

‘Hate Speech’ laws: Welcome to Stasi Ireland!

John Waters

38-49 minutes



Those who have doubted that Western Civilisation is in the process of being dismantled are about to receive their definitive reply. The supposedly ‘unavoidable’ fire-brigade damage inflicted on our freedoms in the Spring of 2020, which has never been repaired or reversed, is about to be consolidated. The shout of ‘Emergency!’ was at that time sufficient to quiet most objections and provide reassurance that this was indeed a temporary imposition. Now, two and a half years later, the maintenance vans pull up and the workmen start to scrutinise the damage done by the firemen — the windows shattered by their axes, the shards of glass still protruding dangerously upwards, the splintered frames. As we look on expectantly, imagining that they are about to replace the broken glass and repair the damaged frames, another convoy of vehicles pulls up, this time bearing men with sledgehammers, crowbars,

pneumatic drills, wonder bars, angle grinders — and, bringing up the rear, a scammel transporter with a large crane and wrecking ball. It becomes clear that what the workmen have in mind is not reconstruction, but demolition.

Thus, the ‘emergency’ is signalled as over and the Era of Permanent Despotism begins. Now we move into the world predicted two years ago by one Larry Fink, the CEO of the world’s leading assets management behemoth, BlackRock: ‘Markets don’t like uncertainty. Markets like, actually . . . totalitarian governments, where you have an understanding of what’s out there, and obviously the whole dimension is changing now with a democratisation of countries. And democracies are very messy.’

Since those fateful days in the Spring of 2020, this was always going to happen, being baked into the lockdown cake. This is because, if an ‘authority’ suspends supposedly inalienable rights and freedoms, and then, after a long period of withholding them without objectively discernible justification, trickles their simulacrum back out under the rubric of concession, it soon becomes clear that these rights and freedoms have ceased to exist. After that, it is only a matter of carting the husks away.

The portents of this were present from the beginning — in the absence of appropriate responses from media and ‘civil liberties’ bodies, in the strange mutism that gripped the familiar voices of objection and dissent — the poets, artists, philosophers — in the vacuum created by dogs not barking. It is like — as we have so often repeated in mutating sentences to ourselves, as though trying to hit upon a new formulation that would magic some new apprehension of the meaning of things — we have awoken in a world after a long, oblivious sleep, to find that the world has not merely changed but turned into something like the opposite of what we recall from the moments before unconsciousness. Out in the street in search of clues as to the dateline, we make eye-contact in the hope of encountering someone as troubled by what we are finding as ourselves, but receive back merely blank, indifferent stares. The New Normal is already normalised, and our memories of freedom and reason are as though increasingly unreliable, if not actual signs of derangement.

On mature reflection, it becomes clear that the era of freedom was

not a stage along the way to Utopia, but a brief experiment that has now been abandoned as a failure. Only certain elements of the Freedom Revolution have been deemed worthy of retention: the right of the richest to stay rich; the rights of nonces and perverts to have their evil ways with children; the right of those claiming victimhood to plunder the reserves of those entitled to make no such claim. All this was set out in advance in the loosely framed prospectus known as Cultural Marxism. Even those who took the warnings on this score seriously did not take them seriously enough, for this new formula for human co-existence was in deadly earnest, whereas we thought it had something to do with the passing disgruntlement of the young or the ideological fancy of some of life's losers. Now, or at least soon, we shall begin to see that it is all meant to be permanent and, once accomplished, irreversible.

Each former nation and its former citizens will soon discover their own concrete examples of what is a universal project of reversing the presumed gains made within Western civilisation going back to the Magna Carta. Some 30 months ago, we passed the terminus of the period of personal freedom, barely even remarking the moment, which occurred on perhaps an evening in late February or early March of 2020. Since then, we may have noticed in fits and starts that most of what we had always taken for granted about our terms of existence in the public world had changed utterly. The assumption that, as free people, we had the right to walk unfettered down a road or street, answerable to no one; or speak our minds on matters that struck discordantly our sense of justice or truth; or speak casually using possessive adjectives like 'my' or 'our' in respect of a house or a country — all this was coming to an end. In the interval between the initial sledgehammer blows to the windows of our liberty and the arrival of the demolition crews to take down the remnants of Western civilisation, we had gotten accustomed to being, you might say, pampered serfs, a condition that perhaps had some residual harmonic in the tom-tom rifts rippling through from back the ancestral line. We were ready for the next bulletin from on high. And now it has arrived, or is about to arrive, to a notice board near you, and the chief 'takeaway' is that the pampering is about to come to an end.

This week, in my country, Ireland, the bulletin board has overnight

been posted with a new set of instructions, concerning what may be written, said or — in the first analysis — thought. It is called the *Criminal Justice (Incitement to Violence or Hatred and Hate Offences) Bill, 2022*, and relates to the issue that has become known as ‘hate speech’, which refers to the manner in which the citizenry is henceforth to be permitted to speak to and about certain named categories of ‘protected minorities’ whom we awoke not long ago to find unexpectedly in our midst. A quarter of a century ago, most of these minorities were unrepresented in our country, and no one dreamed that it might be necessary to introduce ‘hate speech’ legislation to protect the population from the various categories of ‘hate’ going around at that time. Since the turn of the millennium, however, our political class, under instructions from unseen external masters, has been diluting our population with indifferent aliens, more or less randomly selected or self-selecting, and delivered here for the purpose of sundering the claimed attachment of the Irish to the country they once thought of as ‘theirs’ — this country called ‘Ireland’. The Irish in general did not react with hostility to the newcomers, but that may have been because neither did they understand that the influence of new arrivals here was merely the first step in a much more elaborate and ominous process. This moment of the commencement of the Era of Permanent Despotism, however, brings a new dimension: the news that these outsiders are not merely hopeful newcomers, to be welcomed or tolerated or resented or embraced, but in fact the legal inheritors of what we once thought of as ‘our’ country. The *Criminal Justice (Incitement to Violence or Hatred and Hate Offences) Bill, 2022* makes this abundantly clear: These people are not in any sense to be regarded as having come here as mendicants or aspirants, but as the legally protected instruments of a new order that essentially excludes those who were here all along.

The idea of Ireland belonging to the Irish is now legally dead — the *Criminal Justice (Incitement to Violence or Hatred and Hate Offences) Bill, 2022* makes that quite clear. The idea of ‘my’ or ‘our’ country is dead too: It’s with O’Leary in the grave.

I confess that, having warned at some length about the dangers of the Irish manifestation of ‘hate speech’ laws — well in advance of their arrival — (see here

and here),

I had lapsed into a distracted complacency at the moment of their publication in draft form last week. Bizarrely throwing myself at the mercy of jounaliars — a word I actually invented! — I read a number of media accounts that appeared to suggest that the sting of the proposals had been pulled — possibly on legal advice — and what remained was merely a reheating of existing lip service provision concerning ‘incitement to hatred’, which had barely if ever been used in its prior manifestation.

[This article from the *Irish Mirror*](#), sent to me by a friend, provides an example.

Its description of the draft legislation expressly states that its primary purpose is to augment existing law with regard to crimes perceived to have an aggravating element of prejudice — or ‘hatred’ — based on, for example, race or sexual identity.

The report states:

The new Bill will create, for the first time in Ireland, specific hate crime offences.

They will be in the guise of aggravated forms of existing criminal offences where offenders are motivated by hatred of a protected characteristic such as race, colour, nationality, religion, ethnic or national origin, sexual orientation, gender expression, gender identity and disability.

The report, citing a Department of Justice statement, later elaborates:

‘All offences that were aggravated by a hate element will incur penalties that are higher than the ordinary form of the offense [sic], unless the penalties are already set at the maximum possible.

‘The Bill also provides that in any offence, other than the specific aggravated offences, where the Court determines that the perpetrator was motivated by prejudice in carrying out the offence, the Court shall treat that as an aggravating factor in sentencing the person.’

Even allowing for the article’s extreme tendentiousness and sensationalist mode of expression, it was hard, reading it, to see how such a measure could be any more than tedious, a nod toward multiculturalism, progressivism, *et cetera*, and therefore no great

cause for concern. Perhaps our commentaries at the preliminary stages had had some effect? After reading the article, I responded reassuringly to what I thought my friend's somewhat overwrought response to it, foolishly using the *Mirror* report as my point of reference:

In my estimation it will have no effect: The new Act is a paper tiger, which has been radically watered down from the early proposals and drafts of the Bill. This legislation requires an actual crime to have been committed, which may then be deemed to be of greater gravity by virtue of some 'hate' dimension. So it will only be relevant if, for example, someone assaults another person and it emerges that they were motivated by racism, or whatever. The sole area in which it might have relevance for commentators arises if the police were to engineer a situation where a crime was committed and could be linked to some utterance of a public figure. If someone beats up some nonce, for example, and offers as a defence that he was inspired to do it by Gemma O'Doherty, John Waters [et cetera]. But such prosecutions are already provided for in the 1989 Incitement to Hatred Act, which has been used about half a dozen times in 33 years, and never for this purpose. It is clear that the legal advice the Government was receiving made clear that they had no constitutional basis for creating the law they were seeking to, in which someone could have someone else prosecuted for 'hate speech' on the basis that he or she was 'offended' by something that person said, even if the 'offence' was targeted at someone else who was not offended. This Act is a very long way from that, and is clearly a face-saving exercise intended to reassure the Combine that 'something is being done about hate speech', when in reality little or nothing is altered.

Wrong, wrong, WRONG! I cannot say whether the article — and others of a similar nature that I have come across — was intended as a piece of deliberate misdirection, or whether it was simply a lazy co-option of a departmental press release with perhaps a similar objective, but either way it could scarcely have been pitched at a further remoteness from the truth. Certainly the author of the article does not appear to have had a copy of the draft Bill in front of him as he wrote his prejudicial diatribe, since virtually all of the article is directed at the provisions contained in the second half of the Bill, so that he would have had to plough his way through the

most radical and important elements in order to construct the article as he did. This may indeed be part of a deliberate strategy to lull the public into a false sense of complacency — insofar as the public is exercised in the matter at all, which to a high degree it is not. In any event, it briefly lulled me into something that does not flatter me. It was several more days before I came to read the draft Bill, and what I found therein rattled me to the core of my being.

Having since had an opportunity to read the draft *Criminal Justice (Incitement to Violence or Hatred and Hate Offences) Bill, 2022*, I believe it to be extremely dangerous and, in fact, capable of, in the first instance, entirely deleting what is left of public debate or discussion on a number of issues: viz, race, 'colour', sexuality, what is called gender, Islam, atheism, *et cetera* — i.e. 'protected characteristics', which essentially means characteristics protected under Political Correctness/Cultural Marxism — as well as, purely tokenistically, nationality, disability and 'descent', whatever that may be.

Essentially, the Bill identifies and lists (though mostly without defining) the qualifying 'protected characteristics' which entitle a person to enhanced protection from the critical opinions of others under such headings. Instead of 'critical opinions', however, the Bill uses the term 'hatred', an amorphous term that is nowhere defined other than tautologously, as follows:

'hatred' means hatred against a person or a group of persons in the State or elsewhere on account of their protected characteristics or any one of those characteristics.

The Bill co-opts ideological definitions like 'colour' and 'gender' without defining them legally or in everyday terms. Instead it presents a series of inter-linking reiterative terms that simply assume the definitions to be already clear.

'Gender', for example, is 'defined' as follows:

'gender' means the gender of a person or the gender which a person expresses as the person's preferred gender or with which the person identifies and includes transgender and a gender other than those of male and female.

To the apocryphal man arrived from the Moon, this might refer to

anything from hair-colour to horsepower.

In some contexts, by way of offering clarification, readers of the Bill are referred to the EU Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of November 2008, dealing with ‘combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law’. (Confirming that the Bill is, accordingly, the expression of EU policy and mandates.) However, the Framework Decision tells us very little else, its ‘definitions’ being just as tautologous as those in the *Criminal Justice (Incitement to Violence or Hatred and Hate Offences) Bill, 2022*, which lazily informs that ‘A word or expression that is used in this Act and is also used in the Framework Decision has, unless the context otherwise requires, the same meaning in this Act as it has in the Framework Decision.’

‘Hatred’, for example, is defined in the Framework Decision as follows:

‘Hatred’ shall be understood as referring to hatred based on race, colour, religion, descent, or national or ethnic origin.

This is in no sense a definition of ‘hatred’. In fact, it tells us nothing of what hatred is, assuming that everyone already knows. The trouble is that, when the law starts to trick around with notions that ‘everyone already knows’, we very rapidly descend into subjectivism, arbitrariness, and — yes — *prejudice*.

Other critical words, terms and concepts are not defined at all. The concept of ‘incitement’, for example, is nowhere spelt out as to its meaning or particularities in either the Bill or the EU Council Framework Decision. What are to be the thresholds between acceptable public discourse (said to be protected in the Bill, but never defined) and what is called ‘hatred’? Who decides, and on what basis, is never specified.

Due to the paucity of adequate definitions, the Bill, once passed, would place virtually all consideration of the relevant issues in the hands of judges — all or most of whom are likely to be in sympathy with the Cultural Marxist agenda, or at least aware of which side their bread is buttered on — or juries likely to be prejudiced by relentless, expensively-purchased propaganda and NGO agitation.

In relation to the headline ‘offence’ of ‘incitement to violence or hatred to persons on account of their protected characteristics’, the Bill would in effect render unsafe any commentary at all on certain

contentious issues — for example transgenderism, immigration and the activities of homosexuals and/or LGBT activists. This is because the framework of the legislation is so hastily sketched out that it would be a matter ultimately for the subjective appraisal of a judge as to whether the alleged offence constituted a 'hate crime' or not, requiring would-be critics of the policy or campaign in question to err on the side of extreme caution. The result would be an inevitable chilling of all commentary in these areas.

The same will apply in respect of the consequence of the section headed 'Offence of condonation, denial or gross trivialisation of genocide, etc., against persons on account of their protected characteristics'

The introduction of such an offence would, I believe, destroy any possibility of achieving revision of established understandings of key historical events, even if new information were to become available, rendering the existing interpretations cast in stone. Indeed, it is possible that, in certain circumstances, it might open up the possibility of rendering the use of the word 'genocide' illegal for all usage except in respect of those formally approved prior episodes in which it is already an agreed definition (i.e. 'events specified in Article 6 of the Rome Statute' — issued by the International Criminal Court in Rome on July 17th, 1998). This might mean, for example, that someone describing the Covid vaccination programme as 'genocide', in a context in which 'hatred' of some individual or group covered by the 'protected characteristics' provision was in the mix, might find themselves on the hook under this heading also and thereby liable, on summary conviction, to a sentence of up to 12 months, or, in the case of convictions on indictment, a sentence of five years imprisonment. The offence of incitement would mean, in effect, that anyone who, in seeking to comment on certain controversial matters, risked ignoring the new underfoot conditions might be subject to prosecution on foot of the actions of random or unknown individuals which had simply been associated by the prosecutorial authorities or some (not necessarily implicated) complainant with some statement of that person at any time in the past. The connection could be made subjectively and would only need to satisfy a test of 'reasonableness', whatever that might mean.

It also seems that someone could be convicted under this legislation for simply possessing material likely to incite hatred — for example, a book by an author — such as Douglas Murray’s books about mass immigration and Woke insanity, for example — who is critical of issues implicating individuals or groups with ‘protected characteristics’.

The relevant section here specifies that a person shall be guilty of an offence of inciting violence or hatred if he/she ‘prepares or possesses material that is likely to incite violence or hatred against a person or a group of persons on account of their protected characteristics or any of those characteristics with a view to the material being communicated to the public or a section of the public, whether by himself or herself or another person . . . or being reckless as to whether such violence or hatred is thereby incited.’ It shall be a defence to plead that the material was purely for the defendant’s own use, but if ‘it is reasonable to assume that the material was not intended for the personal use of the person’, the person shall be presumed, until the contrary is proved, to have been in possession of the material for the purposes of disseminating it to others.

In any particular case where allegations are made under the provisions of this legislation, if passed into law, concerning incitement to violence or hatred, or condoning or trivialising genocide, a search warrant may be obtained to search any premises at which any relevant material is alleged to exist. If a judge of the District Court is satisfied by information on oath of a police officer that there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that evidence of, or relating to, the commission of an offence is to be found in a particular place, the judge may issue a warrant for the search of that place and any persons found there. The investigators may use ‘reasonable force’ to enter the place named in the warrant, to search it and anyone found there, and to ‘examine, seize and retain anything found at that place, or anything found in possession of a person present at that place at the time of the search’, that the investigating officer(s) reasonably believe(s) to be evidence of, or relating to, the commission of an offence.

The legislation will also permit the seizure and retention of any such material — for example a computer or document — ‘for so long as is necessary’. The officer conducting the search may open and

operate any computer found at the location or require anyone present to supply relevant passwords or encryption keys, or operate a computer for the purpose of enabling a search of its contents, and, if requested, to produce the information accessible by the computer 'in a form in which the information is visible and legible, or . . . in which it can be removed and in which it is, or can be made, visible and legible.'

In other words, Welcome to Stasi Ireland, changed utterly in the name of progress and 'tolerance': totalitarianism bearing down on all in the name of defending the sensitivities of noisy minorities.

Incidentally, the generality of the Bill's provisions refers to material being disseminated 'to the public' and to 'a section of the public', suggesting that it shall not be a defence to argue that the commentary was — in whatever sense — 'in-house' — even if the location of the alleged offence was a private house: it is entirely probable that the law will be applied to statements made in a private dwelling where non-family members are present and have elected to file a complaint.

The religious aspects are confusing (religion is, nominally at least, a 'protected characteristic') and likely to be of no benefit in protecting any aspects of Christian culture or belief. For the first time, atheism becomes a protectorate of Cultural Marxism. Since the Government has already taken steps to remove anti-blasphemy legislation and its constitutional underpinning, it is scarcely credible that the effect of this law would be to restore it in substance, other than for groups (like Muslims) that are protected under another characteristic as well.

The supposed 'free speech provision' of the Bill is meaningless and toothless, since it offers only the promise that consideration of a reference to a person or group on the basis of protected characteristics shall not 'solely' be the basis of the court's decision. Again this is ringed around with non-specific concepts and loose definitions. There is supposedly a provision allowing for 'reasonable and genuine contributions', in the contexts of literary, artistic, political, scientific, religious or academic discourse, and we are told that this means 'a contribution that is considered by a reasonable person as being reasonably necessary or incidental to such discourse.' Again, who decides this? How is 'reasonably necessary'

to be measured? In a highly-charged, propagandised culture such as Ireland has recently been converted into, how can this be regarded as offering any guarantee of protection to someone seeking to advance unpopular, untested or culturally unsupported viewpoints? And, since the public discourse occurs primarily to support the advancement of tentative and often esoteric ideas, how can this be described as a protection for freedom of expression and commentary where it might matter? It is interesting, here, that the term 'reasonable person' has hitherto been mainly associated, legally speaking, with defamations, where at stake in the judicial process would be the reputation of a specific individual. In such circumstances, the complained-of commentary would be defensible by dint of truth or fair comment, but here, since the entire crucible is decked out in ideology, anyone who detects disparagement of himself under a 'protected characteristic' will be able to trump any defence of free expression by virtue of his hurt feelings. Before writing, saying something — and yes, according to the Bill, 'displaying', 'publishing', 'distributing', 'disseminating', 'showing' or 'playing' such communications, or 'making the material available in any other way including through the use of an information system to the public or a section of the public' — the would-be cultural critic will therefore need to think about how his remarks will go down with the most ideologically-slanted person in the (court)room.

Indeed, the restriction is likely to go much further in practice, since the text of the legislation refers to problematic 'behaviour' as well as statements.

For the purposes of this Part, a person's behaviour shall include behaviour of any kind and, in particular, things that the person says, or otherwise communicates, as well as things that the person does and such behaviour may consist of a single act or a course of conduct.

What this means is anyone's guess, but it is certain that, by 'behaving' — i.e., by being alive and breathing in a public space — a person may be liable to prosecution under this legislation. It all depends on how his 'behaviour' or 'communications' is/are interpreted by the most angry/paranoid individual in the vicinity. For once in this piece of draft legislation, we have stumbled upon a reliable — if accidental — definition, for this is the precise definition of totalitarianism.

Under the heading of 'incitement to hatred', the Bill supplants the *Prohibition of Incitement to Hatred Act, 1989*, which will be repealed in the new law, if it is passed. This crime, it appears, can now be committed either with intent or inadvertently, since the criteria include inciting violence or hatred against a protected group or person with or without the intention of doing so. The criterion, again, will be whether some unspecified observer, applying some unspecified non-definition, believes that such an incident of incitement has occurred. Here, the Bill again provides for the defence of 'genuine contribution to literary, artistic, political, scientific, religious or academic discourse', but nothing of this is defined, and already the NGO lobbyists are screaming blue murder against any such defence being permitted. Indeed, the incorporation of 'bodies corporate' within the scope of the Bill's prosecutorial reach will mean that theatres, media organisations, cinemas, art galleries, political organisations, churches, schools and colleges, and scientific bodies may be held responsible for anything said or communicated, or any behaviour of any person on its property, that is found to fall under the heading of 'hatred'.

A body corporate shall be liable if the relevant offence is 'attributable to the failure, by a director, manager, secretary or other officer of the body corporate, or a person purporting to act in that capacity, to exercise, at the time of the commission of the relevant offence and in all the circumstances of the case, the requisite degree of supervision or control of the relevant person.' In such circumstances, the body corporate shall be guilty of an offence.

As regards jurisdiction, the Bill stipulates that its provisions should apply to all material placed on any information system, 'whether or not the offence involved material hosted on an information system in the State', or 'whether or not the person was in the State when the offence was committed.' This would seem to mean that any person, in any country, might be liable to prosecution in Ireland for anything posted on any such information system, regardless of the location of that system. Again, total totalitarianism.

All in all, it is an extremely dangerous piece of legislation every bit as bad as was promised by the various projections and drafts we saw coming through over the past couple of years. In effect, anyone seeking to speak publicly about any of the issues relating to 'protected characteristics' (chiefly Cultural Marxist obsessions)

would be taking their liberty in their hands.

Let us be straightforward: The *Criminal Justice (Incitement to Violence or Hatred and Hate Offences) Bill 2022* is essentially a Bill to protect the pursuit of the externally imposed policy amounting to a programme for the destruction of Ireland from any internal commentary or criticism.

A friend observes: 'Even in the Arts (theatre, literature, painting, film-making, etc), anything that 'offends' those protected anti-Christian minorities will be deemed a hate crime offender, hence, culture is f****d. If they carry out this law in a draconian way and start jailing people, Ireland will become unliveable. Basically, it's a law that prevents heteronormative people and Christians from expressing the truth.'

This, of course, is entirely correct. The vagueness of the legislation will, if anything, exacerbate its intrinsically tyrannical nature, imposing a chilling cautiousness on those who might be disposed to challenge proposed initiatives and developments, especially those proposing the most radical changes to Irish society. These laws will therefore enable even the most far-reaching of reality-reshaping measures to be pushed through the institutions of society without any possibility of proper discussion or debate.

But, over and above all that, the proposed law is a charter for the disincorporation of each and every existing Irish-born person as a proprietorial shareholder of the nation of Ireland, from which flows the inevitable effect of winding up the Irish nation as a community of people sharing the same island space. 'Hate speech' laws are not simply censorship — their deeper purpose is to terminate equality under the law, so that the normative indigenous members of a nation are made to feel like an alien underclass, while the actually imported underclass, and the State-sponsored disaffected, are used as battering rams to decimate the native culture and existing societal structures — the pawns taking out the Sovereign People, Kings and Queens alike.

This has, finally, triggered the vindication of the fear expressed by the great Irish journalist and patriot, Thomas Davis:

'This country of ours is no sand bank, thrown up by some recent caprice of earth. It is an ancient land, honoured in its archives of civilisation, traceable into antiquity by its piety, its valour, and its

sufferings. Every great European race has sent its stream to the river of Irish mind. Long wars, vast organisations, subtle codes, beacon crimes, leading virtues, and self-mighty men were here. If we live influenced by wind and sun and tree, and not by the passions and deeds of the past, we are a thriftless and a hopeless people.'

The Government, of course, has such contempt for the intelligence of the Irish public that it will claim that what it is seeking to achieve is a kinder, gentler Ireland for everyone. This is nonsense: The way to achieve a kinder, gentler Ireland would have been to control inward migration to whatever was necessary to meet the needs of the economy, and the limits of what the culture could bear. At the very least, it would have entailed consulting the population concerning what a succession of governments since the turn of the millennium has imposed. By dint of stealth and moral blackmail, the political class has, for more than 20 years, been flooding the country with indifferent aliens who come here seeking benefits and are coached on arrival by NGOs to treat the host population as inherently racist. This, too, is a key element of the Cultural Marxist agenda, which seeks to impose burdens of guilt on 'white' populations on foot of the mixed history of Western imperialism. Ireland, however, far from having an imperial past, was itself, for hundreds of years, the casualty of English colonialism, having had much of its culture, including its language annihilated by barbaric laws, and its population periodically decimated by genocide camouflaged as natural disaster. These calamities also, of course, provoked the mass exodus of population to the New World and Britain, leaving Ireland in the early years of the third millennium semantically helpless before the disingenuous charge that, its own people having been 'welcomed' in these places, the Ireland of 2010 and 2020 had a responsibility to repay the favour to the universe. What is never allowed is that Irish people went abroad with little or no chance of ever returning home, to work like Trojans in menial jobs in inhospitable places, leaving their native land to stagnate for want of youthful energy and creativity.

Ireland, then, itself a sufferer at the hands of globalist colonialism, has in recent years been force-fed a diet of imported ideology, including Critical Race Theory, which creates a public discussion bearing the almost constant insinuation that Ireland is on a par with

Alabama in its past treatment of black and coloured people. The truth could hardly be more different, but truth has been among the most recent emigrants from the Emerald Isle. The result is that the Irish Government, under instructions from the EU bureaucrats, now invites the world to our shores, with promises of free houses, incomes without obligation, immunity from all kinds of legal consequences for wrongdoing — and now: cultural protection from the merest slight of a disgruntled native who is himself entitled to none of these benefits. This week, homelessness among Irish people approached 11,000 — the highest ever recorded — while a massive building near Castlebar was being prepared to house a further tranche of (alleged) Ukrainians. Irish people live in tents and cardboard boxes while Ukrainians, supposedly ‘fleeing a war zone’, but without encountering any process of vetting or verification, move into duplex apartments at the taxpayer’s expense.

Among the true objectives of the ‘hate speech’ legislation is to protect a treasonous political class against criticism from its own taxpaying population for the crimes it is committing against them, its treachery against the heroes of the long struggle to achieve freedom at a cost invariably paid in blood and life-force, and ultimately the destruction of one of the oldest and intellectually richest cultures in human history.

But even this is not the deepest, most malevolent of the reasons why the Irish political class — Irish-born men and women who have been privileged to be entrusted with care of their country and its inheritance, are in 2022 seeking to impose these new Penal Laws on their own people. The deepest reason has to do with facilitating powerful and already wealthy outsiders in plundering Ireland of everything worth taking, nailed down or otherwise.

The proposed law will destroy — as is the uppermost intention behind it — the concept of equality before the law. It need hardly be pointed out that the Bill, while presenting itself as a charter for increased tolerance and societal gentleness, is in reality a charter for the dominance of minorities over the pre-existing population. In each individual case, it will defend, uphold or elevate that which is alien, esoteric or abnormative, which means that the normal, the here-before and the undemanding get stuffed and silenced every time. It is obvious that anyone who imagines they will be able to use the law to defend themselves from attacks on their

Catholicism/Christianity would be barking up the wrong tree. Similarly anyone imagining that it offers some kind of protection from what the new gender ideology classes as 'cis gender' persons (i.e. those who wish to remain as they were made) had better think again. The law will benefit listed minorities only, and everyone else will be laughed out of court by the occupiers of a now all but totally corrupted Bench. Because this is a Cultural Marxist-inspired law, it is designed to weaponise the grievances of minorities so as to silence and thereafter dispossess the indigenous former majority. The trick is that it empowers each individual only in particular subdivisions of his existence —sexuality, colour, et cetera — while simultaneously denying him as much as anyone else the generic rights that citizens of Western democracies (now 'former democracies') took for granted until the day before yesterday. Even the most 'protected characteristic' endowed beneficiaries will be entitled to prosecute their grievance only on the narrow basis of particular, singular characteristics, and in other contexts have the same rights as everyone else, which is to say practically none. The *Criminal Justice (Incitement to Violence or Hatred and Hate Offences) Bill, 2022* will not restore to any person walking upon the sand bank of 2023 Ireland the rights which the political class stole from the Irish people in 2020, with no intention of restoring.

Once the Bill passes into law, what for the moment we might call the 'native Irish' will immediately become second-class legal citizens, being in a sense the prisoners and slaves of newcomers boasting legally superior 'protected characteristics' that give them exalted protection in any dispute with a native Irish person. Each surviving member of the native Irish will thereafter live on tenterhooks, waiting for the moment of accusation, to be followed hard in the ideological kangaroo courts of post-Irish Ireland by conviction, punishment, incarceration, and thereafter lifetime ignominy. Placing this alongside other imminent measures, such as the banning of public protests under certain headings (abortion, for example), the 'delimiting' of private property, and the seizure by the State of rights over every drop of water in the land, what we are observing is the introduction of a new charter of Penal Laws directed at the indigenous people of Ireland, albeit this time framed and implemented not by a monstrous occupier by their own elected 'representatives', the 'monsters with human faces' who smile as

they help the robber barons to steal our children's birthright. Be in no doubt: The ultimate purpose of this is the wholesale plunder of all resources that have not already been transferred into the ownership/control of the Combine.

What is happening, then, amounts to the final dispossession, re-plantation and re-colonisation of Ireland and the re-enslavement of the indigenous Irish people, using indifferent aliens baited by fistfuls of toytown money, as the principal instrument of plunder.

The present moment is a little analogous to what occurred a decade ago, when the Irish electorate was persuaded to annul the parental rights of parents, essentially transferring them in their entirety to the State, in the name of giving 'rights to children'. This cleared the way for gay marriage, gay parenting and 'legal' gay families, at the expense of the normative and natural definitions arising from procreative heterosexuality. In a somewhat comparable fashion, enforced mass migration is an instrument of rights-stripping in the context of the nationhood of the individual: each newcomer is set against each indigenous person, who is thereby cancelled out and reduced to a free-floating nomad in his own former country. That much of this process will be effected on an ostensibly 'voluntary' basis — i.e, people surrendering to the chilling intent of the legislation — is all part of the plan. When it is all done and dusted, and the old Irish take belatedly to recrimination, they will be told that there was nothing in the least coercive about the handover: They went along with everything of their own free will, and have no one to blame but themselves.

It is important to stress that what is happening is in no sense or respect intended to be to the ultimate benefit of the newcomers, who are simply being used as proxy occupiers so as to effect the first, and most difficult, stage of dispossession. To loosen the grip on Ireland of a people who, in many instances, can trace their lineage there for hundreds or thousands of years, is a massive undertaking. The purpose, in the first instance, as already stated, is to dislodge the Sovereign People, and the proxies are here used as pawns to take out the Kings and Queens who have lived here all their lives and thought of this, their metaphysical home, as being no sand bank thrown up by some recent caprice of earth.