In our plan, we have tried to build a system that is effective and efficient in handling the issues of the era. We believe that the current political and economic situation requires a new approach to address the challenges we face. We propose a system that is based on principles of democratic participation, transparency, and accountability. We believe that this system will help to create a more just and equitable society.

We acknowledge that there are many challenges and obstacles to overcome. However, we are confident that with the help of the people, we can create a better future for all. We hope that this plan will be a starting point for a more inclusive and progressive society.

The essence of our plan is to ensure that the rights of all people are respected and protected. We believe that this is the foundation for a strong and stable society. We call on all parties to support this plan and work together to achieve our common goals.

Thank you for considering our proposal. We are committed to building a better future for all.
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In spite of the length of McGarry and O’Leary’s reply, the following points were among those not challenged:

- Joint authority - the paucity of support for and the imbalance of such a ‘solution’
- Constitutional insecurity and political violence - the appreciation of unionist insecurity over their constitutional position and international isolation might have allowed a more empathetic understanding of unionism than the stereotype of ‘interregnum’/p.1
- The distortion of the NILP’s ‘impressive record on civil rights’
- Elites and ethnonationalism - Most damagingly, they do not challenge the problem of Northern Ireland’s constrained elites. If there is little elite that can do in Northern Ireland because they are constrained to follow their voters why direct your prescriptions at those elites?

CONCLUSION

The abusive response of McGarry and O’Leary to my review article is designed to divert attention away from an informed debate of their work. They start from the assumption that I am some kind of stereotype of unionism and engage with that stereotype rather than with the points made in the review. The polemical, anti-uniform tone of what are designed to be college texts is unfortunate. O’Leary has acted as an aide-de-camp to one of the national causes, the changes in his position do parallel those of the British Labour Party, and he is unable to provide a convincing explanation for his flip-flops. Their analysis is heavily dependent on ‘sick’ Liphart (1975) and constitutionalism’s disnaturalism of materialism and lack of sympathy for integration. In their analysis they echo constitutionalism and take no steps to distance themselves from some of its more disturbing normative implications. Furthermore, the elite focus of their analysis seems inappropriate when dealing with the mass phenomenon of ethnonationalism. On top of all this, to berate and insult others for bias, errors of interpretation and fact, and being aide-de-camp smack of hypocrisy.
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