provided to the Western media by the Centre for Human Rights in Iran. This Centre is not based in Iran—it is based in New York and is financed by the National Endowment for Democracy in Washington. Its Chairwoman, Minky Worden, usually runs anti-China disinformation in the West. Another prominent spokeswoman used by Western media is Masih Alinejad: she has received nearly 1 million dollars from the NED over the last decade.

BBC fact-checkers have not been employed to challenge the widely varying figures given of deaths. These range from hundreds to tens of thousands. This confirms that these BBC activities are solely directed against Russia, and against Trump!

A vast disinformation campaign about the situation in Iran was launched in the West, with the object of establishing a narrative that "this time is different", which is to say that the "regime" was under dire threat and would imminently collapse. This propaganda offensive aimed to generate momentum in Iran and to instil confidence that the Government could be overthrown. Many news agencies suggested that the Supreme Leader would be shortly getting on a plane to Moscow—just as Assad had done! Just one more push . . .

The exiled son of the deposed Pahlavi Shah son was trotted out as an alternative government: a ridiculous proposition.

A far more likely scenario for "regime change" in Iran than the return of the Shah, if the US had succeeded, would have been a replacement of the Iranian clerical rulers by the military—the Revolutionary Guard Corps. Perhaps, in the end, someone told Trump this.

During the disorder, the idea presented by the Western media was that the situation in Iran was a mirror image of the 1979 overthrow of the Shah. But in 1979 the Shah could not depend upon his army—which surrendered to the Revolution—whereas the current Government has security forces which are very willing to both kill and die for it. They will not melt away in favour of some foreign-imposed figurehead.

Furthermore, there was no general strike in Iran, paralysing the State, as there was in 1979.

There was, therefore, no internal force which could force State collapse, despite any internal discontent there might be.

The 1979 Revolution was a truly internal Iranian event. It caught Washington—which held that that it was Communism which posed the danger to the Shah's regime—by surprise. This had the consequence that Iran's subsequent development would be Islamic. And no alternative functional opposition has ever emerged.

The West presents the 1979 events as a hardline Islamic Revolution, but it was nothing of the sort. Much of the revolution was inspired by ideas from the French Enlightenment—just like the Constitutional Revolution that had been suppressed in the first few years of the 20th Century.

In 1979 an activist part of the urban population, which had grown massively with the Shah's petro-development, were motivated against the Shah by a desire for individual rights. The Left was a strong component in the situation. But this part of the Revolution was an alien development and it became submerged in the Islamic Republic: because

the most substantial opposition to the Shah came from the clerics, who the Shah feared to silence, and from rural poor.

The Shah, who had just had a celebrated meeting with US President Jimmy Carter, realised the danger to his regime, and made a notoriously incendiary blunder by denouncing the clerics as sodomites and alcoholics. This attack outraged the Iranian public and sparked off mass protests that were repressed with substantial State violence.

Shia Islam was anti-state in character and never aspired to take power in the state. The Ayatollah stepped up to the job of taking charge of Iran, and then governing the State, as a matter of duty to the people.

The 1979 Revolution developed some of the characteristics of the French Revolution, organising its own kind of Islamic Thermidor.

It is this urban part of Iranian society, motivated by a desire for internal reform, which has been struggling to free itself of the clergy's straight-jacket. This dichotomy forms the basis of internal Iranian politics, when left to its own devices. But the West is not content to leave Iran to its own devices. And, even worse, the West has largely outsourced its Iranian policy to Israel—which has no interest in the welfare of Iranians: its sole intent is to disable or destroy the Iranian State.

I don't think it is worthwhile spending any more time on the internal politics of Iran because what is happening is being determined by two external forces—that infamous double act of Israel/US. Their intentions towards Iran run in parallel. The only question is which is in the driving seat at any one time.

President Trump himself was certainly inciting insurrection in Iran by promising a military operation like that in Venezuela—and urging people to stay on the streets (to be killed). At the point when Trump made his statement that the US was "cocked and loaded", no one had been reported killed. Now it is said that thousands have since died—despite, or because of, Trump's threat.

It is only Trump who is responsible for these deaths: it was he who raised false expectations.

As the insurrection began to wane, Trump tweeted "keep protesting, help is on its way": just to give it a boost.

At that point the Trump was asked by a US journalist:

"Do you see any checks on your power,

on the world stage? Is there anything that could stop you, if it wanted to?"

The US President replied:

"Yeah, there's one thing, my own morality, my own mind. It's the only thing that can stop me."

The manufactured situation, created by the West, is likely to make the Iranian Government desperate and volatile. It has made many attempts to make peace with the US, and has acted with moderation in the face of serious Israeli provocations. But that Government is being boxed into a corner: with the aim of leaving it with only two options: to go down fighting by closing the Straits of Hormuz and/or launching a massive response to Israeli aggression in the form of an attack using hyper-sonic ballistic missiles.

Russia evacuated all its citizens from Israel during the fighting: it knew the Iranian capability one presumes.

But things did not go according to Imperialist plans. The US/Israeli-manufactured insurrection in Iran was defeated by 14th January. And this appears to have happened, not merely through the efforts of the 'State repressive apparatus', but by the people themselves—who did not care for the professed alternative to a functional State.

Trump seems to have had the plan of finishing off the "regime" by means of the concentrated use of its US military power—perhaps in conjunction with Israel—after Iran was in full insurrection mode. However, the insurrection was put down before US forces were ready to strike.

At that point Trump's advisors told him, reportedly, that US strikes would probably fail to finish off the "regime".

Trump is probably also aware that Israel's objective in Iran is certainly not to turn it into a functional, democratic state. Israel needs an Iranian enemy to justify its aggressive actions in the region, and to stimulate the tax dollars the US provides. A nice, Western-friendly Iran is not in its interest. A democratic Iran would be a rival for Western favours.

What Israel would prefer is another Iraq, Libya or Syria—a chaotic, dismantled, State with millions fleeing toward Europe, Azerbaijan, or Armenia, and militant jihadis assembling and organising in neighbouring countries. This would provide Israel with future justification for destabilising the territory of Iran, preventing a functional alternative State from emerging. This is its strategy in Syria—where it remains suc-

cessful, despite the attempts by the US and Turkey to rebuild the shattered State.

Trump—who opposed the shambles created by the US in Iraq—surely understood this. If the madcap plan—involving an attempted US death-blow to the Iranian State—had succeeded, that surely would have been the outcome. But, in the event the insurrection failed.

Later reports have suggested that Israel also came to realise that the time was not right to proceed with implementation of the final part of the plan: CNN, relying on an Israeli source, reported:

"PM Netanyahu urged US President Trump to delay any attack on Iran, warning that the Iranian regime would not collapse without a prolonged campaign and raised concerns over Israel's missile defense systems, damaged during the Iran-Israel conflict."

This confirms what I reported in a previous piece: that Iran had given as good as it got in the 12-Day War, and its stout resistance to Israeli aggression had forced Israel to call up Trump to produce a bit of theatrics to draw a halt to a conflict in which the Israeli public was buckling and heading abroad to their second homes (see: <https://drpatwalsh.com/2025/06/28/the-war-on-iran-trump-averts-a-catastrophe-of-his-own-making/>).

It is interesting that the Democrat jibe of "TACO" ("Trump Always Chickens Out") has not been aired in America about the President's backing down in this instance—

just when most appropriate! What can that mean? Is it realised that this was a serious conflict in which the US lost prestige: and spreading such a cutting jibe would not serve the national interest?

Trump, himself, is in a bind because the traditional Republican Party is attempting to reassert itself against his MAGA base. They see their opportunity in Trump's inability to run for a third term because of the Constitution.

However, this element considers it needs to sideline Vance as well. Israel is reportedly assisting in this process—because much of the MAGA base is America First and not Israel First. Israel prefers war-hawk Republicans like Pompeo and Rubio for its interest.

The division within Trump's support base began to appear in the 12-Day War last year, and Trump knows he needs to heal it before the US mid-terms in November.

Is that, also, what is at the bottom of the US retreat from the brink in Iran?

Trump has now switched the agenda to threatening tariffs against those states who oppose a US taking of Greenland, a Danish colony. The pivot to Greenland is classic bully behaviour as Trump knows the Europeans will roll over, after a bit of bluster, rather than fight like Iran did.

But the fact remains: if Israel has anything to do with it, there is likely to be a US Round 3 with Iran.

Pat Walsh

Child Killing In Gaza

Due to the plans by US President Trump to seize the island of Greenland, the international community has been ignoring the ongoing genocide in Gaza. At least 73,000 Palestinians have been reported killed in Gaza since 7th October 2023, but the full death count may exceed 100,000. On 30th July 2025, the *Washington Post* published the list of names of 18,500 children killed since October 2023. Their deaths must not be ignored.

The Trump peace plan makes no effort to hold Israel to account for the Genocide, or to hold the US and others to account for their participation in that Genocide. Trump's *Board of Peace for Gaza* will be chaired by Trump himself. There will be several subsidiary bodies whose membership will include former UK Prime Minister Tony Blair, US Secretary of State, Marco Rubio, US Special Envoy to the Middle East Steve Witkoff, and Jared Kushner, the US President's son-in-law.

With a line-up like this, what could possibly go right? There are no genuine plans for democracy, independence, accountability or justice for the Palestinian people.

We need to understand the stories of some of the children killed to appreciate the suffering and trauma. The film, *The Voice Of Hind Rajab*, tells the horrific story of five-year-old Hind Rami Iyad Rajab, killed by the Israeli tank fire on 29th January 2024. Six of her family members and two paramedics coming to her rescue were also killed.

More than 100 children are reported to have died in Gaza since the October 2025 Ceasefire. They include two-week old baby Mohammad Abu al-Khair, who died on 15th December 2025. He was the eighth to die of hypothermia in Gaza this winter—including a 27-day-old baby named Aisha Ayesh al-Agha, who died 17th January.

All these crimes against humanity must not be ignored.

Edward Horgan

Casement: Character Assassination

continued from page 1

attended 'Public' Schools in England, and later Trinity College Dublin and Magdalen College Oxford. He served with the RAF during the Second World War and worked for *The Irish Times* before graduating to the 'metropole'—becoming Editor of the *Spectator* and achieving a successful career in British Television.

With such a background there was little risk that he would upset the British Establishment!

The Inglis book gives a competent account of Casement's career in the British diplomatic service in the Congo and later in South America. The fact is: Casement's Reports on the Congo were not antagonistic to British Imperialism. King Leopold of Belgium was running the Congo as a private business.

And British companies were prevented from participating in the exploitation of the rubber industry, in which British subjects from British colonies were exploited. The Belgians operated in effect a system of slave labour in which workers were killed or brutally maimed for not achieving production quotas. Casement's Report in 1904 received international recognition.

Subsequently, Casement's investigation of the rubber industry in the Putumayo region of South America in 1910 exposed even worse atrocities. But in this case the exploitation was financed by British capital and the punishments were often inflicted by men from the British colony of Barbados.

Casement was awarded a knighthood in 1911. But, if the British thought that this award would tame him, they were mistaken. He continued to believe that the British relationship to Ireland was not different from that of Britain to its African colonies.

He noted that Ireland exported £63 million worth of products. Of this total, £52 million went to Britain. Of the remaining £11 million a mere £0.7 million was not routed through British ports. In early 1914 he saw the strategic significance of the Cunard Line's decision to pull out of Cork. This made Ireland even more dependent on British ports for her exports.

In response, he attempted, through a German intermediary, to request that the German shipping company *Hamburg-*

Amerika open in Cork. The negotiations reached an advanced stage but the German company decided not to go ahead with the plan.

It could be said that Casement's approach was visionary in the sense that the struggle for Independence right up until the present has been in large part about reducing Ireland's dependence on British trade.

Casement thought in strategic terms. If Britain had an independent Ireland on its Western flank, that would make it more difficult for the Empire to retain its world naval dominance. He also advocated an alliance with Germany and attempted to carry out that policy.

But, instead of trying to engage with these ideas, Inglis dismisses them as a symptom of some kind of a psychological condition!

There are numerous examples of this approach. For example he says:

"And by the time he went to South America, it was indeed a disease; an obsession, disturbing even those who most admired him, like H. L. Mason, who worked with him, and thought he had—

"only one serious fault... a fanatical view of the Irish situation amounting to mania, so that his friends most carefully avoided ever mentioning the subject"..." (p397).

Elsewhere Inglis describes Casement's support for Germany as "*messianic*". In an attempt to suggest this support was unique, Inglis misrepresents James Connolly as the following passage shows:

"If a German army landed in Ireland, the readers of his Irish Worker were told at the outbreak of the war, they should be supported, provided they gave adequate guarantees for Irish Independence. But his headquarters at Liberty Hall were draped with a banner, 'We serve neither King, nor Kaiser, but Ireland'; and privately, he was to confide in Pearse and Clarke that he thought the Germans as bad as the British."

Needless to say, there is no reference for the 'private' comment Connolly allegedly made to Pearse and Clarke. Readers of the *Irish Political Review* will know that Casement and Connolly were unambiguous in their support for Germany during the First World War.

Shortly after Casement arrived in Germany in 1914, he was able to obtain the following statement from the acting German Secretary of State:

"Should the fortune of the Great War, which was not of Germany's seeking, ever bring in its course German troops to the shores of Ireland, they would land there, not as an army of invaders to pillage and destroy, but as the forces of a Government that is inspired by goodwill towards a country and a people for whom Germany desires only national prosperity and national freedom."

John Devoy, the American-based Fenian, congratulated Casement for effectively countering British propaganda about the rights of small nations (such as 'little' Belgium, with its African Empire!).

Of course, the Black Diaries were another more sinister attempt to characterise Casement as being deranged. Inglis's approach to this subject is to assume that the diaries are authentic without any discussion. Below is an example:

"Alone among those who knew Casement well, Hambloch also claimed to have been aware there was a suspicion that he was 'not normal'. This was on no very strong evidence; simply on one occasion, he observed two English residents, father and son, exchanging smiles when the father, hearing his good-looking son was to have lunch with Casement, advised him to 'be careful'. It might easily have been dismissed as a misunderstanding of some private joke between the father and the son, were it not for the fact that two of the 'black' diaries discovered in London happened to be for 1910 and 1911" (p163).

The first question that arises is: how can disputed documents such as the Black Diaries be considered corroboration for anecdotes that are equally suspect? The 'corroboration' consists of a few sentences from the 'diaries', describing paid sex with Brazilian natives. No mention of 'English residents'!!

Secondly, how credible is this story? Is it likely that a father would consider it amusing for his young son to have lunch with a man in his late forties who was "*not normal*"?

And, thirdly, how reliable is the source? Indeed, what is the source? Inglis provides no reference!

But, in the 'bibliography' section, there is a book by Ernest Hambloch published in 1938. Hambloch was Casement's Vice-Consul in Rio de Janeiro. Paul Hyde in his book, *Anatomy Of A Lie: Decoding Casement*, says that Hambloch worked for Casement for only three weeks (p153).

Even Jeffrey Dudgeon finds Hambloch unreliable. In his book he says Hambloch stated that, when Casement visited Germany in 1912, the Germans provided him with a car. Dudgeon says that in fact Casement travelled with his friend Dick Morten whose car it was (*Roger Casement: The Black Diaries—with a Study Of His Background, Sexuality And Irish Political Life*, 2nd edition, p414).

So we are asked to believe that "alone among those who knew Casement well", Hambloch is the only person who had suspicions about Casement! And he only voiced those suspicions publicly 22 years after Casement's death!!

This is by no means the only example of using the disputed Black Diaries to establish 'facts' about Casement. Inglis blithely says Casement met "*his old love, Millar, and brought him to a hotel in War-repoint*" (p164).

Inglis then produces an extract from one of the 'Black Diaries', describing the sexual encounter. But the sole source for a sexual relationship between Millar and Casement is the Black Diaries. There is no other evidence for any such relationship.

Yet another example of using dubious sources is a quotation from a poem which could reasonably be considered to have a homosexual theme (p382). Inglis attributes this to Casement without discussion. But, interestingly, although he quotes the seven verses of the poem, he doesn't give the title! Of course, if he had done so, readers of his book in 1973 might have recalled that this poem—ironically enough called "*The Nameless One*"—was the subject of controversy regarding its provenance sixteen years earlier (<https://www.decoding-casement.com/naming-the-nameless-one/>).

Inglis has an interesting detail about Casement's brief stay in Norway in October 1914 *en route* to Germany. He says Mansfeldt Findlay (the Minister to the British legation in Oslo) pointed out that, as Casement was travelling on a false passport, his disappearance would not be noticed, and if "someone knocked Casement on the head he would get well paid".

It seems that murder as well as kidnapping was contemplated by the British diplomatic corps!

Elsewhere, Inglis makes the 'innovative' claim that Casement's assistant Adler Christensen 'betrayed' Casement. However, all the evidence suggests the

opposite. Hyde in his book reproduces a letter from Arthur Nicholson (Permanent Under-Secretary of the Foreign Office) to Findlay which indicates that both Christensen and Casement had outwitted Findlay—making the latter's position in Norway all but untenable (Hyde, p175).

For such a senior historian, Inglis makes a number of surprising errors. For example he refers to Sir Wyndham Childs as the "*Chief of the Criminal Investigation Department at the time Casement was captured in 1916*" (p109).

But anyone who has taken even a cursory interest in the accusations against Casement would know that it was Basil Thomson who was the Chief of the CID in 1916!

That is probably the most innocent mistake that Inglis makes!!

On page 332 he says:

"He [Casement, JM] had left some of his possessions in his old Ebury Street lodgings; and among them the diaries for 1903, 1910, and 1911, and the account book for 1911—which Basil Thomson described, after they had been brought to him at Scotland Yard, as containing material which could not be printed 'in any age, in any language'."

But Inglis doesn't give the full quotation, which is from Basil Thomson's book *Queer People*, published in 1922:

"But something besides clothing was found in one of the trunks. —a diary and a cashbook from the year 1903 with considerable gaps... It is enough to say of the diaries that they found could not be printed in any age or in any language."

So, Thomson was unaware of diaries relating to 1910 or 1911.

Under the heading "*The Black Diaries*", there is a very strange passage in the book concerning what was distributed by the authorities in the attempt to discredit Casement. Inglis says "*copies were made*". But he doesn't say what form those "*copies*" took! He then says that one of the principal officers at the Ministry of Information, G. H. Mair, boasted that "*he had the responsibility for getting the diaries copied*". Inglis then adds:

"What has remained obscure is who actually gave the authorisation to show the copies around. Inevitably, suspicion fell on F.E. Smith. He showed them to friends: Sir James O'Connor, the Irish Attorney-General, told Bulmer Hobson how shocked and disgusted he had been "at the impropriety of the Attorney-General of England peddling dirty stories in

this way about a man he was prosecuting on a charge of treason". But Smith's interest, apparently, was only scatological; when he heard that the Foreign Office was proposing to photograph portions of the diary, with a view to influencing opinion, he told Grey he thought it was "rather a ghoulish proposal". Grey agreed: it would not be proceeded with, unless the Cabinet gave its authority."

So, Smith thought photographing "*portions of the diary*" (singular) "*ghoulish*", which begs the question, what exactly Smith was showing to his friends! Paul Hyde in his book says what was shown were "*typescripts*" that were claimed to be copies of the diary or diaries of Casement. (It seems that people were initially under the impression that there was only one diary!)

But it is a little bizarre—not to mention insulting—to suggest that Smith's interest was "*only scatological*". Whatever that might be said of Smith, he was a serious person. He threatened to resign if the Government granted Casement a reprieve.

Inglis then speculates on who authorised the showing of "*copies*" of the 'Diaries'. He notes that the Government did not authorise this, but made no attempt to prevent it from happening. Such an approach, of course, would allow future deniability!

Inglis thinks that Ernley Blackwell, the legal adviser to the Home Office was a key figure. He says:

"Blackwell did not need authorisation to show the diaries. All that he required was the Cabinet's tacit consent."

But, while Blackwell was a key figure, he certainly was not the orchestrator. His role was as a conduit between the Intelligence Services and the Cabinet, making sure that the latter would not weaken in its resolve to destroy Casement for the present and in posterity.

But, for all Inglis's deceptions, every so often he gives the game away. On page 279 he says:

"‘At last in Berlin’, Casement wrote on October 31st in his diary—preserved by a friend he made in Germany, so that it did not fall into the hands of the Home Office (it contained no references to homosexual activities—presumably because Casement realised it would be risky, in the situation in which he now found himself, to include them)“.

Yes. This does require an explanation! No sexual activities in 1914—unlike in 1903, 1910 and 1911! Inglis suggests

that Casement was still "at it" in 1914 but that he decided that it would be prudent not to document it!

But there is an obvious alternative explanation which Inglis has unwittingly suggested. The reason for the absence of sexual activities in the 1914 Diary is that it was "*preserved by a friend he made in Germany, so that it did not fall into the hands of the Home Office*"—or those of the forgers!

Apart from that *faux pas*, it must be admitted that Inglis's book, which Penguin Books designates as a "*Classic Biography*", is a brilliant piece of character assassination of a great Irish patriot by a faithful servant of the British State!

The Inglis book has indeed been the template for subsequent biographies.

John Martin

Postscript: Addendum

The 2002 edition of Brian Inglis's biography of Roger Casement says that Inglis was "*knighted in 1977*".

But Inglis himself never claimed to be a knight nor did anyone accuse him of being so during his life.

Is it possible that there are some knighthoods that are awarded secretly and can only be revealed posthumously? (Inglis died in 1993).

It turns out that there is a far simpler explanation. Penguin publishers got it wrong! There was indeed an Australian "*Brian Inglis*" who received a knighthood in 1997 for services to industry—not the same person who wrote the biography!

It is possible that this was the most innocent error in the whole book!

JM

he had lied; "He told me nothing about the diaries or about himself..." .

9 – Casement had homosexual relations with his servant Christensen. False. Source: Findlay, Brian Inglis and later biographers especially Dudgeon. There is no evidence that Casement ever had sexual relations with anyone.

10 – Christensen betrayed Casement to Findlay at the Oslo legation in 1914. False. This lie was invented by Brian Inglis in his 1973 biography. The Foreign Office files of the period show very clearly that no betrayal took place. Nonetheless, the Inglis lie has been widely accepted and is the foundation of Dudgeon's incoherent but influential mythology.

11 – In 1916, Christensen offered to testify against Casement. False. There is no evidence that Christensen offered any such thing. The claim originated in 1916 from a telegram sent by Consul General Bayley in New York to Nicolson in the Foreign Office. Inglis lied again: "Christensen wrote to the Foreign Office from the United States suggesting they might like to have his testimony against the traitor." No such letter or document written by Christensen has ever been seen. Inglis gave no source for this lie or indeed for any of his many lies.

12 – Casement's mission to Germany failed totally. False. Source of disinformation: most biographers. His mission had three objectives; two succeeded and one failed.

13 – The Giles Report was a state-of-the-art forensic investigation proving authenticity by DNA, paper and ink testing. False. Source of this disinformation: the British and Irish media; recent comments by former Foreign Office historian, Gill Bennett. Giles was not commissioned to produce a forensic report for court purposes. She produced a handwriting comparison without charts or explanations or examples and concluded with an opinion which proved nothing. There was no DNA testing or paper and ink testing since these are not allowed by government policy. Her report was independently peer-reviewed by US document experts, James Horan and Marcel Matley, who stated that it did not meet publication standards and was 'junk science'. Her investigation had no official status and was privately commissioned by a well-known proponent of authenticity. The remit given to Giles was biased, instructing her to authenticate the diaries.

14 – Michael Collins authenticated the diaries. False. Collins was shown two diaries in 1922 but he left no written com-

The "Black Diaries"—A Catalogue Of Lies

Much of what has been published about the diaries scandal is demonstrably false. Today's consensus for authenticity of these vile documents is the result of persistent propaganda, a long campaign of deception and disinformation since the 1950s aimed at concealing the criminal plot to exact revenge on Casement. Listed below are fifty of the most frequent lies and falsehoods which nonetheless are believed to be facts. That it was necessary to publish so much deception constitutes strong evidence of awareness of forgery.

1 – The diaries were found in Casement's luggage. False. No incriminating diaries were found anywhere. Source of disinformation: Basil Thomson & CID in 1916. Home Secretary R. A. Butler and many later biographers.

2 – The luggage was delivered to Scotland Yard on 25th April, 1916. False. Most biographers and commentators now accept that the police seized the luggage at least one year earlier. Source of disinformation: police interrogation document 25th April. Dudgeon is now alone in defending the bogus April claim.

3 – The diaries were 'circulated' to influential persons before, during and after the trial. False. The diaries were never circulated at any time and indeed were not shown to anyone in 1916. Source: René MacColl and later authors. Nor were the police typescripts circulated; they were shown to selected persons.

4 - King George V, missionary John

Harris, Clement Shorter, US journalist Ben Allen, Ambassador Walter Page and others were shown handwritten diaries. False. Home Office files state that these persons were shown police typescripts which allegedly were official copies of unseen diaries. Source of disinformation: Inglis, Sawyer, Reid, Dudgeon, Ó Síocháin, etc.

5 – Anyone who wanted to see the diaries could do so. False. Only police typescripts were shown and this was a targeted and controlled operation. Source of this disinformation was biographer B.L. Reid who failed to name anyone who saw manuscript diaries in 1916.

6 – Casement's parents were alcoholics. False. There is no evidence to support this allegation. Source: the recent biography *Broken Archangel* by R. Philipps. This slur contributes to the portrait of Casement as a fractured personality, disturbed and unstable since childhood.

7 – Casement's nationalist feelings arose very late in his life. False. Source: Attorney General F. E. Smith and most biographers. Casement had felt nationalist sentiments from his schooldays and favoured some form of Home Rule. He joined Sinn Féin in 1905 and moved to support outright independence when it became clear that Britain would never grant either Home Rule or independence.

8 – Casement told his defence barrister Sullivan that he was homosexual. False. Sullivan did claim this in 1952 for the first time but in 1956 he publicly admitted that

ment about the experience. The widely believed claim is based on hearsay comments made many years later by Eamon Duggan who saw the diaries with Collins. In 1922, shortly after seeing the diaries, Collins told Gogarty and friends that he knew Smith's purpose in showing him the diaries was to persuade him of their authenticity. There is no evidence of any kind to show that Collins was duped by seeing the diaries.

15 – Casement conducted an affair with Joseph Millar Gordon in 1910. False. This lie was invented by Frank Hall of MI5 in 1915-16 and amplified by others including Dudgeon.

16 – Casement bought a motorcycle for Gordon in 1911. False. This was also invented by Frank Hall of MI5 and promoted by Dudgeon and others.

17 – Other scandalous diaries were found by Casement's friend Biggar after the execution and were destroyed at once. False. This lie was invented by René MacColl in his 1956 book. He gave as source a well-known anonymous citizen of Cork who allegedly was informed by Biggar's nephew shortly before the nephew's death in 1951. When the alleged source died in 1967, MacColl revealed his name.

18 – Casement instructed his lawyers to prepare his trial defence against homosexual charges. False. Source: this lie was invented by Dudgeon in his 2002 book and has been since amplified by several authors. No such charges were ever made or contemplated and Casement knew nothing about the diaries scandal until after the trial.

19 – Post-mortem examination by the prison doctor confirmed the homosexual allegation. False. The prison doctor wrote that he had performed an anal probe and found anal dilation, a normal condition in cadavers. This was taken to be confirmation of habitual sodomy. Although documented, it is uncertain that this probe was performed and there is no explanation of why it was required.

20 – In 1957 The Sunday Times published a poem by Casement which was interpreted as a confession of homosexuality. False. The poem was called The Nameless One and its authorship remains unknown. Publication of the poem coincided with publication of Alfred Noyes' book Justice for Casement. The poem typescript was sent to the newspaper by Frank McDermott, a retired Irish journalist living in Paris and published in an article by his friend, Unionist MP and former MI6 agent H. Montgomery Hyde – who

claimed he found the manuscript in The National Library of Ireland. A manuscript poem of that name in the Library is radically different in subject, style, construction, and date of composition. No-one knows who wrote the poem published in the newspaper.

21 – Casement intended to invade Ireland with the Irish Brigade. False. The source of this absurdity is Roland Philips, author of the totally dishonest biography Broken Archangel.

22 – 25 Author Roger Sawyer was a prominent forgery denier who published a cluster of four lies on a single page of his 1984 book, The Flawed Hero. On page 140 we find the first lie: a claim that editor Clement Shorter was shown 'the originals' by Thomson. No source is given and in 1922 Shorter published a pamphlet indicating that he did not see manuscript diaries. Sawyer's second lie asserts "[He] was prompted to declare that the handwriting bore not the faintest resemblance to Casement's". Again no source is cited and no other author mentions this claim. His third deceit asserts that the "original rolled manuscript" shown to journalist Ben Allen "was later found to have been twenty-two pages torn out of the 1903 diary". However this is patently false; the pages seen by Allen measured 216x356mm approximately, which makes them 5.7 times larger than the diary pages at 90x150mm; Sawyer's fourth deceit on this page alone asserts that Congo missionary John Harris was shown 'the diaries' and was convinced of their authenticity. This too is transparently false. HO 144/1636 confirms that Blackwell showed the typescripts to Harris on 19th July 1916. This does not exhaust Sawyer's lies.

26 – 29 Sawyer was surely inspired by Brian Inglis, the influential pioneer of diary propaganda and deception. On page 290 of his 1974 edition, Inglis published a group of interconnected lies which are the foundation of today's claims of authenticity. "But he [Findlay] transmitted Christensen's information to Whitehall, enclosing the material Christensen had handed over. It included a letter in which Casement described his servant. 'I am glad I brought him, indeed—he is a treasure'." In these few lines there are four lies. First, Christensen did not hand over any material. Second, Findlay did not take possession of any letter. Third, the letter mentioned had not yet been written. Fourth, the letter mentioned was written weeks later and does not state "he is a treasure"; Findlay's own account does not claim material was handed over and does not mention the al-

tered phrase. Both MacColl and Doerries cite the phrase correctly as "he has been a treasure". The relevant FO files do not contain any letter allegedly 'handed over' and enclosed. There are many other deceptions in Inglis' book.

30 – Popular historian Robert Kee reported a 1956 interview with Sergeant Sullivan during which Sullivan recounted a seventh version of the diaries provenance supposedly reported to him by the Director of Public Prosecutions in 1916. This alleges Christensen stole the diaries from Casement during the voyage to Norway in 1914 and later sold them to the British. There is no evidence whatsoever to support this absurdity which contradicts the other six conflicting versions of provenance.

31 – Professor Christopher Andrew is a recognised authority on the British Intelligence services. In a 2005 essay Professor Andrew wrote "One of the reports from Findlay... included the statement that Casement and Christensen had 'unnatural relations'... they began when he was a seaman aged only fifteen or sixteen... according to Christensen, Casement followed him into a lavatory in a Montevideo hotel where they had sex". This statement attributes to Findlay comments allegedly made to him by Christensen in 1914. This is false. Scrutiny of Findlay's extensive correspondence with Nicolson in Whitehall fails to produce any such statement far less any reference to Montevideo.

32 – 34 Paul Tilzey, producer of the 2002 BBC documentary Secrets of the Black Diaries, repeats on his BBC website many of the above lies. He describes the Giles investigation as "impartial scientific analysis" and the first "independent forensic examination" although it was neither impartial nor scientific, nor independent nor forensic. Giles, a former Scotland Yard document expert, confirmed her instruction was to authenticate the diaries without recourse to modern scientific testing. She was not instructed to produce a formal report of forensic standard for a court of law. Giles exposed her own bias by falsely alleging that Collins had held the diaries were authentic. Tilzey writes that Alfred Noyes saw the diaries when Noyes clearly stated he had seen only police typescripts. Tilzey continues "Irish Republican leader Michael Collins who inspected them in 1921 and was satisfied that they were genuine." No source is given for this lie; Collins saw two diaries on February 6, 1922. There is no evidence that he thought them genuine.

35 – Prolific propagandist and forgery denier Jeffrey Dudgeon made an attempt in

October 2024 to demonstrate the material existence of manuscript diaries in 1916. In the pages of Village magazine he alleged that both US Ambassador Page and Congo missionary Harris were shown manuscript diaries in 1916. This is false. Home Office file 144/23481 states that "After the dismissal of the appeal a typescript copy was shown, on the Home Secretary's instructions, to Mr. (later Sir John) Harris..." It does not state that Page saw manuscript diaries but confirms he received photographs of typescripts. In the following edition of Village this author exposed Dudgeon's chicanery and he fell silent. To date no-one has furnished evidence which demonstrates the existence of the diaries in 1916. There is no evidence.

36–38 In 2016 former Attorney General Michael McDowell lectured his legal colleagues on the authenticity of the diaries by presenting an incoherent series of non-sequiturs and hopelessly muddled speculations and assertions. '...the British Minister to Norway alerted the Foreign Office to evidence that Casement was an active homosexual in late 1914. He cited the statements of Adler Christensen and of certain other Norwegian sources confirming Casement's homosexual activity.' This is entirely false. There was no such evidence and Christensen made no such statements. Findlay did not cite 'other Norwegian sources' at any time. McDowell goes on 'He was, on Casement's account, promised £5000 by the British to have Casement "knocked on the head". This too is false. The account of this bribery is an official note on legation stationery in Findlay's hand promising Christensen £5,000 for information leading to Casement's arrest. The sum was authorised by Whitehall. Copy of Findlay's bribe note is held in NLI.

39–40 Inglis is probably the most subtle and pernicious of those who have lied about Casement. He did not hesitate to cite Casement texts which he had altered to deceive his readers. Casement's poem *Quo Vadis* of 1906 attracted Inglis because its second stanza lent itself to a minor manipulation which indicated a forbidden desire. The altered stanza appears on page 404 of his 1974 edition; the alteration concerns a single preposition. Robert Kee reproduced this lie in 1994. (See page 12 of *Decoding False History*.) Another lie appears on page 439 where Inglis writes "The other [diary] was a copy of his Putumayo diary which he made for the use of the Select Committee..." This is false. Casement did not make a copy of his Putumayo diary. Inglis claimed Casement withheld the original document and sent a cleaned-up

copy to the Committee. Casement's covering letter sent on 27th January, 1913 with the original diary contains this sentence: 'Naturally there is in it something I should not wish anyone to see—but then it is as it stands.' Inglis then altered the sentence and published 'Naturally there is in it [the original diary] something I should not wish anyone else to see.' Correspondence in Rhodes House with chairman Roberts is unambiguous.

41–42 Historian Michael Laffan contributed the Casement entry in the authoritative Dictionary of Irish Biography. In referring to the diaries he wrote 'Eventually in 2002 forensic examination confirmed their authenticity to general (although not universal) satisfaction.' This is false. There was no forensic examination in 2002 or at any other time. Giles was not asked to produce a forensic report to court standards. Secondly, the Giles report did not confirm authenticity of the diaries since its conclusion simply expresses an opinion, not a proven fact.

43 – Inglis' book presented a new version of Christensen's first visit to the British legation in 1914. This entirely false version was taken as fact by almost all Casement authors because it created the vital legend of betrayal. B.L. Reid in 1976 wrote: 'In his first account of these events, sent to Sir Edward Grey on 31 October 1914, Findlay wrote that Christensen had simply presented himself at the door of the British Legation at 79 Drammensvein in the late afternoon of the twenty-ninth'. However, Findlay's letter of the 31st does not contain this apparently paraphrased statement attributed to him

by Reid. Findlay's letter says 'The man called at the Legation about 11 a.m. and asked to see me alone. He went over much the same ground as he had covered with Mr Lindley on Thursday evening. There is no reference to Christensen's arrival on the early afternoon (not evening) of 29 October. Reid lied to his readers by falsely attributing his own false account to Findlay. Obviously Findlay's letter refers to his first meeting with Christensen on the morning of 30 October.

44 – 50 The account published by Ó Síocháin in 2008 is even more duplicitous in his desire to reinforce the original Inglis invention of betrayal. Ó Síocháin gets all basic facts wrong and by omission he lies at least seven times. There was no 'British legation account' and no evidence that Christensen was asked to return next day and no 'information on Casement's homosexuality' in Lindley's memo. Indeed Ó Síocháin avoids reference to the memo and his chicanery is easily exposed by the following seven undisputed facts: 1- Christensen did not betray Casement when the Oscar 11 was boarded, 2 – he did not blackmail Casement who had a large sum of money, 3 - he informed Casement of all his legation visits, 4 - he gave Casement the 'earnest money' from Findlay, 5 - he persisted for two months with Findlay to obtain the written bribe, 6 - he did not betray Casement when he obtained the bribe, 7 - he at once surrendered the written bribe to Meyer in Berlin. None of these crucial facts is reported by Ó Síocháin. Finally, FO letters to Findlay in 1915 clearly state that no betrayal took place.

Paul R. Hyde

Access Irish Political Review online!

<https://irishpoliticalreview.com>

**The new site is a 'work in progress'
and will carry back issues
and other features!**

**Due to pressure of space, we have been
forced to hold over**

***The First Fifty Years Of The
Aubane Community Centre***

**for the March issue of *Irish Political Review*
However, it can be found online at the
address above**

Casement And Emotion

(Some Thoughts On Broken Archangel by Roland Philipps)

Reading the latest biography of Roger Casement by Roland Philipps, a few things struck me that may be of some interest. I don't think Philipps's work is particularly original. It seems to be largely an elaborate development of ideas thrown out sketchily by Jeffrey Dudgeon in his large edition of *The Black Diaries*.

Philipps takes the 'Black Diaries' as given and uses them very frequently, even when not pursuing the sex theme. However, he tries to create a more comprehensive picture of Casement than Dudgeon attempted. What he contributes is psychological speculation, written in a style that *The Tablet* reviewer calls "calm, authoritative and sympathetic".

Philipps's argument may be summarised as follows. If Casement's mother had been a better mother and if his father had been a better father, and if that better father and mother had not both died when Roger was a child, and if he had gone through Oxford or Cambridge instead of leaving school at fifteen, and if he had married someone and had had children and lived a conventional family life, then he would have been a better-balanced human being and British public servant, and he wouldn't have ended up the way he did!

Or, to quote the biographer's words: Casement was—

"a complex man, forced to live a double life by the contemporary legal and moral constraints, whose silencing of his own voice allowed the voiceless to be heard. He had carried himself from an unanchored childhood to barely charted West Africa and the first of his three destinies, yet the same impulses that generated global renown as the first great humanitarian reformer of the century also sowed the seeds of strategic chaos and eventually brought him to Pentonville."

This is cited from the Prologue (page xviii) in which the reader is primed. The unanchored childhood afterwards becomes "emotionally disjointed" (p3), a "bewildering childhood that left him emotionally hollow" (p84) or, alternatively, left him with an "emotional hole" (p132).

Then, remarkably enough, great hot masses of raw emotion afterwards poured out through this hole! However, unfortunately, the emotion so emitted was "*untutored*" (p160) and was focussed on causes rather than personal relationships.

While this was OK in the beginning (ie, while Casement was still in good standing as a British public servant!), in a longer perspective one must see it as "*Casement's increasingly uncentred, emotional passage through life*" (p75).

From the turn of the twentieth century, "many of his actions... were fuelled by pure emotion without profound thought" (p82).

At this stage, Phillips still tries to maintain some measure of restraint in his use of language. But all restraint has disappeared by the end of the book. Winding up, he approvingly cites Joseph Conrad's notion of Casement a—

"a creature of sheer temperament—a truly tragic personality', who had made his way through life by 'emotional force... sheer emotionalism that has undone him'" (p324).

The biographer's method can be seen fairly clearly in his treatment of Casement's mother, who died when Roger was eight. Roger invariably spoke highly of her, according to his aunt's testimony. Phillips, however, finds that her death certificate gave cirrhosis of the liver as the cause of death, which to him suggests alcoholism. It might indeed suggest alcoholism if there was any supporting evidence—since alcoholism is only one of the major causes of cirrhosis of the liver! Philipps provides no supporting evidence for his remark.

Roger's mother died apart from her family in a boarding house, but that is evidence of nothing: we do not know the circumstances. But Philipps' ignorance provides no obstacle to the biographer's flight of fancy:

"She died apart from her family shortly before her fortieth birthday in a boarding house in Worthing, and her alcoholic ab-

sences, both emotional and actual, would be a critical factor in her son's make-up: his inability to regulate and override his emotional responses as a result of the lack of guidance in early years was one of his campaigning strengths, but also a significant catalyst in the tragedy of his last years" (p82).

The book is full of such 'bargain-base-ment' psychology! Roger's father died five years later, when Roger was thirteen. He was not said to have cirrhosis, but that doesn't stop Philipps from suggesting, as usual with no evidence, that the father also was over-fond of the bottle!

It does seem that Casement senior found it hard to adapt to humdrum civilian existence, having previously been a soldier and enjoyed the military life. (Roger liked to relate his father's favourite story, of how he had once played a crucial part, as a messenger, in the rescue of a Hungarian rebel force led by Kossuth when they were trapped; the biographer is forced to concede, in the most grudging language conceivable, that the truth of the story is well substantiated (p80)).

The family, bereaved of their mother, were desperately poor at times. Roger, aged eleven, and his elder brother were caught shoplifting books, which they intended to resell, and were brought to court. The judge made their father sign acknowledgement of liability for any recurrence, and let the boys go. There was no recurrence.

Another biographer would have emphasised precisely this, that the incident did not establish a pattern. Philipps, of course, says nothing of the kind. Though he mentions the incident briefly, by his placing in context he milks it for all it is worth, as supposed evidence of Roger's disordered childhood.

From what evidence there is, the truth seems to be that Casement had excellent relations with his brothers and sister and other close relatives, and warm memories of both his deceased parents. In adult life he proved capable of forming long-lasting friendships and retaining the loyalty of many of those friends under very difficult circumstances. And the notion that he was emotionally undeveloped, undisciplined, and uncontrolled, is incompatible with the facts of his career. There could never have been any such career if he were like that!

How could an emotionally uncontrolled man—familiar with what was going on in

the Congo—have met the King of the Belgians two days running, kept his temper, and spoken effectively so as to make the monarch as uncomfortable as that creature was capable of being?

The Unashamed 'Black Diaries' !

Roland Philipps, anyhow, has no evidence for the case he is trying to make. This means he is forced to make considerable use of the Black Diaries, where Casement allegedly recorded, in the same laconic way he recorded other things, his promiscuous homosexual experience. Quite like some other diarist might write about shopping ('Marks and Spenser's, green sweater. Pricey, cashmere, really nice. Best since the one I got in London'), the Black Diarist writes, allegedly in Rio de Janeiro, about his pick-up: "Lovely. Young—18 & Glorious. Biggest since Lisbon July 1904."

One must agree with Jeffrey Dudgeon about this much: the writer of the Black Diaries is 'guilt-free'. This is something Roland Philipps has failed to appreciate:

"None of Casement's annotations of his sexual encounters in port cities carry any personal freight, as shame overwhelmed the possibility of any analysis of emotion, and there seems no practical reason for listing them as he does" (p52).

Shame! What shame? The author of the Black Diaries is entirely shameless! This 'Casement' has so little shame that he can put one of his casual sex encounters right next to a meeting with his sister, for example! The shamelessness of the Black Diarist is extraordinary, in fact, in his place and time. If any emotional quality attached to any of his encounters, this Diarist would not be dissuaded by shame from analysis or description. But he never gets beyond the skin, the hair and the genitals, which is rather remarkable.

On the other hand, Philipps is surely right in thinking that there was no evident practical reason for the Diarist to list his encounters like this. And, even if he personally thought that casual sex with an unknown young man was quite as natural as meeting his sister, he must have been well aware that society and the law thought differently. If he wished to record these highly illegal acts, which could destroy his life if publicised, would it not have been wise to commit them exclusively to a special diary, guarded with special security (and not casually left in a trunk in an apartment in London, where we are told the 'Black Diary' of 1903 was found)?

We are invited to believe that Casement, as the Black Diarist, wanted a personal written record of practices that were illegal and punishable by law and regarded as morally reprehended by mainstream society, though to him they were as natural as the experience of shopping.

But, although in other respects an argumentative person, he never seemed to feel any need to affirm this naturalness in argument, even privately in his remarkable diary; in fact, on the one occasion where he expressed a view on homosexual practice, he called it "*a terrible disease*" (Dudgeon, *The Black Diaries*, p124).

Be that as it may, to enhance the feeling of naturalness, he set down many details of his unproblematic overground life alongside the underground entries, all in a similar style. And, because it never occurred to him that this way of doing things was dangerous, that a double-life diary was not a good idea, that being too casual about his diary might cause his ruin, he kept several such double-life diaries in the space of nearly a decade, if not longer! And, even then, he left double-life diaries lying about . . . !

The '*Berlin Diary*' of 1914-16, on the other hand, is strictly single-life. Had the addict conquered his addiction, at least to recording his double life? There are no sex entries, even though at that time, according to Philipps, Casement was having his one truly romantic homosexual experience, with his manservant Adler Christiansen. (Again there is no evidence, just a conclusion one half-crazy British diplomat jumped to!)

Intellect And Poetry

Undeniably, the Casement that emerges from the pages of Roland Philipps's book is complex. So complex that he simply can't hold together, he makes no sense at all. Having hollowed out Casement emotionally, Philipps proceeds to hollow him out intellectually and poetically. Casement was—

"inadequately educated" (p3).

"He was entirely without the intellectual underpinning, cynicism and instinct to compromise to be able to strategise through the rough seas of wartime" (p326).

"He had no conditioning in how to process his feelings, nor in how to look at them with the paradoxical detachment that a true poet requires" (p82).

On the first point, one must note that

Philipps steers well clear of Casement's essay on *The Keeper Of The Seas*, which is wise of him. But I leave this to a later time.

On the poetry—well, I would not claim that Casement belongs in the first rank of poets. But I think he's well in the top half of the very numerous field, and he has his particular successes. I'd like to include one of them here, which should be sufficient comment on Roland Philipps's pretentious dismissal.

New Year's Greeting is a poem about friendship. It is warm, but not excessively. It conveys emotion with due poetic discipline and control. Maybe it isn't perfect, but the critics have done well if they have produced something better!

John Minahane

New Year's Greeting

by
Roger Casement

Some wish their friends gay Christmas cheer

And others wish a happy year

But all in cold and printed phrase.

Then what shall I wish thee today?

For those are things that all can say

And rarely soft emotion raise.

I want to let you know that one

However swift the years may run

However friendships may decay

Will think of thee with kindly thought

With heart with loving wishes fraught

On every coming New Year's Day.

And not at this glad time alone—

But when the Autumn leaves are blown

In rustling showers on the Earth,

And when the yellow primrose peeps

From mossy cell when April weeps

Yet weeps but in her joy and mirth,

And when the Summer's golden blaze
Grants night small room between the days

And robes the Earth with waving green,

Then still my thoughts will backward flee

And memory winging swift to thee

Forget all else that lies between.

Series 9

The Brian Murphy osb Archive

The Evolution of British Policy and the Emergence of a Sinn Fein Publicity Department in the years after the Easter Rising, 1916-1918.

Mss notes, Part 24

Irish Bulletin On Creeds And Crown Juries

While focussing on the election results and crime statistics, the *Irish Bulletin* continued to give prominence to accounts of Catholic and Protestant co-operation. An opportunity was provided by the visit of a Protestant delegation to America and the response to it by the Church of Ireland journal, the *Gaelic Churchman*. On 3rd February the *Irish Bulletin* carried an extract from it which was critical of the Ulster Protestant delegation to America and its claim that a republican government would threaten their religious liberties:

"We have often challenged, and we challenge again, anyone to produce an instance of a member of our Church interfered with in modern times solely on account of his religion in the predominantly Roman Catholic parts of Ireland where no questions of politics and proselytising were involved. We honestly believe that these Ulster qualms are the outcome of a guilty conscience, and the champions of "civil and religious liberty" mean by that blessed phrase that they are on top and intend to remain so" (IB, 3 Feb.'20) ?? check Rev. Irwin in States).

Voices such as this, emanating from a religious source—in favour, not only of religious toleration, but also of Dail Eireann—were especially welcomed. For example, on 27th January, the *Bulletin* gave prominence to a letter that Archbishop Harty of Cashel had sent to de Valera in America with a £50 contribution to the Dail Loan. The Archbishop wrote—

"Here at home the British Government has continued to trample on the principles of democracy. Ireland is in a state of political and industrial bondage" (IB, 27 Jan.'20).

The Archbishop recorded a list of actions to illustrate his claim, citing a muzzled Press, arrested Dail Deputies, banned Irish Societies, homes raided, and the presence of "an army of occupation". He concluded:

"These are some activities of the British Government, which has loudly proclaimed its respect for the liberties of small nations" (Ibid).

A similar appeal by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy on 27th January was also given prominence under the heading, *Irish Bishops Condemn Military Rule, Demand For National Self-Determination* (IB, 28 Jan.'20):

"We would represent to the advocates of military rule in Ireland that Government by force, which was never right, is to-day wholly obsolete and cannot hope to prevail for long against the democratic spirit now animating the world... "we have, therefore, to declare that the one true way to terminate our historic troubles and establish friendly relations between England and Ireland to the advantage of both countries is to allow an undivided Ireland to choose her own form of Government" (Ibid.)

In the context of British plans to formulate a new Home Rule Bill, the Bishops' statement, and the publicity given to it by the *Bulletin*, presented a clear alternative policy.

Another permanent feature of the *Irish Bulletin* was use of both the evidence and the verdicts of coroners' juries to illustrate the excesses of the RIC. These juries, as the *Bulletin* was careful to point out, had been appointed by the police. Following the death by drowning of a young boy, Michael Darcy, of County Clare on 19th January, the *Bulletin* publicised the accounts of witnesses. One witness declared that—

"when they ran to the river to rescue the boy who was struggling in the water, the police who were on the opposite bank ordered them away and fired at them with rifles and revolvers when they refused" (IB, 28 Jan. 1920).

Another witness maintained that she tried to help the drowning boy, but the police sergeant "presented his rifle at her and ordered her back". The verdict of the jury was then recorded. It unanimously—"condemned the heartless action of the police in not allowing

deceased to be rescued from the river" (IB, 28 Jan. 1920; See O'Hegarty to FitzGerald, 14 Feb.'20, DE 2/10, NAI for the suggestion that Richard Mulcahy, Chief of Staff of the IRA, had more details on the death).

The same approach was used in reporting the deaths of Miss Lena Johnston and Richard O'Dwyer, in Limerick on 2nd February 1920. The *Bulletin* carried the story under the headline, *English Military Kill Two Limerick Citizens*, on 5th February, and gave the jury verdict on 9th February under the heading, *Another Verdict Of Murder Against The English Military* (Irish Bulletin, 5 and 9 Feb. 1920). The verdict of the jury on O'Dwyer's death reported that:

"the evidence shows that the military having fatally shot two unoffending citizens and wounded two other people, marched off singing "Rule Britanni"..." (IB, 9 Feb.'20).

In the case of Lena Johnston the verdict stated that the—

"death was caused by a rifle bullet fired by the police without orders from their superiors. We strongly condemn their action as there was no provocation. It is what the Jury considers murder..." (IB, 16 Feb.'20; FJ of 14 Feb; and article, *Baiting the Irish People*.)

Sympathy for the victims and hostility towards the RIC was generated by the *Irish Bulletin*'s use of accounts such as these.

Occasionally a cutting type of humour was added to the more sombre accounts of the *Irish Bulletin* as, for example, when Lloyd George spoke in the House of Commons on 10th February of murders and assassinations in Ireland, and asked rhetorically "are we to withdraw our troops and leave the assassins in charge?" The *Bulletin* replied in a banner headline, *The Assassins Are In Charge In Ireland*, adding that the Dublin Castle administration connived at their activities.

A detailed list of the critical verdicts of coroners' juries against the Crown Forces, going back to 1916, was then provided (IB, 13 Feb. 1920). Although the *Bulletin* was, by this stage, covering particular occurrences in some detail, the Dail Ministry suggested on 13th February that "striking instances should from time to time be fully investigated and written up", as they "would more readily command attention" (O'Hegarty to FitzGerald, 13 Feb. 1920, ?? source and date cf. above 19 May 1920, Ibid).

Desmond FitzGerald, who was in London when the instruction from the Dail Ministry arrived, defended the policy of the *Bulletin* on his return to Ireland. While in London he

had continued to build on the contacts with journalists that had been well established in the past year. He met many French journalists as well as others from America, Italy, Holland, Scandinavia, Greece and Australia. FitzGerald wrote positively about all of his contacts, except of that with Steele of the Chicago Tribune, whom he described as "fundamentally anti-Irish" (DF to DO'H, 21st Feb. '20, *ibid.*??; McKenna 505,506)

On 11th February FitzGerald, in the company of Arthur Griffith and Eoin MacNeill, met Art O'Brien to discuss plans for a pro-Irish meeting in the Albert Hall (O'Brien to O'Hegarty, 12th July 1920, NAI DE 2/11, *Documents On Irish Foreign Policy*, vol. 1., p81 and see more).

In America itself the publicity campaign was running into trouble as a result of de Valera's 'Cuban' speech on 6th February.

Harry Boland's initial reaction had been to describe de Valera's interview with the Westminster Gazette as "good stuff", but de Valera's comparison of Ireland's relationship with England to that of America's relationship with Cuba, and his apparent acceptance of it, appeared to qualify Ireland's complete claim to recognition as an independent Republic (*Boland Diary*, 5 Feb. 1920, 2172/1, de Valera Papers, UCDA).

Even among de Valera's own supporters, both in Ireland and America, questions were raised about the interview, and John Devoy used his paper, the *Gaelic American*, to make a scathing attack on de Valera's integrity and ability. De Valera responded privately by informing Judge Cohalan that "I alone am responsible" to the Irish people. He went on to ask Cohalan to intervene with Devoy over the contents of the *Gaelic American* (De Valera to Cohalan, 20 Feb. 1920, DE 2/245, NAI).

Cohalan, however, stood by the policy of the *Gaelic American* and of Devoy. The latter, moreover, was convinced that de Valera's interview was intended to launch a "new departure", a new party to supplant the Friends of Irish Freedom, and that his action was "a serious danger to the National Cause".

He was also annoyed that de Valera was using the funds of the *Friends of Irish Freedom* to pay for his own staff, the Bond Scheme, the Bureau, and the expenses at the Hotel Waldorf Astoria ('Hudson': *Devoy to Schell*; McGarrity, 20 Feb. 1920 *McGarrity Papers*, 17486 (4), NLI).

Despite these acute difficulties, Harry Boland concluded, somewhat surprisingly, that the month of February had been "the most fruitful since our arrival" (*Boland Diary*, 29 Feb. 1920, 2172/1, de Valera

Papers, UCDA). He based this conclusion on the fact that the Bond Drive, thanks to the efficiency of James O'Mara and Sean Nunan, was running efficiently, and that an anti-British spirit was increasing among American public representatives.

However, Boland's high spirits were immediately dampened on 1st March 1920, when James O'Mara offered his resignation—a resignation which de Valera immediately tried to reverse (James O'Mara to de Valera, 1 March 1920, *de Valera Papers*, 1728, UCDA; de Valera to O'Mara, 4 March 1920, in Lavelle, *James O'Mara*, pp155-6).

By 5th March Boland was confiding to Michael Collins that, although the *Gaelic American* had modified its attacks on de Valera, "it must be admitted that the criticism has affected the Bond Drive" (Boland to Collins, 5th March 1920, DE 2/245, NAI).

At a time when the unity of Irish-American efforts was paramount, divisions in the ranks were weakening both Ireland's claim for International Recognition and the success of the Bond Drive. Liam Mellows gave some insight into the problem, from the perspective of a de Valera supporter, when he wrote on 9th March 1920 that "I was horrified beyond measure at the editorials of John Devoy..."

As to the Bond Drive, Mellows commented that, "it is very slow indeed"; and, referring to Devoy and his supporters, he added that "the New York gang have done nothing to help the Drive, but everything to hinder it" (Mellows to John Hearn, 9th March 1920, *Hearn Papers*, 15986, NLI).

These divisions kept simmering away until they reached a dramatic conclusion on 19th March 1920. In the meantime, all of those engaged in publicity work in Ireland were extremely busy.

Irish Bulletin And Sir John Taylor

Brennan and Gallagher met Childers on 14th February to discuss publicity matters and, on 21st February, FitzGerald was in touch with Childers about developments in England. The close relationship between advancing Ireland's cause in both Ireland and England, and, from that base, to a wider world was maintained.

During the month of February Childers was occupied with the National Land Bank and with the personal situation of his cousin, Robert Barton, whose trial by court martial began on 12th February. He communicated his concerns about his cousin to Wedgwood-Ben, who raised them in the House of Commons (*Childers Diary*, Feb. 1920, 7811, Trinity MS).

The sentencing of Barton to three years' penal servitude, and his deportation to Portland Prison in England on 22-23 February,

prompted Childers to leave Ireland immediately to visit his cousin.

While Childers was in England, Brennan and Gallagher launched a personal attack on Sir John Taylor in the *Irish Bulletin* of 24th February 1920. The character of the article marked something of a new initiative for the *Bulletin* and may have been prompted by the earlier *Memorandum* from the Dail Ministry.

The article may have been provoked by the knowledge that Taylor was responsible for the inner workings of Dublin Castle and, therefore, linked in some way with the recent arrest of some eighty republicans and many newly elected councillors on 2nd February, the deportation of some sixty republicans on 9th February to Wormwood Scrubs in London, and the imposition of a Curfew Order on Dublin on 20th February by Major General Boyd, acting as the Competent Military Authority.

All of these events had been chronicled in the *Irish Bulletin* as examples of the punitive character of Dublin Castle rule.

The article in the *Bulletin*, under the caption, *Facts Concerning The Real Ruler Of Ireland*, attributed the repressive policy in Ireland to Taylor. The title was prompted by an observation in the *Sunday Chronicle* of 22nd February that "the real ruler of Ireland is Sir John Taylor". He was identified by the *Irish Bulletin* as—

"the inspiring figure of the coercion regime and the person chiefly engaged in concocting another plot against Irish leaders" (*Irish Bulletin*, 24 Feb. 1920).

The details of Taylor's personal background and career record were then recorded: his association with Balfour in the 1880s; his association with Walter Long in 1905-1906; and his re-emergence under Long in 1918, to whom it was claimed that Taylor owed his knighthood. It was also alleged that he had co-operated with *The Times* of London on two occasions: firstly, to prove that Pigott's letters incriminating Parnell were genuine; and, secondly, by contributing to articles on "Parnellism and Crime", he had helped to prepare the way for the *Perpetual Coercion Act* of 1887 (the *Jubilee Act*). The very Act, it was pointed out, that Taylor, in co-operation with Bell, was putting into renewed effect at the present moment.

nb: reminder of Balfour and Long's enduring role in saga

Reflecting on these past actions of Taylor, the *Irish Bulletin* then maintained that he—

"has devised for Dublin Castle an im-

proved method of propaganda against the Irish Nation and its leaders. In the Balfourian days the propaganda was carried out mainly by the "Loyal and Patriotic Union" of which Houston, Pigott's paymaster, was Secretary ... Taylor invented the new method of giving publicity to plots without running the risk the "Times" incurred. The method is to issue political manifestos against the Castle opponents in the form of Government statements or returns. For this the Castle can always claim privilege as a bar to any action such as Parnell took against the "Times". In a word, the English Government under Taylor's device, can slander its political antagonists with impunity in the public press at home and abroad" (*Irish Bulletin*, 24th Feb. 1920)

The *Irish Bulletin* continued:

"An instance of the manner in which Taylor works is afforded by the publication of a list of "Crimes attributed to Sinn Fein". He takes all the offences reported and declares Sinn Fein committed them. The preparation of such a list has been a special study of this man. They are based upon a system of expansion and contraction, varying according to the pressure of the political barometer whenever it suits the officials of the English Government; for instance, preparatory to Coercive measures a list of crimes reaching to large dimensions is forthcoming. This is effected under Taylor's system by classifying under several distinct headings what is in reality one offence."

The *Irish Bulletin* then spelt out the precise manner in which Taylor manipulated the recording of one particular offence:

"For example, take a raid on a dwelling house and the effecting of an entrance by an armed party, an attack on some of the inmates inside either to gratify private revenge or for some other obscure motive. Under Taylor's directions, this is classified under the following headings: 1. Assault on a dwelling house; 2. Burglary; 3. Firing at a person; 4. Assault endangering the life of A.B; 5. Assault endangering the life of C.B; 5. Intimidation; 6. Malicious injury to property; and so forth." (*Irish Bulletin*, 24 Feb. 1920)

If, however, Dublin Castle wished to convey the impression that Coercion was working, then only one offence would be recorded.

This view of Balfour's legislation relating to the collection of figures for evictions, crimes and outrages, and of its use for propaganda purposes, has been substantiated by the recent findings of Margaret O'Callaghan, who concluded that:

"the system itself became a weapon of propaganda... Crime figures... had always been thrown back and forth indiscriminately

during coercion debates and had provided party political ammunition, but the form and content of reports under Balfour substantially altered" (Margaret O'Callaghan, *Parnellism and Crime: Constructing a Conservative Strategy of Containment 1887-1891*, p113 in Donal McCartney (ed.): *Parnell the Politics of Power* (Dublin, 1991; F.S.L. Lyons, *Parnell* (Irish History Series 3, Dundalk, 1974 pp23-4).

Moreover, O'Callaghan reported that Dublin Castle's minute and detailed knowledge of agrarian affairs was only possible owing to the regular reports of the RIC. It was the contention of the *Irish Bulletin* that Sir John Taylor was, and had been, using the same RIC to make similar reports about political suspects. The *Bulletin* asserted that:

"Threatening Letters were a particularly malleable statistic", as they could easily be fabricated by, what it termed, were Agents Provocateurs. These paid agents, the *Bulletin* declared, had played an extremely important part in the police career of Alan Bell of which they gave an extensive account. The *Bulletin* also noted that, in a recent letter to the *Freeman's Journal*, a man had narrated how he had been approached by Superintendent Brien "to swear that he had heard a Sinn Fein member of Parliament giving instructions to men to shoot policemen" (*Irish Bulletin*, 24th Feb. 1920).

While these revelations about Taylor and

Bell were being distributed to a wide range of foreign correspondents, Childers was active on his brief visit to England.

On 24th February Childers interviewed the Governor of Portland Prison and talked with [Brian] Barton. While convinced that "nothing will break his spirit", he was angry at the manner of his cousin's sentence, and was also concerned at the prison conditions.

In London, Childers made contact with Wedgewood Benn and Lord Buckmaster at the Whips' Office of the House of Commons, showing that, despite his public pro-Irish stance, he still enjoyed an entree to the inner corridors of power.

He also saw Sir Horace Plunkett, discussing with him de Valera's mission to America: Plunkett had just returned from America, and Lord Monteagle*, thus illustrating the broad range of contacts that he used to further the Irish cause. Childers returned to Ireland on the morning of 26th February (Childers' *Diary*, 23 - 25 Feb. 1920, 7811, Trinity MS) ?? cf. Bureau ??

(To be continued)

* Lord Monteagle put forward a Bill, giving Ireland a considerable measure of Home Rule, but retaining Foreign Affairs and Defence for British rule. His Bill was defeated on 1st July 1920. (Ed.)

Some Thoughts On Events In Venezuela

"You can check in any time you want but you may never leave."

(The Eagles, Hotel California)

That might be said of the Petrodollar system that sustains US power and influence in the world and largely explains the gunboat diplomacy employed by Washington against Venezuela.

In his press conference explaining why the US launched a special military operation against Venezuela and kidnapped a neighbouring head of state President Trump called a spade a spade:

"We're in the oil business. We'll be selling large amounts of oil to other countries."

The shale revolution disguised the fact that the US does not possess an abundance of oil—or rather the type of oil it needs.

The shale gas the US has pumped out in recent decades is light crude that does not feed the US refineries. The old US refineries were built 50 years ago and designed to process heavy crude oil. That is why the

US, with its abundance of oil, still continues to import large quantities of it.

It would also be very expensive to transport the shale oil to California and the east coast: its market. Enormous pipelines would be required. It is much cheaper to ship foreign oil to US ports.

The price of oil is very important to the US consumer. It has a major impact on the cost of living, influencing the results of the plentiful elections the US system has.

Heavy crude is produced by Russia, Canada, Saudi and Venezuela. The US has traditionally imported Saudi Arabian heavy oil for its refineries. But Riyadh is not now the US dependency it once was! In the mid-1980s its arm was twisted to collapse the price of oil and thus help destroy the Soviet economy by depriving it of the income and foreign currency resulting from oil exports.

Saudi Arabia saw the effect of Western sanctions against Russia in 2022 and began making alternative arrangements. Its future is towards BRICs.

It was the Reagan/Casey strategy of the mid-1980s, aimed at collapsing the global oil price in order to undermine the USSR economy, that destabilised Venezuela. Up to that point it was pumping 3 million barrels of oil a day and the Petrodollars were flowing into the US-aligned Caracas.

When the oil markets crashed, the illusion of prosperity disappeared and this prompted the Chavez coup of 1992. In 1998 he won the Presidency in a landslide vote: on a programme of clearing out the old elite which had ruthlessly cut social spending to preserve its own wealth.

The US/Venezuela alliance ended, and Caracas reorientated on Bolivarian lines.

Sanctions were imposed by George W. Bush on Venezuela.

The US has bided its time because it required the Venezuelan heavy crude, especially when it was embarking upon its destabilising adventures in the Middle East. But things have changed.

Now, the US Strategic Petroleum Reserve is at its lowest level. To stop inflation President Biden drained the US energy Reserve. This Reserve of oil was meant for emergencies such as war. But Biden flooded the market to keep prices low in order to win the 2024 election against Donald Trump. And he also released large quantities to shore up Europe: in order to break its relationship with Russia, as part of Washington's War in Ukraine.

The US Strategic Petroleum Reserve had reached critically low levels just when oil prices were beginning to rise. The instability in the Middle East, brought about by the ongoing Israeli threat to Iran, was also a factor to consider.

The US Strategic Petroleum Reserve could not be replenished on the open market without economic damage to the US economy, so the only alternative was to seize control of Venezuela's oil.

It should be understood that the US dollar is no longer backed by gold or by industrial productivity. It is backed by an agreement with the House of Saud made 50 years ago. That agreement dictates that oil must be sold using dollars. This creates a universal need for dollars because everybody needs oil.

This system created the ability for the US to print dollars out of thin air. Ordinarily this would produce inflation, but it does not have the same implication it would if others did it, due to the need for dollars around the world in purchasing energy.

New dollars can always be sold as long as the world needs them for oil. Over half the print run can go abroad, bought by foreigners, making the increased supply only marginally inflationary for US consumers, since it is absorbed outside the domestic economy.

If another state acted in this way, the result would be massive inflation—but the US can print as it sees fit and it has been printing and spending, despite all promises to curtail producing an ever-growing deficit.

It is the Petrodollar system that is the main source of US power and prosperity these days.

But the new coherence presented by the BRICs alliance threatens the success of this. After all, Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Ethiopia, United Arab Emirates, and Indonesia together represent about 49% of the world population, 36% of its territory, 39% of GDP, and 23% of international trade.

There were reports that Venezuela, to escape its predicament, was preparing to price its oil in a basket of currencies led by the Chinese Yuan. The Petrodollar system was, therefore, under threat.

Venezuela was under long-standing Washington sanctions, and—with no way out of a predicament that has produced great poverty and depopulation in the country—was threatening to decouple from the dollar.

If this happened the US Treasury Bond Market would begin to collapse.

If Venezuela was successful, the Petrodollar was dead. If the dollar was dead Trump and MAGA were done.

Trump had inherited a situation in which US Sanctions on Venezuela were not achieving anything. Venezuelan oil in the ground is useless to the United States.

The US policy has, therefore, moved from containment of Venezuela to direct control of the country and its oil.

The US will now hope for a compliant Venezuelan government which will assist the re-integration of Venezuelan oil into the

US dollar system, along with a rebuilding of the oil industry by US companies, tying it to the needs and putting it under control of the United States.

At the time of writing, Trump and Rubio are content to work with the present Caracas "regime" with a US gun at its head—rather than to import the Nobel-prize winning Quisling Opposition figurehead, María Corina Machado.

The maintenance of the present relationship, of course, will be conditional on good behaviour on the part of the Venezuelans.

Intelligence had informed President Trump that President Maduro had prepared for a US invasion on the Iraq-rearguard model: he had deployed heavily armed forces in the barrios. Venezuela is awash with weapons and there are revolutionary groups on its borders. The country has the potential to be a quagmire for the US and Trump if he intervenes in a more substantial way.

Venezuela has the potential to be a quagmire for the US and Trump if he intervenes in a more substantial way. There is the spirit of Simon Bolivar, waiting in the long grass. Maybe one day they will talk of "America's Ukraine"—along with Vietnam etc!

On a historical note, people forget the Venezuela crisis of 1902, when the US threatened Britain and Germany with war if they attempted intervention on the American continent in breach of the Monroe Doctrine—a long-standing policy which marked out the continent as a sole US sphere of influence.

At the time, the British and the Germans were mounting a naval blockade against Venezuela to recover banking debts. But they backed down for the first time in the face of US power and President Theodore Roosevelt's ultimatum. The British and the Germans were forced to agree to having the dispute referred to international arbitration and settled to US satisfaction.

The effect of the confrontation was that European Imperialists were successfully warned off and the Monroe Doctrine became a reality.

The incident was an early indication that Britain, the global hegemon of the time, was prepared to give way to its Anglo-Saxon cousin, rather than risk a disastrous war with the growing young upstart. Instead, the British Empire was to make war on Germany, twice, and gave way to the US in due course.

Northern Standard continued

despite the fact that vital evidence was invalidated by several witnesses greatly respected for their integrity. During the period of Hughes' appeal, it was assumed he would be merely confined to prison. Instead, he was hung.

"In the *Belfast Vindicator*, Gavan Duffy assailed the judges for this legal assassination; in turn, the Attorney-General

prosecuted the paper. The case was tried at the Four Courts, Dublin, and, to answer his case, Gavan Duffy came to Dublin.

"One day in that Summer of 1842 he was walking through the Phoenix Park with Thomas Davis and John Dillon when the three men had a sudden notion to bring out a new national paper—*The Nation*!"

(see *The Newspaper Book, A History of Newspapers in Ireland, 1649-1983*, by Hugh Oram: MO Books, Dublin, 1983).

The Nation: Selections 1842-1844.
Vol. 1: Young Ireland, Daniel O'Connell, Monster Meetings, State Trials, A New Culture. *Introduction by B. Clifford.* 152 pp. Index ISBN 1 903497 02 7 AHS, 2000 €25, £20.

Thomas Davis by Charles Gavan Duffy. Reprint of classic biography of 1890; With extract from Duffy's autobiography. Introduction by B. Clifford. 268 pp, Index. ISBN 1 903497 01 9. AHS, 2000. €25, £20.
www.atholbooks.org

ORGANISED LABOUR

ALMOST 100,000 households will pay more Tax this year following the Government's decision in Budget 2026 not to increase tax credits or bands.

According to calculations by Revenue, 23,000 taxpayer units—individuals or couples—who did not have a tax liability last year will have one in 2026.

An additional 76,400 taxpayer units will be pushed into the higher 40% rate of income tax. This means that, even if workers receive a pay rise, a large portion of it will be taxed at the higher rate, or they will start paying the higher rate for the first time.

CAREDOC workers accept pay proposal ending threat of further industrial action.

SIPTU members employed by Caredoc have voted to accept a pay proposal in a ballot count which brings to an end a pay dispute involving support staff employed by the out-of-hours GP service (SIPTU, 12.1.2026).

HOME SUPPORT workers vote for strike action. SIPTU members working as Health Care Assistants (HCAs) in the HSE [Health Service Executive] Home Support Services have voted overwhelmingly for strike action in Donegal, Clare, Cork, Kerry and Limerick. (SIPTU, 12.1.2026)

BUS ÉIREANN—SIPTU members in Bus Éireann vote to accept above inflation pay increases . . . SIPTU members have voted by 62% to 38% to accept a Labour Court recommendation.

WHICH countries have the Most Sustainable Pension Systems?

Iceland, Denmark, and the Netherlands have the most financially sustainable pension systems, due to well-balanced contribution rates and participation.

PENSIONS and EARLY RETIREMENTS

Based on recent RTÉ News reporting from 2025 and early 2026, the Irish Government has introduced legislation allowing employees to remain in their jobs until age 66, but it does not create a total "no limit" scenario on retirement for all.

Here are the key details regarding the new legislation and retirement age in Ireland:

- **New Right to Work Until 66:** The Employment (Contractual Retirement Ages) Act 2025 allows, but does not compel, employees to remain in their jobs until age 66, even if their contract states an earlier age (e.g., 65).

- **Targeting "Forced Retirement":** This legislation was introduced to stop employers from forcing workers to retire at 65 when they are not yet eligible for the State Pension (which is 66).

- **Public Servants:** Since 2018, most public servants have had the right to continue working until age 70.

- **Not a Total Removal of Age Limits:** While advocacy groups have called for the abolition of all mandatory retirement ages, the current legal changes are focused on aligning contractual retirement with the state pension age (66).

- **Flexibility & Pensions:** From 2024, people have the option to continue working up until the age of 70 to receive

a higher, flexible State Pension.

In summary, the new law prevents mandatory retirement at 65, ensuring workers can stay until the state pension age of 66, with options for some to work until 70 (RTE, 16.1.2026).

BBC NEWS has reported extensively on the relationship between TikTok and **TRADE UNIONS**, primarily concerning job cuts, safety concerns, and the use of the platform itself.

Key stories covered by the BBC include:

- **Job Cuts and AI Moderation:** TikTok announced mass lay-offs in its Trust and Safety teams in the UK and Asia, aiming to replace human moderators with AI. The Communication Workers Union (CWU) has heavily criticised this decision, calling it "corporate greed" that compromises online safety. CWU National Officer John Chadfield stated that hundreds of UK moderators had already signed termination agreements despite the company's public stance that the cuts were only proposals.

- **Union Recognition:** The layoffs were announced just as workers were about to vote on having their Union officially recognised, a move the CWU suggested was not a coincidence. (BBC, 1.1.2026)

These reports highlight the various intersections of the growing influence of the social media platform and the established structures of Trade Unions, from labour disputes within TikTok itself to the platform's societal impact on Union members in other professions. More information is available on the BBC News Trade Unions topic page.

continued on page 18

**LABOUR****Comment**

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 44 No. 2

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

The Northern Standard!

Ceases Publication!

THE *Northern Standard*, a regional weekly newspaper in Monaghan, ceased publication on 18th December 2025, after 186 years.

The weekly publication struggled to sustain its long-term viability in the face of what it called the "steady decline in readership and advertising in recent years", the publisher stated.

Adding that, as news consumption shifted to online media, "print newspapers have struggled to compete with digital platforms and social media outlets" and the "regrettable decision" had been made to cease publication.

The *Northern Standard* was founded by Arthur Wellington Holmes, and the first issue of the newspaper was published on 10th January 1839.

The 'Standard' has been described as an "historic newspaper": it certainly earned that title! Below is a brief account of its history by the late Hugh Oram.

The Monaghan Paper

"WHEN the first issue of the Northern Standard, Monaghan, was rolling off the press in March 1839, the list of prisoners awaiting trial in the town's jail at the Spring Assizes read as follows:

Murder, 13; Rape, 5; Lifting arms by might, 5; Robbery, 16; Base coin, 6; Forgery, 2; Assault, 2; Exposing child, 3; Picking Pockets, 3; Stealing Rosin, 2; Possession of stolen goods, 1; Vagrant, 1; Wounding, 1; Misdemeanour, 1; Pig Stealing, 1.

For a fleeting moment, just after the paper was founded, Charles Gavan Duffy was its Editor, on the way to great editorial

achievement with the *Nation*.

Gavan Duffy, a native of Monaghan, already had much newspaper experience behind him. He arrived in Dublin as an eighteen year old and promptly secured a job as a reporter on the *Morning Register*, the Catholic newspaper founded in 1824. His starting pay was £1 a week.

Gavan Duffy soon began his rapid climb upwards, moving from the reporters' desk to the sub-editors' desk. He survived a monumental row with Daniel O'Connell—who had accused him of attributing a speech to him that he had not made. Gavan Duffy stuck to his guns and insisted that his report was entirely accurate.

At the next meeting of the *Precursor Society* in Dublin, O'Connell attacked both the *Morning Register* and its reporters. Gavan Duffy was in high dudgeon; he swept up his papers, grabbed the top hat customarily worn by reporters in

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: €50;
Sterling-zone: £35**

Electronic Subscription:
**€ 15 / £12 for 12 issues
(or € 1.30 / £1.10 per issue)**

You can also order from:
<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>

those days and stalked out of the room. Three other reporters followed Duffy's example.

Later, O'Connell became reconciled to the *Morning Register* and as his autobiography so delicately phrased it, "ceased abusing reporters".

"Just after the launch of the Northern Standard, the editor, Arthur Wellington Holmes was struck down by a fever. He was tortured by the impossibility of bringing out the paper, but Gavan Duffy arrived, had all the proofs revised and selected the current news.

"His arrival mitigated the local bitterness against the new Conservative newspaper and later, when Gavan Duffy and the *Nation* were in the dock charged with sedition, the Northern Standard remained silent amid the general uproar of the Tory press."

Fifty years later—by which time Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, living in Melbourne had been made Premier of Victoria—was on a visit home to Monaghan, he was reminded cordially of his brief Editorship all those years before.

"Gavan Duffy went on from the *Northern Standard* to become Editor of the *Belfast Vindicator*. He recalled the day in 1841 when O'Connell came to Belfast, managing to evade the mobs who were roaming the city in search of him. The Orange gangs did not find O'Connell; as a substitute, they broke every pane of glass in the *Vindicator* office.

"An incident shortly afterwards was to lead eventually to Gavan Duffy's part in founding the *Nation*, that seminal influence on nineteenth century journalism and politics. A man called Hughes was sentenced to death at Armagh Assizes,

continued on page 19