

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

ISSN 0790-7672

Volume 20 No 5

The Northern Star

*Incorporating
Workers' Weekly*

Volume 19 Number 5
ISSN 0954-5891

May 2005

**False History
French Referendum
Hope from the Pope?**

**Work—some thoughts
Terence McSwiney's Preface**
(Back page: Labour Comment)

Contents: See Page Two

The Northern Ireland Election

Ballot Wars

Ian Paisley in his moment of victory reasserted the classical Unionist position that there could be no deal until the war was won. But the winning of a war which is not being fought is problematical. And that is the Unionist dilemma. The practical alternative to crushing in war an enemy who is not fighting is to find peaceful means of humiliating him. Because the enemy remains the enemy. He is not the enemy because he fought. He was the enemy before he went to war and he remains the enemy after he reverts to a peaceful mode of existence. War has nothing to do with it. Such is the position of the movement for which Northern Ireland was created.

Dr. Paisley added that in any other country Gerry Adams would be locked up. And so he would be in this country—or is it these countries—if Ministers of Justice believed some of the things they say they are certain of. He is the head of a criminal gang, the organiser of bank robberies, the supervisor of torture, and yet he remains scot-free in Belfast and Dublin.

Paisley takes in earnest what Michael McDowell says is the case. He did not need McDowell to tell him it was the case. But when he sees McDowell repeating what he has always said, and yet doing nothing about it, has he not grounds for his belief that Fenians are all tarred with the same brush and that the Ethiopian cannot change his skin? McDowell, despite his best efforts to walk in the path of righteousness and become a West Brit, remains an Ethiopian and a leopard with spots.

Republican, Nationalist, Free Stater—what's the difference? What Ulster Unionism arose against was a mild measure of Home Rule within the empire under Westminster supervision. By comparison with that evil which brought Ulster Unionism into being, the Free State was wild raving Republicanism in a world gone mad.

And the Free State, christened a republic by McDowell's hereditary party, remains the fundamental evil against which Ulster must be perpetually on guard. Wars within Ulster are transient events. They come and go, but the Fenian danger is present in



The Gaa and Rule 42

The Gaelic Athletic Association is an affront to the modern world. It is a voluntary association in the strict sense. Its players do not play for hire. But soccer and rugby, though conducted on a commercial basis, and therefore in harmony with globalist principles, do not rival its popularity in Ireland. Though they are commercial, they are unable to provide themselves with adequate stadiums for international games. The *Gaa*, though conducted on a voluntary basis, has reconstructed Croke Park into a stadium which matches any of the famous soccer stadiums of the world. It has done so by terrific voluntary effort, and it would have done so if it had never received a penny from the state.

The *Gaa* also has a network of parish grounds throughout the country, all maintained to a high level. And they are not run by wealthy individuals who have a fancy to own a club, but by the members. The *Gaa* must be the institution with the highest community participation in its affairs in the world. It is a popular participatory body which exists everywhere, and it is a national body in that sense. One could even say it is the national body. It is not national in the sense that it is an organ of nationalist propaganda, but in the sense that it has a cohesive and structural popular existence throughout the country.

Other bodies whose proper function it is to be nationalist institutions of the state have been de-nationalised. The Universities, for example. But the *Gaa* is beyond the reach of the British Council and the

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Ballot Wars (The Northern Ireland Election). Editorial	1
The Gaa And Rule 42. Editorial	1
Democratic Mandates & The 1916 Rising. Pat Muldowney (Report)	3
Election Results. Report of Northern Ireland results, Westminster Election, 5.5.05	4
False History? Editorial	5
The Two Nations Theory. Ivor Kenna (Reader's Letter)	6
French Referendum. John Martin	7
What To Hope From The Pope? Jack Lane	9
Politics In Northern Ireland, A Review Of The Year. Mark Langhammer (speech)	10
Ireland's Intelligentsia BITE (more) Air. Seán McGouran (Part 2 of Barbican review)	13
Shorts. (The Orange Order & The Reform Movement; Syria & Lebanon; France's Patron Saint (1905-1980); The Spirit Of The Good Friday Agreement; Irish Times & Debate; McDowell & Mandela; Bolkestein In France; Prince Rainier Dies; Greatest Frenchman)	15
Art & Poetry: Two Reviews. (Reports of Luke Dodd's <i>Conquering England</i> review and Bernard O'Donoghue on <i>Yeats, The Love Poet</i> by Michael Stack)	16
Kennedy At Chappaquiddick. (Reader's Letter)	18
Ulster's Hope, or The New Gerrymander. Seán McGouran	19
Conclusion. John Martin (review of <i>Das Kapital</i> , part 12)	19
"Frank Ryan, a great Irishman who always put Ireland first" (letter by Manus O'Riordan, report)	24
Labour Comment, edited by Pat Maloney:	
<u>Work—a couple of thoughts</u> p28	
<u>Cultural Vandalism In Cork:</u> Terence McSwiney's <i>Preface</i> , left out of his book p26	
<u>They will even pay for Unification!;</u> <u>Poetry</u> p25	

peace no less than in war. And the Free State is always in the grip of a diabolical compulsion to interfere.

When C.C. O'Brien was born again he joined a Unionist Party in proof of his conversion. But, alas, it was only a movement of the intellect accompanied by a gesture of good works. The will remained unregenerate. And the intellect cannot always be watching itself. One day the old Conor escaped from the supervision of the new and made a remark which horrified the Unionist spirit. Whereupon a senior Unionist commented: "*That's what comes of having a cuckoo in the nest*". And it was not a Paisleyite who said it, but one of Trimble's moderates.

The main feature of the election campaign was the deployment of the entire propaganda apparatus of two states, with RTE and the BBC at its core, in support of the SDLP, and the attempt to turn the pub brawl in which Robert McCartney was killed into an IRA murder for the purpose of collapsing the Republican vote. The pretence was made that Sinn Fein was the oppressor of the Northern Catholic community rather than its creation and representative, and it was hoped to implant this as a false memory. The ideologists who work in broadcasting live in the world of 1984—and the British Ministry of Information, which was based in the BBC during the 2nd World War, was actually the inspiration of Orwell's novel. Our

broadcasters have no more concern for factual truth than Dr. Goebbels and they have an even greater belief in the suggestive power of propaganda.

One of the buzz-words of the revisionist establishment of the Celtic Tiggers just now is "*reinterpretation of memories*". This is a nicer way of saying false memory. Re-inventing is another way of putting it. *Inventing Ireland* is the title of one of the anti-historical works of ideology in recent times. You re-invent yourself, reinterpret your memories, and derive yourself from a world that never existed. When the Republic was suddenly deluged with 8 billions from Europe ten years ago there was a mushroom growth of a new, mindless, middle class. Modern money must circulate because if it doesn't do so it doesn't exist. The Celtic Tiggers are in substantial part a product of the necessary circulation of that money. There is undoubtedly a widely-dispersed entrepreneurial spirit in the South (there always has been)—but it was not what produced the deluge of money. That was the product of Charles Haughey's European statecraft. The necessary circulation of that money threw up a large new middle class for whom the continuity of life, with its sense of social reality, was broken as effectively as if they had all been transplanted to Hollywood. These people, who are the citizens of Invented Ireland, are the Celtic Tiggers who have reinterpreted memories appropriate to their exalted but inexplic-

able, not to say undeserved, status. The North is absolutely beyond their ken. And every *Questions & Answers* audience on RTE appears to have been carefully selected from them.

They are greatly embarrassed by the persistence of real memory amongst the Northern Catholics, with whom they still retain some residual sense of affinity. And they cannot understand why somebody doesn't do something about it.

Well the broadcasters did their best. They depicted a fantasy world, a kind of soap opera world, in the hope that in this age of soap opera it would displace the actual world. But it had the contrary effect, if anything.

During the grand illusion of the McCartney propaganda a Queen's University Professor, Liam Kennedy, placed himself at the head of the proclaimed revolt of the people against Provo oppression by standing against Gerry Adams on an all-out programme in West Belfast. Adams had invited the Taoiseach, if he believed his own propaganda, to stand a candidate against him. But the Taoiseach, for all his bluster, is wise enough in his generation, and he declined the challenge. So it was left to Professor Kennedy to raise the revolt. The outcome was that Adams *increased* his vote by a large multiple of what Professor Kennedy got ccc in total.

Though Kennedy lives in Northern Ireland—or at least in Queen's University, which is geographically situated there—he comes from the Republic and he clearly brought the mental world of Dublin 4 with him to Belfast. His candidature demonstrated how little the people of Belfast feel oppressed by the Provos. Kennedy responded to the revelation in a graceless and spiteful tirade against Adams in his post-election address. One might admire him if he had directed his tirade against the electorate which failed to reinterpret its memories in response to his suggestion that it was oppressed.

The SDLP candidate was Alex Atwood, who was quick off the mark with support for the Chief Constable's statement about the Northern Bank robbery. His vote nosedived.

Although the Dublin Government would neither arrest the criminals who planned the bank robbery (according to their certain knowledge) nor sponsor candidates against Adams and Mc Guinness in their strongholds, it did send

Democratic Mandates And The 1916 Rising

Editorial Note: The following letter appeared in Village Magazine on 8th April 2005. The words within square brackets were omitted in published version.

two Cabinet Members North to canvass for the SDLP and solicit Unionist votes for it in a couple of other constituencies, helping it to gain South Belfast (which is a Unionist constituency) due to a split Unionist vote, and to hold Foyle (Derry), though with a reduced majority. (It is said that some Unionists voted SDLP to prevent Sinn Fein becoming the largest party in the North—though in the event there was no danger of that with the UUP being reduced to one seat to the DUP's 9. There was, of course, no chance of the Unionists winning Derry.)

The strange thing is that the SDLP went very Green for this election. And two Dublin Ministers, formally committed to a United Ireland went North for the express purpose of campaigning against the only all-Ireland party.

The SDLP gained one seat but lost another. It lost Newry & Armagh by a landslide to Sinn Fein's Colm Murphy, who was heckled and travestied on *Questions & Answers* recently. The seat it gained is likely to be lost the next time, because South Belfast is naturally a Unionist seat. The reckoning is that it would have been touch and go in Derry if a Sinn Fein candidate with IRA credentials had contested it. (Everybody agrees that Mitchell McLaughlin is exclusively Sinn Fein, even though the Taoiseach says that there is no such thing and that Sinn Fein is just another name for the IRA.) But there is one safe SDLP seat: South Down. The word 'tribal' is loosely and meaninglessly used by supercilious commentators to describe Northern Ireland politics but, if it has a proper application anywhere, it is to McGrady's seat in South Down. Or perhaps feudal would be a better word. Anyhow the McGradys are a power in the region and the seat is Eddie's as long as he cares to hold it. (Incidentally, his big vote might have been enhanced by some Unionist support.)

*

It has become the fashion among the egg-heads and other nitwits of 'constitutional nationalism' to draw a comparison between Sinn Fein in 1926 and 2005. They recommend that Gerry Adams should do now what De Valera did then. But they are remarkably ill-informed about what De Valera did then. He resigned from Sinn Fein after failing to win it over to his policies, and he not only left the IRA in being, but relied on its existence during the next seven or eight years as a physical counter to the coercive apparatus of the Treatyite Government. And he founded Fianna Fail as "a slightly

Your correspondent Pierce Martin says that the purpose of the 1916 Rising was to impose pro-fascist ethnic nationalist domination on the whole of Ireland, and he says that the rebels destroyed a developed democratic system that had secured a Home Rule settlement.

In fact the modest measure of Home Rule enacted by the House of Commons was rendered meaningless by the combination of armed revolt by the Ulster Unionists, mutiny against Parliament by the British Army, and rejection of the decision of the elected chamber by the unelected House of Lords and by the British Conservative and Unionist party. Prior to the Rising the electoral mandate of the British Government expired, and the Unionists consolidated their armed revolt and defeat of the Home Rule Party by becoming part of the new, unelected government which assumed power in Britain and Ireland in the Spring of 1915. This was the sentence of death for the Irish Party which had sent thousands to war against Germany, Austria, Hungary, Turkey and other countries which had never invaded, conquered, expropriated, colonised or starved Ireland. About 50000 of these were to die for an Empire which was a prototype for militarism, conquest, world domination [and genocide]; and it was clear by 1916 that they had been duped by a bogus promise of Home Rule. In a typical ten minute period on the Western Front, the numbers of people slaughtered in the interests of British Imperial aggrandisement, in a war engineered by Britain, was greater than the total number of all those who died in the week-long Easter Rising against British Imperialism.

The unelected, self-appointed British government had no electoral or moral mandate to oppose the declaration of an Irish Republic—pending the holding of Irish elections—by a Provisional Irish Government in 1916.

As to the 1918 elections, it is illusory to set the combined Home Rule Party/Ulster Unionist support against the Republican vote as Pierce Martin does. The Ulster Unionists had gone into armed revolt, not against Republicans, but against the Home Rule Party. On the separatist side, the substantive difference between the Home Rulers and the Republicans was that the latter were prepared to face up to the overwhelming military force and violence that were the permanent basis of the British position in Ireland, and which had been nakedly demonstrated yet again in the destruction of the Home Rulers. The Home Rule remnant were part of the separatist tendency. They cannot be counted among the loyalists who brought about their downfall. [The history of the Home Rule Movement has been sadly neglected until recently. For a detailed and accurate account, see *The Rise and Fall of Imperial Ireland*, by Pat Walsh, published by Athol Books, 2004.]

Pierce Martin says that only a minority of Irish electors voted for independence. In fact the credibility of the Home Rule Party had already been shattered by the anti-democratic actions of the British and the Unionists before the 1916 Rising ever happened; to the extent that by 1918 the Home Rulers were unable even to mount a contest in many constituencies. Thus no vote was held in the areas where Sinn Fein was strongest, so the overwhelming independence vote was only partially counted in 1918. This independence vote was no temporary aberration. It was replicated in all the elections held in Ireland from 1918 to 1921 throughout the period of armed struggle by the IRA in defence of Irish democracy against the military aggression of a superpower.

Pat Muldowney

constitutional party" (in Lemass's words). Fianna Fail entered the Free State Dail, taking the Oath of Allegiance to a foreign power with its fingers crossed.

What Gerry Adams is doing differs from what De Valera did in this way He has not resigned from Sinn Fein and founded a new party whose relationship with the IRA would be similar to De

Valera's—and also similar to the relationship of the two Unionist Parties with the Loyalist paramilitaries. He has stayed with Sinn Fein with the intention of bringing about a settlement in which the IRA would be disbanded.

Are the good people of 'constitutional nationalism' seriously suggesting that Adams should emulate De Valera? Or

should we forgive them for they know not what they say?

Eamon Phoenix (a Northern academic historian of 'constitutional nationalist' outlook) was particularly eloquent and particularly ignorant on the historical comparison on *Hearts & Minds* (24.2.05). He said that De Valera, who was in the political wilderness as a result of his rejection of the Treaty, might have stayed there indefinitely—

“had it not been for the intense pressure exerted by the Government of the day... led by William T. Cosgrave, who forced De Valera and his political supporters into the Dail and eventually they became the Government in 1932. It took De Valera... a mere five years from abandoning violence and taking the hated Oath of Allegiance in 1927 to becoming the Government of the Irish Free State.”
And now:

“Bertie Ahern has thrown down the gauntlet to Sinn Fein as Cosgrave did to De Valera in 1927.”

The situation in the 26 Counties in 1926 was that the Treatyite wing of Sinn Fein, which was established in power on a British mandate and with British arms in 1922, had discarded the strategy of its founder, Michael Collins. Collins had gained support for the Treaty, which dismantled the Republic, by undertaking to use the institutions established under the Treaty as “*stepping stones*” back to the Republic. He undertook to use the Treatyite institutions to subvert the Treaty. His colleagues discarded that strategy after his death and became Imperialists.

The electorate voted for the Treaty under the influence of the British threat of “*immediate and terrible war*” in 1922-3. But, as British power fell into confusion and the prospect of a new British conquest receded, and as the Treatyite party became Imperialist, the voters began to elect Republicans in large numbers once more. But the Treatyite Government used the Treaty Oath to keep elected Republicans out of the Dail. They could only take their seats after taking an Oath of Allegiance to Britain.

Where was the democracy in that state of affairs? The voters might elect a majority of Republican TDs, but those TDs could not take their seats without perjuring themselves or betraying their mandates.

If a Republican majority was elected, the situation would be much the same with relation to the Treaty Dail as it was in 1919 with relation to the British Parliament..

Civil War would have been in prospect—a genuine civil war this time. (The 1922 conflict is given the wrong name when it is called a civil war. Collins was in full agreement with the ideals of the people he made war upon. He made war on them as the lesser evil. Churchill had given him an ultimatum: either he would make war for the purpose of installing the Treaty or Britain would take the country in hand once more. The conflict was in fact a Treaty War, not a Civil War.)

De Valera defused the situation by forming a new Republican party which did not take Oaths as seriously as the majority of Sinn Fein did, and which was willing to perjure itself (with its fingers crossed) in order to take power within the Treaty Dail and revoking the Treaty. He was backed informally by the IRA in this project. The transfer of power was enacted peacefully in 1932-3, in the sense that the military power which was available on both sides was not set in motion.

The conduct of the Treatyite Cosgrave Government in using the Treaty Oath to exclude Republicans who baulked at perjury, which is praised by Eamon Phoenix, was long remembered. And Cosgrave's party never again won an election. In defeat Cumann na nGaedheal/Fine Gael became a Fascist party. It adopted a Fascist programme and aligned itself with Mussolini and France, returning to the ways of Parliamentary democracy only after it had been thwarted a every turn by Fianna Fail.

PS An interesting piece of information about the McCartney affair emerged on Prime Time on March 3rd. Michael Heney had spent the previous weekend with the McCartney sisters. Gerry Adams, after consultation with them, had made a strong statement in support of their demands. Heney was asked what more they expected Adams to do. He explained:

“Well, I felt that they expected something from him. They said that meeting with him had been heartening... But the sort of language that they have used about this is, they say the IRA is a military organisation: they respond to military discipline. These people should be ordered, this is the thinking of the family and you can certainly understand it, that the murderers have now to come clean and tell the truth. But of course there's a massive problem with that because you cannot compel the truth. Whoever is going to give evidence in this case is going to have to do it voluntarily or it will be no use.”

So the IRA offer of a punishment shooting was not rejected on the moral ground that the IRA was an illegitimate body which had no right to do such things. It was rejected in support of a demand that the IRA coercive power should be applied to the more difficult purpose of somehow compelling a group of people to convict themselves under the rules of evidence of the Queen's Courts.

*

BBC, Northern Ireland, sent Noel Thomson to Washington for St. Patrick's Day to report on the absence of Sinn Fein from the White House. When given an interview with Bush's new Special Envoy, Mitchell Reiss, he complained that the exclusion of the other parties along with Sinn Fein eased the pressure on Sinn Fein. Reiss replied that Sinn Fein had a crucial role in the situation:

Thomson: “So you say to Gerry Adams, the IRA must go away. Gerry Adams is in America this week saying the same thing... So it doesn't give you much leverage, does it? You seem to be singing from the same sheet...”

Reiss: “Well, that's very good news. And I'm looking forward to exploring ways in which the U.S. can help Sinn Fein...”

Thomson: “The difficulty is that even the Irish Prime Minister, Bertie Ahern, believes that Sinn Fein, the leaders of Sinn Fein, and the IRA are inextricably linked. So who indeed are you talking to?”

Reiss: “Well, I'm going to be talking to Mr. Adams and to all the leadership of Sinn Fein and to the other political leaders as well. Again, you take the world as it is, not as you would always like it to be. The fact of the matter is that Sinn Fein has a crucial role to play as we go forward in the peace process.”

*

Tony Gregory (Independent Dublin TD, with revolutionary lineage) on the McCartney incident:

“Joe Higgins in the Dail described the activities of the group in the Short Strand as acting like an S.S. unit. And that's exactly what they were at” (*Questions & Answers*, 21st April 2005).

Election Results

2005: Seats won & Vote share

SF 5, 24.46% ; SDLP 3, 17.6% ; UUP 1, 17.84% ; DUP 9, 33.89% ; AP 0, 3.42% ; Others 0, 2.79%.

2001: Seats won & Vote share

SF 4, 21.70% ; SDLP 3, 21.00% ; UUP 6, 26.80% ; DUP 5, 22.50% ; AP 0, 3.60% ; Others 0, 3.91%.

[PTO]

Selected Results 2005

(with 2001 result for the Party
in brackets)

South Antrim

Burnside David UUP 11059 (16,366)
Cushinan Henry SF 4407 (4,160)
Ford David AP 3278 (1,969)
McClelland Noreen SDLP 4706 (5,336)
McCrea William DUP 14507 (15,355)

Belfast East

Devenny Deborah SF 1029 (1,237)
Empey Reg UUP 9275 (8,550)
Long Naomi AP 3746 (5,832)
Muldoon Mary SDLP 844 (888)
Robinson Peter DUP 15152 (15,667)
(3 other candidates stood)

Belfast North

Cobain Fred UUP 2154 (4,904)
Dodds Nigel DUP 13935 0 Yes
Kelly Gerry SF 8747 (10,331)
Maginness Alban SDLP 4950 (8,592)
(3 other candidates stood)

Belfast South

Maskey Alexander SF 2882 (2,894)
McDonnell Alasdair SDLP 10339 (11,609)
McGimpsey Michael UUP 7263 (17,008)
Spratt Jimmy DUP 9104 (-)
(3 other candidates stood)

Belfast West

Adams Gerry SF 24348 (27,096)
Attwood Alex SDLP 5033 (7,754)
Dodds Diane DUP 3652 (2,641)
McGimpsey Christopher UUP 779 (2,541)
Kennedy Liam Ind 147 (-)
(2 other candidates stood)

South Down

McGrady Eddie SDLP 21557 (24,136)
Nesbitt Dermot UUP 4775 (9,173)
Ruane Cairtriona SF 12417 (10,278)
Wells Jim DUP 8815 (7,802)
(1 other candidate stood)

Fermanagh & S. Tyrone

Elliott Thomas UUP 8869 (17,686)
Foster Arlene DUP 14056 (-)
Gallagher Tommy SDLP 7230 (9,706)
Gildernew Michelle SF 18638 (17,739)

Foyle

Durkan Mark SDLP 21119 (24,538)
Hay William DUP 6557 (7,414)
McCann Eamonn (Soc.) 1649 (-)
McLaughlin Mitchel SF 15162 (12,988)
Storey Earl UUP 1091 (8869)
(1 other candidate stood)

Mid Ulster

Armstrong Billy UUP 4853 0 No
McCrea Ian DUP 10665 (15,549)
McGlone Patsy SDLP 7922 (8,376)
McGuinness Martin SF 21641 (25,502)
(1 other candidate stood)

Newry and Armagh

Berry Paul DUP 9311 0 (6,833)
Bradley Dominic SDLP 12770 (20,784)
Kennedy Danny UUP 7025 (6,833)
Murphy Conor SF 20965 (17,209)
(1 other candidate stood)

West Tyrone

Buchanan Thomas DUP 7742 (-)
Deeny Kieran (Hosp.) 11905 (-)
Doherty Pat SF 16960 (19,814)
Hussey Derek UUP 2981 (14,774)
McMenamin Eugene SDLP 3949
(13,942)

Upper Bann

Kelly Dolores SDLP 5747 (7,607)
O'Dowd John SF 9305 (10,770)
Simpson David DUP 16679 (15,037)
Trimble David UUP 11281 (17,095)
(2 other candidates stood)

False History?

Mairead McGuinness, Fine Gael MEP, appeared on RTE's *Questions & Answers* on 7th March and she lectured Sinn Fein MEP, Mary Lou Macdonald:

"All of us have read history and we understand it. And we all take different dimensions from it. But could we not respect our different interpretations of that history."

This is in accordance with the revisionist dogma that the conflict in the North is caused by a false interpretation of history. The wrong history was taught in the schools. Catholics were taught to hate Protestants, and they were taught that Partition was a great injustice, and that is why there is sectarianism and anti-Partitionism. But the schoolbooks which engendered a fierce sectarian anti-Partitionism are never cited, and we have been unable to find them. And there is a very different spirit in the schoolbooks we have found.

Perhaps interpretation of history has something to do with attitudes to the North in the Republic. But, if so, schoolbooks, or any other books, have little to do with it.

We remember when Mairead McGuinness's party came back into office as part of a rainbow Coalition in 1947, after fifteen years of Fascist wandering in the wilderness, declared the 26 County state a Republic, broke its vestigial connection with the Empire, and launched a worldwide anti-Partition campaign. De Valera did not initiate it. He seemed to disapprove. But, once the movement was launched, he had to join in. The campaign went on into the early fifties, and there can be little doubt that it inspired the IRA invasion of the North in 1956.

The Northern Catholics did not support the invasion. It was easily suppressed. And Charles Haughey rounded up the IRA in the South.

Provisional Republicanism had little to do with interpretations of history. It was based on current experience of life in the strange variation taken on by the British state in the Six Counties. There was no possibility there of democratic political activity—activity whose logical culmination

is participation in the Government of the state. Democracy is a form of government of a state, not a mode of contemplation of high-minded sentiments, and the North was cut out of the whole business of governing the state.

Politicians and commentators and historians in the South have never given a moment's thought to the ramifications of exclusion from the political life of the state. They even refuse to see that it is the case. That is why what they say about the North has a fantasy air about it that would be appropriate to speculations about the mental life of the man in the moon.

Two Northern Ireland Prime Ministers understood that Northern Ireland was an abnormal political structure in which normal democratic activity was not possible, and therefore they discouraged political activity. They were Lords Craigavon and Brookeborough, who were generally held in contempt as backwoodsmen, but were invariably praised in this journal.

Then along came a progressive Prime Minister and a progressive Taoiseach, Captain O'Neill and Sean Lemass. Neither of them understood Northern Ireland. Lemass abandoned De Valera's cautious attitude and he browbeat the Nationalist Party into role-playing the part of Official Opposition at Stormont, as if it was the Parliament of a democratic state. And O'Neill set about shaking up the North into democratic activity. Three years later the chaos began.

The Northern Ireland in which there was no possibility of democratic politics suited the Protestant community very well, and not only because they were top dogs in it. They are a remarkably unpolitical people. The best of them have usually disdained politics as vulgar and corrupt and fit only for grubby individuals. The Catholic community is extraordinarily political and was deprived of a democratic outlet for its political energies in 1921. The two together constituted the region of the world least suited for devolved government—a fact which must have been plainly obvious to the British statesmen who set up Northern Ireland.

This is the stultifying constitutional framework in which the things called sectarianism and discrimination have flourished for eighty years, and could do nothing but flourish. It produced Provisional Sinn Fein, which is one of the best things it produced.

Mary Lou Macdonald started to explain to her MEP colleague that Catholics in the North were motivated by experience of actual life, rather than by interpretations of history. But John Bowman would not let her. It would, in any case, have been a waste of time because Mairead didn't want to know. ●

Letter To Editor

The Two Nations Theory

I have been a reader of Brendan Clifford's writings for nearly 40 years and can well remember when he came up with the Two Nations Theory.

Economics had a lot to do with the TNT. Stalin, among other things, had defined a nation as a place having a common economic life. North-East Ireland had an economy, eg shipbuilding, that made sense in the context of the British Empire but not in the context of Ireland on its own. The decline of North-East Ireland industry means that there are now less grounds for the TNT.

At the time that the TNT was put forward, most revolutionaries throughout Europe fervently believed that "over 90% of the people want revolution" and that "revolution is the main trend in the world today". I did not so believe, for reasons I shall not go into here.

Ireland was regarded as *the* place most suitable for revolution. And then Brendan went and spoilt it all by revealing the existence of a million Northern Ireland Protestants who were certainly not in the Wolfe Tone mode. Shortly afterwards, main trend revolutionism died the death in Europe.

We need to look at the situation in Ireland today. For many years, decreasing numbers of Protestants kept themselves racially pure by not marrying Catholics. Despite their efforts, the Protestant, or English if you prefer, bloodstock could not be maintained. The racial composition of the population of Ireland is now practically homogeneous, apart, of course, from Bengalis, Chinese, etc.

There is little objective basis remaining for the existence of a second Irish nation. It is like the grin on the face of the Cheshire Cat which remained long after the animal itself had vanished.

Ivor Kenna, London

The *Gaa* and Rule 42 continued

ideologists of the Oxbridge Universities. And for that reason it is fiercely resented.

An acquaintance of ours who lived in a Protestant housing estate in North Belfast moved out of it some years ago and got employment where there were large numbers of Catholics. On the basis of this experience he began to reflect on what it is that constitutes people into a community. On the housing estate he had bumped into the same people every day, but when he returned to it after a few months he felt he was a stranger there. There was no wider bond than continuous presence in the same small physical space. But he observed that Catholics had an instant rapport with one another, wherever they happened to come from, through the organic influence of the *Gaa*.

Soccer is utterly unlike Gaelic in that respect. It has no definite local structure and no organic social dimension. And relations between the supporters of Gaelic clubs are utterly unlike the relations between the supporters of Soccer clubs.

Gaelic is played for the love of sport and the glory of it. The players belong to the areas they play for. But, though its structure is strictly local, it has a well-organised existence throughout the country. And the *Gaa* is the only sporting body to take women's games seriously.

It exists below, or beyond, political divisions. Its popularity is universal. And, for that reason, it was a major influence in overcoming the division of what is called the Civil War. Cork hurling and Kerry football exerted an irresistible gravitational pull on Treatyites and anti-Treatyites alike.

The powerful revisionist lobby has reason to hate it. It is immune to their influence. Their power can get no purchase on it. Professor Roy Foster has therefore condemned the *Gaa* as chauvinist, irredentist, and negative. He only means that it doesn't bother its head about him. And, if it is irredentist for having a 32 County structure, then so is the Church of Ireland.

But the failure of the commercial sports, in which the players are hired, to be successfully commercial has been seized upon as a device for making a small chink in the self-sufficiency of the *Gaa*. Soccer and rugby have failed to establish adequate

national venues for themselves, and a campaign has been waged against the *Gaa*, for entirely political purposes, to oblige it to let soccer and rugby be played in Croke Park. And this year the *Gaa* gave into the pressure, at least in principle. But great practical difficulties lie in the way of practical implementation.

Something like Euro 20 million would need to be spent to allow soccer and rugby to be played in Croke Park. This is because the international soccer authorities require physical segregation of supporters to prevent hooliganism—something not needed for Gaelic games. Indeed separating rival supporters would work against the *Gaa* ethos. Also, floodlighting would have to be installed to facilitate evening matches for television, which are not now played. As the numbers of matches for which these facilities would be required is small, it is hard to see how the work could pay for itself. And, if the Government stumped up the money, allowing the *Gaa* to profit by hosting soccer and rugby at Croke Park, that would only increase the pressure to concede professionalism to leading players, ending amateur ethos and the playing of the games for their own sake.

In addition, the *Gaa* has been careful to keep the Dublin inner-city population which lives around its stadium on-side by limiting the numbers of matches that are played there. Hosting other sports would strain this relationship, particularly as other supporters are not as well-behaved. If the locals are asked to put up with the inconvenience of extra matches, there are plenty of other Gaelic fixtures which would be more suited to be played there.

John Arnold, PRO to Bride Rovers (Cork) has explained why he thinks Rule 42 is important. Gaelic sports are in competition with the 'sexy', heavily-promoted sports of soccer and rugby in attracting participants and supporters.

"We can't offer professional contracts, or an international element, or weekend trips to premiership games—the only thing we have is a magnificent world-class stadium; it's the only thing we have" (Sunday Independent 10.4.05). Sharing it with other sports would undermine the one major asset of the *Gaa*.

Incidentally, Croke Park re-made itself whilst remaining open for matches. Why can't Lansdowne Road do the same? ●

French Referendum

The French referendum campaign has not gone as well for the supporters of the EU Constitution as they would have liked. Since the end of March opinion polls have been consistently showing the “no” side with between 52% and 58% support. Recently, after a huge propaganda campaign, which involved bringing Jacques Delors out of retirement and passing the Constitution through the German Parliament, the polls are breaking even, or tending towards the ‘Yes’ side.

Why have there been such problems for the ‘Yes’ campaign? Last December the socialists voted by a 60-40 majority for the constitution in an internal referendum. The socialist leader Francois Holland was voted “man of the year” by one of the French current affairs magazines and the right wing government parties were overwhelmingly in favour.

The ‘Yes’ side were hoping that following the vote of the socialists, left wing dissent would be kept to a minimum and the referendum would pass on the ‘nod’.

But it is clear that the minority within the Socialist Party which voted against the party leadership last December is the most political element. While the socialist leader of the ‘No’ campaign, former Prime Minister Lauren Fabius, has remained silent since losing the internal party referendum, other dissidents have been active. It is too late for the leadership to silence them because there is no doubt that the minority is now a significant majority within the party.

In the absence of Fabius, the leader of the socialist ‘No’ campaign is Henri Emmanuelli. Emmanuelli looks like an ageing Italian boxer. He is never going to be a champion or even a contender: not slick enough. But he has a few good fights left in him and this one could be his best.

His most recent bout was a head to head with Nicolas Sarkozy in a television programme called *100 Minutes To Convince*. The format has a leading politician (in this case Sarkozy) giving his views for 100 minutes. In the course of the programme he is challenged by journalists and other politicians on various themes. Unfortunately, Emmanuelli was allowed

only 15 minutes to challenge him on the EU Constitution.

Emmanuelli opened aggressively by claiming that the Constitution was not “social”. This immediately put Sarkozy on the defensive. The leading pro “free market” politician in France was reduced to claiming that it was “social”. He tried to say that the European Trade Union movement supported it. But Emmanuelli countered by saying that he marched with tens of thousands of European Trade Unionists against the Bolkestein Directive in Brussels and they were also against the Constitution. By the end of this brief debate Sarkozy was reeling, but fifteen minutes was far too short for a knockout blow to be delivered.

In an article in the March issue of the *Irish Political Review* I suggested that French political culture can be understood in terms of communist and Gaullist values. But there is a third political tendency. This tendency likes to think of itself as being progressive. It denounces the conservatism of France. “We must change”, it says and “we must keep pace with international developments”. It supports the EU Constitution because “competition” and the “free market” is the wave of the future. Supporters of this view are found in the Socialist Party as well as the Government parties. They like to think of themselves as “modern”. But some people think that they belong to an older tradition.

The pugnacious Emmanuelli came out with the following in a newspaper interview to justify his opposition to the socialist leadership:

“There was a majority of socialists who supported Petain in 1940. Those who resisted have passed into posterity. Those who supported his policies are held in opprobrium.”

Of course, that kind of talk was denounced as being ‘below the belt’. But could there be an element of truth in it? This is not to say that the ‘Yes’ side are fascists, only that this tendency supports the dominant international political trend. In 1940 it was Nazism and in 2005 it is free market, globalist values.

The campaign against the Constitution has been largely driven by the French Communist Party. As indicated in last

month’s issue it published a best selling pamphlet on the constitution in October 2004. It has also been campaigning against the Bolkestein directive since July of last year. The communist daily newspaper *l’Humanite* has been an invaluable means of mobilising opposition to the Constitution.

The communists are opposed to the Constitution on economic grounds. They claim that it is the only Constitution in the world that enshrines free market values. In my view this claim is justified. Almost at the beginning of the Constitution Article i-3-2 indicates that the Union offers freedom, security, justice without internal frontiers and an internal market where competition is free and unrestricted.

Article i-3-2 indicates that the Union works for the sustainable development of Europe founded on balanced economic growth and on the stability of prices, a highly competitive social market which tends towards full employment and social progress and an increased level of protection and improvement of the environment. It promotes scientific and technical progress

At first glance the above article appears to have something for everyone. “Sustainable development”, “balanced economic growth” and “improvement of the environment” sound ecological. “Social progress” and “full employment” sound socialist and the “highly competitive” and “stability of price” phrases sound capitalist if not monetarist.

However in my view the ecological and socialist sounding phrases are mere pious aspirations without substance. They are political window dressing. There is no indication of how these might be achieved anywhere in the Constitution. On the other hand, the Constitution is extremely detailed as regards stability of price and competition.

Article i-4-1, for example, defines as a fundamental liberty the free circulation of persons, services, products and capital.

Section iii fleshes out how the objectives in article i-3 might be achieved. Article iii-177 says that to achieve the aims of article i-3 there must be close coordination of the economic policies of member states in conformity with the principle of an open economy where competition is free.

The second paragraph of this article lists as a principal objective the stability of prices and again indicates that the Union must conform to the principle of free

competition. In case there is any doubt, the third paragraph says that member States must respect the following principles: price stability, healthy monetary and public finance policies and a stable balance of payments.

Article iii-178 also refers to the objectives contained in article i-3. It says that member states may act in respect of the principle of a market economy where there is free competition, favouring the efficient allocation of resources.

The pious aspirations of “social progress” and “full employment” etc in article i-3 are not mentioned at all in these articles or anywhere else.

Regarding the “stability of prices”, this will be implemented by the Central Banks (Article iii-185-1). Article iii-188 guarantees their independence. Neither the member states’ Central Banks nor the European Central Bank can solicit or accept instructions from member state governments or other institutions within the Union.

It is extremely difficult to see how any socialist could support this Constitution. In the past there might have been an argument for free market policies as a means of disrupting local monopolies. But this was in the context of a large European Social Fund and a generous Common Agricultural Policy. It was also in the context of a small number of states with broadly Social/Christian democratic values. Such free market policies were a means of encouraging greater economic integration (i.e. an economy organised across the European Community rather than on a national basis) and not an end in itself.

But these conditions no longer apply. The growth and stability pact and now this Constitution will place constraints on public expenditure policies designed to mitigate the effects of free market policies. There is no doubt that since the end of the Kohl/Mitterand era free market policies are seen as good in themselves and not as a means to an end. The European Constitution reflects this shift to the right.

Amid a plethora of pious aspirations Article i-3-4 says that in its relations with the rest of the world the Union will contribute to “free and equitable trade”. It is very clear that free market values are fundamental to the European project. This is not just an internal matter for the European Union: these values define its relationship with the rest of the world.

Article iii-156 says that restrictions in movements of Capital and payments between states of the Union and states

outside the Union are forbidden. This latter article has caused severe embarrassment to Chirac. Recently, the French President advocated a “Tobin tax” (named after the Nobel Prize winning economist), which is a tax on movements of Capital as a means of eliminating world poverty. He now has to keep quiet about that because such a proposal would violate this article of the EU Constitution.

Recently, the lack-lustre performance of Chirac has come in for criticism. It’s my suspicion that this is not due to incompetence or lack of energy, but rather his heart is not in it.

Since the opinion polls began to show a ‘No’ majority the Eurocrats from other countries have been trying to find scapegoats. If it is not the “French political class” it is the French people themselves. The view has been expressed that the French don’t really oppose the EU Constitution they are just using the issue to sanction their government. In my view this is patronising rubbish.

The Catholic Daily Newspaper *La Croix* conducted a detailed analysis of the reasons given for voting ‘No’. The paper, which has taken an even handed editorial line on the Constitution, concluded that the ‘No’ voters were not confusing the forthcoming referendum with a general election. On the contrary, following the focus group surveys that it commissioned, it concluded that the reasons given for voting ‘No’ were quite profound.

There were broadly two reasons for voting ‘No’. The first reason is not to sanction the French Government, but to sanction the European project itself which many French people consider to have become too “liberal” (i.e. free market orientated). The French blame the transfer of production from their country to low cost countries in Asia and Eastern Europe on “free market” policies imposed from Brussels. They also think that competition has undermined gains won by the labour movement such as the 35 hour week. The Bolkestein Directive confirmed their negative views of European economic policies.

The second reason given for voting ‘No’ relates to the French identity. The market researchers found that the French have a very particular relationship with the state. They perceive it as a protector, as a source of security. It is centralised with clear national boundaries. Europe, on the other hand, represents the opposite. It is diverse with provisional boundaries. The enlargement of the EU to the East and the proposed accession of Turkey, even if it will not happen until 10 or 15 years, have accentuated French fears.

However, although the opinion polls indicate that a majority might vote ‘No’, one opinion poll also showed a majority hoped that the ‘Yes’ side would win! The contradiction is explained by the fact that some ‘No’ voters fear the consequences for Europe of a French ‘No’. They want to send a message to Europe but on the other hand they fear the consequences of a majority ‘No’ will undermine it. This indicates a certain fragility on the part of ‘No’ voters which could be exploited by the ‘Yes’ campaign as polling day draws near.

Another weakness on the ‘No’ side is that many of their campaigners are perceived as extremists. Jean Marie Le Pen of the National Front is advocating a ‘No’ vote. However, much to the chagrin of many on the ‘Yes’ side, this person has been uncharacteristically quiet during the campaign.

One prominent ‘No’ campaigner on the “right” is Phillipe De Villiers. This politician is considered to be a conservative Catholic. He is also proud of his aristocratic lineage. He represents the Vendee region of France which is famous for its rebellion against the French Revolution. Normally such a reactionary would be a liability for any political campaign. But worryingly for the political establishment, he has been appealing to mainstream French values. One issue that has been raised during the campaign has been the level of cheap Chinese clothing imports resulting in job losses in France. De Villiers contrasted the response of the USA to this problem with that of Europe. In the US protectionist measures were implemented almost immediately, whereas the European commissioner, Peter Mandelson, decided to implement a 6 stage consultative process (in other words do nothing). De Villiers’s conclusion was that the EU is being run by free market dogmatists.

When a reactionary from France accuses a senior British Labour Party politician of being a “free market dogmatist”, that is a problem. It indicates that French values are diametrically opposed to British values. If the French reject the EU Constitution on 29th of May it will be because it is against the Constitution’s free market orientation and the undermining of State control in relation to employment law. On the other hand, if the British vote ‘No’ next year it will be because it is too ‘social’. Those two visions of Europe are not compatible.

In recent years British values have been in the ascendant and Continental politicians have not resisted the drift towards Anglo-American economic policies. A French rejection on the 29th of May could galvanise an alternative vision.

John Martin

What To Hope From The Pope?

The reactions to the new Pope from the liberal Catholics have been predictable and more predictable in Ireland than anywhere else. Some of the snidest references have come from that quarter. He is not a liberal and therefore he has let them down and the Catholic Church is on course for a disaster under him. We will have to wait and see. The demise of a Catholicism that does not adapt to liberalism is one of the most oft repeated mantras in recent history. But why is it not obvious to the billion plus that follow Catholicism and the many others who show respect for it, however grudgingly? There is no evidence that Benedict XVI is any different from his predecessor in theological matters and one cannot doubt that the Catholic Church grew in influence under John Paul II. Maybe it declined in Ireland but Ireland is not now, as it once was, a reflection of the world in these matters. It is now just a pale reflection of the Ameranglian cocoon.

Why is the influence of the Catholic Church a growing influence if the liberal view of things was so self evidently right, as they themselves believe? Why indeed does the Papacy exist at all at this stage of history? Is it possible that there are things not dreamt of in the philosophy of liberalism that the Papacy encapsulates and are relevant? And does it by any chance encapsulate things that are more important than the preoccupation of our liberals? Among the many issues for which the Papacy is noted, but not given due weight, is its position on war and peace today. This is noted and passed over, but is there anything more important these days? We hear plenty about the theological arguments on sexual matters but war and peace are hardly less important than these issues.

Benedict has put this issue centre stage with his chosen name, as the last Benedict was best known for his efforts to stop World War I. The *Irish Times* reported a typical cockeyed version of Benedict XV's position on 20th April 2005:

“Power ignored emissary of peace in first World War

“What’s in the name? Benedict XV

“Can Cardinal Ratzinger’s predecessor in name tell us anything about the sort of papacy the new Pope Benedict would like to fashion?

“Pope Benedict XV, formerly Giacomo della Chiesa (1854- 1922), was elected to the papacy on September 3rd, 1914, following the death of Pius X on August 20th, having served as a cardinal since May 1914.

“He was reputed to be a man with renowned diplomatic talents, but he found his abilities—and unique position as a religious emissary of peace—ignored by the belligerent powers in the first World War.

“Having unsuccessfully pushed the idea of a general Christmas truce in 1914 as an end to what he termed “the suicide of Europe” (initially accepted by the Germans but dismissed by the Allies), circumstances in Italy—where his regular intervention was resented as potentially weakening national fighting resolve—further diluted his influence from 1915 onwards.

“In short, the 1915 Treaty of London included secret provisions whereby the Allies agreed with Italy to ignore papal peace moves towards the Central Powers.

“Consequently, the publication of his proposed seven-point Peace Note of August 1917 was roundly ignored by all parties except Austria-Hungary.

“Despite requesting a role in the definition of the peace, the Vatican was excluded from the Paris Peace Conference in 1919.”

The message that gets obscured here is that it was the Allies, and that means Britain, who refused to countenance an end to that war. This is a rather important matter to be clear about.

The First World War was the defining moment of modern history. What was at issue was exactly what Benedict XV said—“*the suicide of Europe*”—or more precisely the murder of European civilisation caused by Britain who launched it as a World War—“*the crime against Europe*” as Roger Casement predicted before it actually began. In any case Benedict XV got the measure of the issue at stake as the war did indeed prove to be the end of European civilisation—not just in its massive loss of life but in the emergence of the elemental forces of society that were set in motion and which caused massive slaughter and chaos within and outside Europe down to the present day.

The crucial thing that ended European civilisation was the morality introduced by Britain, which launched and justified

the war as a crusade of Good against Evil. All others involved had definable vested interests in the conflict but Britain turned it into something else. The concept of wars against Evil is now centre-stage in the Ameranglian scheme of things and is causing similar havoc.

The First World War was justified to the masses on the basis that Evil incarnate had appeared in the World in the shape of the Germans/Prussians/Huns and the forces of Good were ranged against it. But how come the Pope of the day could only get support from the forces of this Evil in his attempts for peace? This is a question that the *Irish Times* commentator quoted above did not seem to find any necessity to explain. It did not even occur to him. Was the Pope in cahoots with Evil in WWI? And was he in the same boat with Saddam Hussein—given that the late Pope took the same attitude to the war against him?

The Socialist and Communist movements tried valiantly to explain World War I in more down-to-earth terms i.e. that it was an inter-imperialist war and that all wars were economically driven. Liberals had no credibility in the matter, as it was the Great Liberal Party that launched the war. But could the millions fighting and dying all be doing it for economic reasons or simply being used by the million for economic reasons time after time? If they were, then there was no obvious reason why they would not continue doing so forever. But the idea of people dying by the million for the economic benefits involved is unconvincing. If true, it would destroy any faith whatever in human beings. Something else was clearly motivating them and that clearly was the fight of Good against Evil.

The bottom line for the leaders of Western Civilisation—Bush and Blair today—is that they are defending Good against Evil. This is always the final word, the final argument, and it works. The Mother of Parliaments and Congress can be relied on to succumb to this argument without fail. It is the clinching, unarguable-against, argument that gets people in the mood for blood. And the Papacy today is as clearly not on the side of this Good as it was not on its side in WWI. Yet the Papacy is still around and apparently growing. Does no commentator see that this needs explaining?

The choice is clear—the Papacy for the last 100 years has been fundamentally

wrong or Western Civilisation has been fundamentally wrong, on the most basic issues of the bloodiest century of recorded history.

The explanation for this is that best set out by the American writer, Carroll Quigley. It is based on the different and irreconcilable conceptions of human nature. More specifically, what exactly is good and evil in the world? The traditional Christian view now exemplified best by Catholicism is that there is not Good and Evil, but Good versus insufficient-Good in the world—which is vastly different to seeing physical Evil inhabiting and stalking the world. The Catholic emphasis is working on ways and means of increasing and spreading Good as the best way of dealing with the lack of it. Evil is not given the positive incarnate form that justifies the self-appointed Good wiping out what it declares to be Evil.

These differing views of human nature have a long and varied history and the belief in positive incarnate Evil is currently best exemplified by the Puritan view of life—the chosen, elect, of God who decide who is evil and how they are therefore set up for destruction. This is the road to perpetual war and barbarity. It is the view of the Bible—a horror story that Catholics abhor and ignore as much as possible. The Catholic view is positive, pragmatic in seeking to counter the absence of Good. It is the modern polar opposite to this Puritan, biblical, negative view of life which now dominates the West's political thinking. And it is hardly an accident that it was the Liberal/ Puritan tradition, as personified by H H Asquith, that set the world on its current course in August 1914.

All the progressive political philosophies from Liberalism to Social Democracy, Socialism and now Communism have effectively succumbed to the Good versus Evil view of things. Only the Papacy stands against it. But no one dare say the Papacy is on the side of Evil but that should be the logical conclusion.

This Pope has already forced people to think about fundamentals. Where will it lead? He is also clearly a German and may help do for Germany what John Paul II did for Poland. If he does Europe could be transformed. Germans might regain the confidence to think again for themselves and if the Papacy becomes the vehicle for achieving that then we are in for a transformed, safer, saner and more enlightened Europe.

Jack Lane

Politics in Northern Ireland: *A Review of the Year*

Cllr. Mark Langhammer's Speech to Irish Political Review group,
Cork, 17th April 2005

Introduction: After the European Elections in June 2004, which confirmed the dominance of the DUP as the principal Protestant Party and Sinn Fein as the principal Catholic Party, the past year has seen a phoney war on 'Talks' pending an election—both aiming to 'dung out' their respective communal sheds of competition.

The main event of the year was the **Comprehensive Agreement** in December, a piece of "high wire" choreography aimed at re-establishing the institutions. The political aspects of the Agreement were, it seems on the surface, 'agreed'. What was not agreed was the requirement for the IRA to disappear under terms set by Ian Paisley.

After the impasse, the £26m Northern Bank raid, and the fall-out from the murder of Robert McCartney in Magennis's Bar have dominated the political discourse.

The Bank raid was quickly deemed by the PSNI's Hugh Orde to be the work of the Provisional IRA. Evidence to back this up has not yet been forthcoming.

Bertie Ahern, based on the same security intelligence as seen by Orde, has taken a similar tack, with Sinn Fein under attack from all elements within the Free State.

The McCartney murder has seen Sinn Fein come under concerted political and media pressure. Some figures from within Republicanism, such as Tommy Mc Kearney, have pointed to the inevitability of contradictions between political activity and maintaining the IRA in being, the IRA increasingly being seen as an encumbrance. Others, such as Anthony McIntyre, have concentrated on the "long leash" or "blind eye" approach to elements of the IRA who were, in some localities, increasingly seen as criminal in character. McIntyre considered the Short Strand element to be such a criminal hard core. Asked on BBC's *Newsnight* whether he considered a split likely, he responded "A split to what? To doing Red Diesel, or illicit vodka?" or words to that effect.

Whilst the British, and Southern political establishment have been quick to make political capital and 'beat up' Republicans, Sinn Fein face the problem that no one has to go very far to make these allegations up.

Much of the rest has been about waiting for the Westminster and local government elections, which gives further opportunity for Sinn Fein and the DUP to strengthen their respective communal hegemonies. For the SDLP, the Westminster elections may be terminal.

Protestant politics: On the Unionist side, since the Assembly Election in 2003, the DUP has gained a significant degree of hegemony within the Protestant community. The seriousness of their intent was shown in the sidelining of Willie McCrea as their candidate for Europe, choosing Jim Allister—a more presentable barrister—in a move that maintained their lead in the Euro elections (from which Paisley has stood down) in 2004.

The DUP position within the Comprehensive Agreement appeared to weaken considerably. On the face of it, the DUP negotiating stance, based on its 2003 election pledge of "7 principles", did not establish the accountability of the Executive Ministers to the Assembly. David Morrison set out, in the *Irish Political Review*, that the DUP had, in a real sense, accommodated to the Agreement—and that a repeat of Martin McGuinness's decision on the 11+ or Bairbre de Brun's decision on acute hospitals, would have (even under changed political arithmetic since 2003) resulted in no change to the decisions.

However, I have spoken to a number of DUP MLAs (indeed I put this question to Sammy Wilson in a pre election UTV programme) who think the reverse is the case. The DUP's view is that Ministerial autonomy is at an end, and that an Executive would not be formed until the statutory Ministerial Code is enacted. Like the Agreement itself, Paisley and Adams have signed up to different versions/understandings of the Agreement. Constructive ambiguity rules. Just as in the 1998 Agreement, where the 'words' indicated that there was no requirement for actual decommissioning at all, just "*best efforts of all parties*"—the Comprehensive Agreement could be taken to mean, in practice, whatever the DUP thinks it means.

At the very least, the DUP will be more effective in scrutinizing the Programme

for Government. The Ministerial Code will require a statutory basis—and this may be the DUP opportunity to copper fasten their understanding of the Comprehensive Agreement. Delays could be easily fabricated. The capacity for referrals from the Assembly will increase.

The Alliance Party, with a greatly reduced vote, retained all 6 of its Assembly seats in 2003, have supported something close to the DUP line—a Cabinet Government with a weighted majority, rather than “designations”. Their main activity in politics has been as the balance of power in Belfast City Council, where 3 Alliance seats hold the balance as between Protestant Unionist and Catholic Nationalist.

The long term prognosis for Alliance is poor, reduced to largely Unionist hinterland of the East with little residual support within the Catholic community. The local Council elections of 2005 is likely to confirm decline.

Within this context, with the DUP appearing confident, and the British and Irish Governments weighing in to put pressure on Republicans (most recently over the issue of the Independent Monitoring Commission on paramilitary activity)—Loyalist sectarian activity has lessened. Parts of the PSNI [Police Service of Northern Ireland] are making some progress on clamping down on some criminal activity, and the Criminal Assets Bureau is making modest inroads. Loyalist areas, however, remain largely unpoliced territory, and the disentanglement of the police from its past relationships with loyalist paramilitarism may take some time.

And the positive development of the Progressive Unionist Party has receded significantly from its high water mark. It is in decline, with doubts as to whether Billy Hutchinson, for instance, will hang onto his City Council seat in Oldpark

Catholic politics: On the Catholic side, Sinn Fein confirmed its position as the dominant force, likely to be further confirmed in the May Westminster and local Council elections.

Bairbre de Brun defeated the SDLP’s Martin Morgan comfortably in the June 2004 Euro elections. The SDLP is on something of a cleft stick, as an allegedly nationalist party restricted to the Northern Ireland entity and with no real relevance to national island-wide political development. Their minority status has caused some SDLP people, such as Tom Kelly, to

mute a link with Fianna Fail—but little has been heard of this recently. Mark Durkan appears to understand his dilemma, and has made speeches and positions about the “*protections*” of the Good Friday Agreement being “*carried over*” into any united Ireland. He hasn’t grasped that Labour, the Greens and presumably the PDs wouldn’t fancy ‘protection’ that meant any of their northern votes in the Dail would be worthless—as is the case for the votes of “*Others*” so protected in the Stormont set up. Their recent policy document, *For A United Ireland And The Agreement*, was a confusing piece of policy, which argued to continue the “*protections*” of the Agreement in a United Ireland—a sort of SDLP *Eire Nua*. It smacked of desperation. And ineptitude, given that Durkan’s electoral hopes in Foyle may require (like Joe Hendron in West Belfast in 1992) the support of East Bank Protestants. Alex Attwood’s City Council seat in West Belfast may even go! In South Belfast, where Alastair McDonnell requires some of Alex Maskey’s votes to “come through the middle” he gratuitously invited Michael McDowell to tour the constituency with him. Inept.

Within civic society Sinn Fein’s grip is even stronger—with well developed newspaper, cultural and community activity within its sphere of influence. In addition to activity like the West Belfast *Feile*, the launch, by the Andersonstown News group of their **Daily Ireland** newspaper, shows political ambition. It is too early to say whether that effort will survive and thrive, and it has announced redundancies in its staff after only a few months, but I wouldn’t bet against it hanging on in a notoriously difficult and competitive morning newspaper market. It has targeted the 12 or 13 Northern counties, the 6 or 7 southern border counties have strong Sinn Fein support and no strong attachment to either the Northern *Irish News* or the Southern *Examiner*, *Independent* or *Times*.

There is significant and growing contact between Sinn Fein and elements of the Protestant community at representative level—with business leaders and with Churches, but very little at grass roots level. Alex Maskey leads a group devoting itself to this work—work interrupted by the bank raid and Mc Cartney murder (with a public spat between Maskey and Rev Ken Newell of the Presbyterian Church, a party to these talks).

The McCartney incident has seen

Republicans less surefooted than normal. The IRA statement setting out their offer to shoot the murderers of Robert McCartney seemed foolish. The subsequent statements of Martin McGuinness “advising” the McCartney sisters on political activity were read, at best, as patronising.

The McCartney issue has exposed to a wider audience the matter of ‘leadership style’ and culture. The Sinn Fein leadership appears collegiate and considered. The grass roots, at times and in some localities, appear robotic. John Kelly’s recent criticism—in essence about leadership “*control freakery*”—have been accentuated in the McCartney incident. My own observations, in north Belfast, are that Sinn Fein at its grass roots can be crudely territorial, ‘in your face’ and sectarian. It appears excessively negative in instinct in regard to local issues, to the point of whingeing, and rarely looks at practical solutions to workaday local problems. It can’t send, for instance, one representative to local meetings, rather preferring delegations of numbers of party members. I take this to be partly a military culture—a closed, authoritarian method, information on a ‘need to know’ basis—a sort of democratic centralism. Adams appears to have recognized and acknowledged this tendency in recent statements. It is a culture, rooted in defence and conflict, which is understandable—but will place a ceiling on Sinn Fein growth ultimately.

The energies of the Catholic community will eventually want a broader canvass—that of national politics. Sinn Fein has been to the fore in trying to develop and encompass that energy, but the ‘control freakery’ tendency and ‘*democratic centralist*’ way of organising suggests that it will not be the only one.

Collusion, Cory and intelligence activism: The issue of collusion, following the publication of the Cory reports which recommended public inquiries in all cases the Canadian Judge examined. The British delayed publication, and eventually published incomplete versions. They have now agreed to inquiries for all cases, with the Finucane case deferred—as a delaying mechanism—until after legal proceedings. Following the conclusion of the case against the Loyalist patsy, Ken Barrett, the British Government has responded with further delay through its **Inquiries Act**—the purpose of which is to ensure that information given to any tribunal is politically restricted, with large parts of the hearings held “*in camera*”.

I take the Finucane case, given the efforts that have gone into frustrating resolution, as being close to the heart of the British war secrets.

Cory (who was straightforward in his examination) has been troublesome for the British.

The second issue is that the notion of a Peace and Reconciliation or Truth Commission is being counterposed (by Chief Constable Hugh Orde amongst others) as an alternative to “endless inquiries” or “selective” inquiries. The British have announced that a commission will investigate and recommend whether and how such a body might go about its work. Although the idea comes at a time when the spotlight is shifting towards British military and police intelligence activity—and therefore appears as a cynical ploy—the broad idea is not without some support.

Seen as a follow-on from Columbia, Castlereagh (for which no one has been charged), the *Stormontgate* affair, and the strange, and very public, attempted abduction of Bobby Tohill in 2004, it is clear that intelligence service political activism is still an important feature. The Intelligence War, it seems to me, remains a central ‘endgame’ issue in political life in Northern Ireland.

The Independent Monitoring Commission, a creation developed outside the scope of the Agreement (as a *quid pro quo*, according to Mark Durkan, for meeting the Sinn Fein demands for a resolution of the “on the runs”) on the prompting of the Alliance Party, and supported by Trimble, is now regularly investigating and reporting on paramilitary activity. The IMC report this Spring resulted in sanctions against Sinn Fein following on the Northern Bank Robbery

There is no similar counterbalance to investigate intelligence activism.

The influence of the Treasury: In general social politics, and within the public service, both during and since the functioning of the Executive, the grip of H.M. Treasury has grown significantly, and at a very micro level. Just as the Treasury in England is at the heart of the service provision in Health, Education, transport infrastructure and so on, so it is in Northern Ireland. Paul Boateng (who is about to move to a Commissioner post in South Africa) acted as ‘enforcer’ ever more frequently over the Reform and Reinvestment initiative, which was signed by the Executive before it collapsed. This is basically a *Private Finance Initiative* [equivalent to Southern *Public Private*

Partnerships) agenda run by a Strategic Investment Board.

All the principal issues in Northern Ireland have been Treasury driven:

- * The reform (ie privatisation) of the Water Service

- * The reform of the rating system

- * The 2005-08 Spending Review, implementing the Gershon Review efficiency savings

- * The reform of the Civil Service

- * Civil and public service pension reform

- * High levels of capital investment through the Strategic Investment Board in education, health and transport.

The local Ministers are all operating, in this regard, on very short rope from the Treasury. Ian Pearson, in particular, finds going through the motions a bit irritating. One gets the impression he’d rather just say “*You can’t have it, Gordon says so!*”

The Future: It appears to me that the current political impasse will—in time—require a fresh look. The Governments are “Micawber” like at present—in denial and hoping that something will turn up. Doing nothing seems the least worst option—with the underlying sense that ‘doing nothing’ hurts Republicans more than the British.

It seemed to me a year ago that the Good Friday Agreement was done for. Paisley however, moved some distance within the “Comprehensive Agreement” The DUP have not prepared the Protestant ground for a ‘sell out’. Protestant society appears happy, ‘at ease’ even, with the impasse. The ‘ordinary five/eights Prod’, unlike the DUP, is not wedded at all to Stormont and doesn’t see the need. Paisley may, after the elections have seen a further routing of the UUP, consider that there is nowhere else to go other than into Stormont. Don’t assume that the relative calm in Protestant working class areas will survive a Paisley ‘sell out’.

The *Northern Star / Irish Political Review* has taken the view from the outset that the British set out to use the Ceasefire to engineer a surrender—a tactic similar to that at the time of the 1918 Armistice. That assessment looks stronger with the passing of time, particularly as the light shines on the British role in the war.

Two Governments centre stage? So, assuming the Agreement is ‘done for’, what should we seek to develop? The basic fact is that Stormont doesn’t work. Without severe external pressure and strong measures of compulsion, the thing will not stick. The alternative to Stormont is for the two Governments to accept joint

responsibility and move centre stage. Joint government, with a generation without Stormont is, I believe, what is required.

Within this context the imperative would be for political development in two directions. Firstly local political development could be enhanced within the auspices of the Review of Local Administration. Secondly, a generation without the prospect of Stormont would (aside from reducing the aggravating effects of state-funded communal politics) tend to encourage the development of island-wide political development.

Review of Public Administration: I was involved in compiling a submission for the Labour Party on the Review of Public Administration. We proposed the two urban areas (Belfast and Derry) and six counties as the basis not just for local council governance—but as the administrative units or building blocks for all local administration. We proposed more powers of local councils offset by more regulation to ensure fairness and equality.

The Review team has just reported, largely following the logic presented by the Labour Party submission of

- * Fewer Councils: The Review team is understood to favour 7 Council areas with the political parties (through the NI Local Government Association) favouring 15. A third, compromise option of 11 may be where the horse trading settles at

- * Co Terminosity: ie all quangos, central government operational services and other bodies would ‘fit in’ to the local Council boundaries

- * Reduction of quangos: over 100 quangos will go, including the Education and Library Boards

- * Reduction of Health bodies from 22 to 5 or 7.

The consultation period finishes in late September with the Minister making decisions by December. The local parties don’t like the RPA report. It will lead to a loss of capacity for the communal parties—many fewer councillors. This should, in my opinion, be considered as an unambiguously good thing. In regard to the capacity of communal politics, the old adage of ‘*Less is more*’ applies.

The Review has proposed very simple, radical, and administratively sound proposals. They are in sharp contrast to the administrative pig’s ear of the Stormont arrangements—and the need for 108 members at Stormont with little to occupy themselves will increasingly be very hard to justify. The Review of Public Administration has played a straight bat and looked at things in terms of administrative coherence—but there’s no escaping that the NIO may feel that the proposals are, in the absence of anything else, a useful “Plan B” to the Agreement

Mark Langhammer April 2005

Ireland's Intelligentsia BITE (more) Air

Part 2 of a review of the guest appearance of the Abbey Theatre at the Barbican, London, with its production of *The Plough And The Stars*

“O’Casey’s searing political drama *The Plough and The Stars* is set at the time of the bloody Easter Rising of 1916, the seminal event in the progress towards an Irish state... Despite being on the bread line and fighting for survival, the characters ignite the play with their banter, humour and rancour until tragedy strikes and the full horror and waste of the fight for freedom is realised” (Promotional brochure for Abbey production, 2005).

On Thursday, 21st January, Graham Sheffield (Artistic Director, The Barbican) interviewed Ben Barnes, Director of The Abbey, and of its production of Sean O’Casey’s *The Plough*. Sheffield simply asked some questions and let Barnes get on with it, a good approach as Barnes is a very fluent speaker. He said a number of (discretely) interesting things: he was not a Dubliner, but came from Wexford (implying that he didn’t have standing objections to armed Risings?). He said London is the capital of “*a country at war*”, which surprised Sheffield. (*Private Eye* has a ‘Warballs’ column deriding any mention of the Iraq imbroglio, but the *Eye* has not had to get a caravanserai like the paraphernalia for *The Plough and the Stars* through Heathrow.) Barnes bemoaned the ‘blood sacrifice’ element in 1916: “*we have lived with the consequences of that ever since*”, and was echoed to the word, by Ruth Dudley Edwards, the following night. Unfortunately, Barnes and his contemporaries in the artistic field tend to take their bearings from academics, who have been pushing the ‘revisionist’ line for decades—many of them taking as their excuse the ‘Troubles’ of the North (for which there was sufficient reason within Northern Ireland).

Barnes’s production brings out all the problems in *The Plough*. Admittedly, it is not a ‘well-made play’, the first and last two sets of Acts are out of ‘sync’ with each other. Barnes decided that O’Casey was already partially into his ‘expressionist’ phase, and the scenes where Nora (the would-be genteel wife of Irish Citizen Army officer Jack Clitheroe) in essence goes mad are overwrought. In the Programme write-up about O’Casey it was said that he played a part in Dion Boucicault’s *Con the Shaughran*, a fabulously successful play that only fell out of favour in Ireland in the 1960s. (It

was successfully staged in London ten years ago.) Boucicault wrote a Victorian melodrama, but clearly struck a chord in audiences. Whether O’Casey will have a similar effect in the long run is questionable—neither part of his play is really convincing—the genuinely comic elements are probably in the Boucicault tradition.

The first section, building up to the Rising (or the appearance of the Figure in the Window—Pearse), is quite straightforward, if heavily distorted. This is a drama, not a social report, but all of the men, as Stephen Regan remarked, are “*buffoons*”. Some of the distortion must have been designedly provocative. For instance, there is no report of the ICA (Irish Citizen Army) or Volunteers cutting and running in Easter Week as the play suggests. England’s propaganda machine would have noised such a turn of events around the globe and back again. The GPO was vacated, under very heavy fire, because it was in flames. The audiences of the time—who we were invited to condemn, or feel superior to, in some of the discussions about the play staged at the Barbican—were veterans of these events, or were ‘Widows of Easter Week’.

The latter loomed large in the immediate aftermath of the Rising, not because of some ghoulish Catholic Irish obsession with death and widowhood, but because the men were interned. Internees included people who were not in the Volunteers or Citizen Army, but happened to be ‘advanced Nationalists’. One of these men, Herbert Pim (realising that dual-monarchist Sinn Féin, of which he had been a member for ten years, had been suborned by the IRB—Irish Republican Brotherhood—at the 1917 Convention) produced a *Hymn To The UVF* in early 1918! For all the hard labour of the revisionists, 1916 and all that was not a series of simple events.

Barnes described the men in the play as being “*used in this rising*” (as opposed to other risings?); and declared that Jack Clitheroe’s “*real affinity*” (admittedly in the character Nora’s eyes) “*should be to her and family...*”. The problem with this assertion is that the actual alternative for a working class man to the socialist ICA (made up of volunteers) was an imperial uniform. He added that “*very many people resented the Rising*”, but, by the same

token, a great many people did not resent the Rising, and the Volunteers were welcomed home from Internment, if not as heroes and prophets, at least as gallant fighters. And the authorities were so intent on getting Irishmen into imperial uniform that they gave the, now Republican, Sinn Féin party the gift of a campaign against Conscription.

If these matters are not factored in to the production of such a deeply political play, it simply distorts it into a cartoonish caricature, or more of a cartoonish caricature than it is on the face of things. Barnes said he took an operatic approach to the play: Nora’s ‘mad scene’ reminded me of elements in the ballet *Giselle*. It went on too long. (Cathy Belton made a good fist of it that night but somebody’s mobile phone unfortunately went off at the crucial moment.)

The first *Talking Heads* session involved Stephen Regan, Terence Brown, and Ruth Dudley Edwards—Regan is newly appointed Professor of English at Durham, “*specialising in Modern Irish literature*” (according to Brown who is at Trinity College, Dublin, and was the Chair of the session). As nobody had encountered the piece of paper with the information about these discussions on it, I held up my hand to suggest that Brown introduce himself. He appeared not to see me, but he did not ‘see’ me the next three times I held up my hand.

Regan was under the impression that he was discussing literature. (I got the impression that he was not an habitu  of the theatre, a bit of a disadvantage in discussing such a ramshackle play, or drama in general.) He has a ‘neutral’ English accent and was quite interesting, and clearly bamboozled by the fact that the political aspect of this play, dating from 1926, is still ‘live’. He talked about the “*play as play*”, mentioning “*cartoon effects*” attacking “*vainglorious, nationalist politics*”. (The only real alternative in 1916 was vainglorious imperialist politics. Witness the off-hand killing of the pacifist Sheehy-Skeffington. And witness the fact that his killer, Colthurst-Bowen was declared ‘insane’, served two years incarceration, and died in his bed in Canada in the 1920s).

Regan was not grinding a political axe, the other speakers were. Ruth Dudley Edwards, disingenuously introduced by Terence Brown as the author of a “*brave*” biography of Pearse, being particularly shrill. She attacked the whole myth of Easter Week, and described the Widows of Easter Week, who disrupted with others the play’s premiere performances, as

“hand maidens” who “had to adopt the cause for which they [surely their men-folk?—SMcG] died”. This must be the first time Hanna Sheehy-Skeffington has been described as being anybody’s ‘hand maiden’ or patsy. Her husband was a hard-line pacifist, thus very different from the Pearses’ mother and Connolly’s daughter. ‘Widow’ was stretched a very long way. Possibly Dudley Edwards hoped that the audience was made up of students susceptible to the ‘revisionist’ message. But it was not put across particularly well on this occasion. Both Brown and Dudley Edwards told Regan that we were meant to laugh “with” Fluther Good. They were very emphatic about it. Regan was clearly puzzled, as was the audience. He had suggested that we were meant to “laugh at” Fluther Good and Peter Flynn, the gorgeously-uniformed uncle of Nora Clitheroe.

Fluther is pictured as a ‘public house Republican’, especially during the speech by the Figure in the Window, who speaks a number of lines taken from Pearse’s speeches and writings over the period prior to Easter Week, especially the ‘blood sacrifice’ element. The production has two different people performing this role—in Hitlerian mode. The accusations of ‘fascism’ hinted at by the ‘revisionists’ bears some strange fruit here. We get distorted feedback, as from electronic megaphones, reminiscent of those (doctored) films shown on telly featuring Hitler. But such things were not available in 1916. The shadow of the Figure in the Window is *Nosferatu*-like, squat and long-taloned. The effect was comic rather than sinister, as was the plummy voice adopted by the actor. Pearse was a middle-class Dubliner of a period when Irish people spoke in the tongue of their own region or Province: bourgeois north Germans derided Hitler for his plebeian, Austrian, accent.

Clitheroe and another Citizen Army man, Brennan, and their Volunteer friend Lieutenant Langdon, celebrate the speech by throwing their glasses (as in drinking vessels) through handy windows. Whatever point was being made here, (and a point *was* being made, by O’Casey and by Ben Barnes) escaped me: possibly childishness was being hinted at. Earlier in the play-script, Clitheroe was shown as being jealous of Brennan because the latter got a Captainship and he did not. He is at this demonstration because “*Commandant General Connolly*” appointed him a Captain. Nora had opened, and hidden, the letter with the details of this promotion.

A ‘voice-off’, presumably Connolly’s, orders the “*First Dublin Battalion, Irish Citizen Army*” to “*quick march*”. Connolly was anything but a fantasist, he did not have battalions at his disposal, and

the ICA did not really exist outside of Dublin.

Stephen Regan said Yeats had a hand in the composition of *The Plough*, which may explain some of the openly provocative elements in it. O’Casey was Secretary of the ICA and knew Connolly, and knew that Connolly (a former Private in the British Army) was not prone to fantasy. Possibly O’Casey was. He seems to have wanted the ICA to launch out on its own: a genuine, and totally pointless, ‘blood sacrifice’.

As regards opposition to the play, Regan claimed that Yeats had his famous “*You have disgraced yourselves again...*” speech from the stage prepared well in advance, and nipped round to the *Irish Times* office with a typescript ready for the next day’s edition.

Dudley Edwards and Brown expressed—dismay is not strong enough a word, genuine anger, is better—at such a point being made, though they could not refute it. Regan seemed to find the fact amusing, in the sense that any publicity is better than no publicity. He was introduced to the bitter political reality of this matter 79 years on! The fact is that *The Plough* and Yeats’s speech were a convergence of two opposing sets of objections to the new Irish Free State. O’Casey, the simple-minded Socialist (later Stalinist), yearned for a proto-Bolshevik 1916. Yeats felt pseudo-aristocratic, quasi-Fascistic contempt for the plain bourgeois Republic-in-all-but-name, Saorstát—despite the fact that the same Saorstát was excessively kind to him, making him a Senator and putting him on all manner of Boards and Committees.

It was at this point that Dudley Edwards said that “*1916 was bad*”, though that cannot convey the actual emphasis: it was more like “*Nineteen Sixteen WAS BAD!*” Shortly after this the audience was asked to participate, I was ignored. The first speaker expressed a fairly raw Republican viewpoint. He said that O’Casey was interesting in that the ‘Irish Renaissance’ tended to be made up of middle class Protestants and working class Catholics. And O’Casey was a working class Protestant—not to mention a Socialist and a Republican. This man went out of his way to rebut everything Dudley Edwards had said about 1916. His grandfather was a volunteer in the Citizen Army and was a militant in the IT&G, and he was proud of those facts. It was only afterwards that it struck me that he was probably saying that *he* was a working class Dublin Protestant and Socialist-Republican. Stephen Regan nodded in agreement at the first part of this intervention. He nodded as vigorously when the speaker went on to defend “*1916*”. Someone in the audience applauded this intervention. One got the

impression that the non-Irish in the audience were confused by the fact that 1916 and the foundation of the Irish State was a matter for debate in the twenty-first century.

Dudley Edwards and Terence Brown (who has an easy-going attitude to the concept ‘chairman’) had to accept the fact that they lost this particular round of the battle to make the Irish embarrassed about fighting for their political freedom. (The term ‘technical knockout’ would cover the situation nicely.) Brown did mention the fact that 1916 was the “*foundational myth*” of the Irish State, and suggested that the Rev. Shaw SJ’s essay of 1971 (written in 1966), was the beginning of ‘revisionism’. Which it was: in the sense of rubbishing the Rising. (G.A. Hayes-McCoy of the Military History Society of Ireland was quite capable, in the mid-1970s, of pointing out that the insurgents in Wexford in 1798 were better armed than the Crown forces, without feeling the need to sneer at the rebels).

To be fair to Professor Brown, he mentioned Séamus Deane’s book *Celtic Twilight*, a fairly feeble counterblast at ‘revisionism’—presumably the feebleness was what recommended it to him. He also echoed something Ben Barnes said, to the effect that the Abbey was the first national theatre “*in the world*” to receive a State subsidy. Surely the Soviet State, with Lunacharsky as Minister of Culture, heavily subsidised theatres in their scores if not hundreds? The Palaces of Culture in eastern Europe (the erstwhile ‘Soviet Bloc’), much sneered-at in the 1950s, mostly dated from the Hapsburg period (presumably set up by Lueger and his ilk). It may be true to say that these things were not *national* theatres, but municipal, regional and provincial, though they mostly had full professional staffs and ensembles (something else sneered at in the good old days—these people were mere ‘civil servants’!)

I came to the slightly glum conclusion that Barnes and Brown meant the ‘English-speaking world’, in making their claim. And that the English-speaking world actually means England, to the exclusion of nearly all of the vital bits of the English-speaking world. The USA is the heartland of English-language culture and has been since, at least, the 1920s. And Australia has been producing ‘cultural product’ that is interesting since the 1950s. ‘Revisionism’ as put forward by Ruth Dudley Edwards and Terence Brown really seems to be a form of nostalgia for Imperial England, but the latter has settled down into being a particularly obedient satellite of the USA.

Seán McGouran

To Be Continued

Shorts

The Orange Order & the Reform Movement

The Dublin and Wicklow District of the Orange Order website has some interesting information on the Reform Movement. The Reform Movement is the group which last September had a well publicised meeting in the Mansion House addressed by former Taoiseach, John Bruton. The following is an extract from the Order's website:

"In 1996 some members of the institution along with others got together to form the non-denominational Reform Movement, which was launched in 1998. Once again members of the Orange Institution in the Republic, co-operating with others, were the first to re enter the political arena since independence. The Reform Movement represents all those who regard themselves as British.Irish, descendants of the old southern Unionist tradition, Redmondite and post Nationalist. Along with others we are actively promoting greater integration within these Islands; we would argue that the Republic of Ireland rejoins the Commonwealth of nations."

We just thought readers would like to know! (More on this subject can be found in the current issue of Church & State (Spring 2005). Ed.)

Syria and Lebanon

The situation in the Lebanon following the assassination of Rafic Hariri is very serious. It has enabled the USA with the support of France to interfere its internal affairs. UN resolution 1559 requiring the withdrawal of Syrian forces is not a positive development. It risks disrupting the fragile balance of forces in that divided country.

The Hezbollah mobilised hundreds of thousands on the streets of Beirut to oppose Syrian withdrawal. This group represents the Shia Muslim minority in Lebanon and conducted a military campaign to push Israeli forces out of South Lebanon, which happened in 2000.

It is very clear that the US is up to no good in the region. Its objective is to isolate Iran and as a preliminary to weaken Iran's allies in the region: Syria and the Hezbollah.

The role of France in all this is very disappointing. It appears to have abandoned its independent foreign policy in the last year and is anxious to develop more friendly relations with the United States even if this further destabilizes the Middle East.

France's Patron Saint (1905-1980)

This year is the centenary of Jean Paul Sartre's birth. He believed that existence

precedes being; that what we are is what we do; and that we have the choice "to do".

Was he the greatest philosopher of the twentieth century? It is impossible to say. He admitted that many of his ideas came from Heidegger.

But to the French he represented philosophy come down from on high and living in the world. He was philosophy made flesh: the toad who became a prince, the man with the bottle glasses who loved Simone de Beauvoir; who proclaimed his solidarity with striking baggage handlers; who opposed French Imperialism in Algeria; whose house was blown up twice by OAS fascists; who said "*every anti-communist is a dog*"; who refused the Nobel Prize for literature because since the Algerian war had ended it was of no use to the world; who braved ridicule and addressed striking Renault factory workers from the top of a barrel.

France's Patron Saint!

The Spirit of the Good Friday Agreement

The IRA's recent statements on the McCartney killing are interesting. It has indicated that it was prepared to shoot those responsible for the murder. The McCartney family has requested it not to and it has acceded. Instead it has urged all those with information to make it available.

The IRA has never accepted the British presence in Northern Ireland. Neither has a significant proportion of the Nationalist population. The problem with not recognising the state and also not having a state of your own is that it is difficult to control anti social behaviour within your own community. Prison is not an option. Therefore punishment beatings, shootings and killings are the only means of ensuring order.

The recent IRA statements indicate an accommodation with the British State, very much in the spirit of the Good Friday Agreement.

Irish Times & Debate

Mary Raftery, in an article on the Bolkestein Directive, says the following:

"That any serious debate on this should have passed Ireland by is a poor reflection on a Government which will shortly be expecting us to march, sheep-like, into the polls to pass another piece of EU legislation—its new constitution" (*The Irish Times*, 10.3.05).

Leaving aside the question of whether the proposed Constitution can be described accurately as a "piece of legislation", it is amazing that she considers the responsibility for political debate to rest with the Government. Not for the first time we ask ourselves: is there an independent press in this country? Raftery seems to think that if the Government doesn't initiate a debate, there will be no debate. She may be right, but we don't expect such an open admission of the fact from a journalist.

Could it be that the real reason there is

debate in Continental Europe and none here is that in Continental Europe there is still such a thing as "journalism" whereas in this country we have only "hacks"?

McDowell and Mandela

A few years ago the English comedian Ricky Gervaise said that prison was a good deterrent because when Nelson Mandela was released he didn't re-offend.

A lot of people like Gervaise's "cringe" inducing humour. But when Michael McDowell declared that Bobby Sands was a criminal no one laughed. He was quite serious. It would be interesting to know whether our justice minister regards Mandela as an "ex con". If Mandela was not a criminal, what distinguishes Mandela's lawbreaking from that of Sands?

Bolkestein in France

The author of the notorious EU Services Directive made a visit to Paris in April. Fritz Bolkestein has a holiday home in Maubeuge in Northern France and he suggested that maybe it would be a good thing if there was an influx of Polish plumbers because he couldn't find any when he was on his holidays. This heartrending situation prompted an inspirational suggestion from the socialist mayor of that small town: "have you tried the yellow pages?" Apparently, there are 13 French plumbers in that small area.

But maybe this misses the point. Perhaps Fritz prefers to pay Polish rather than French rates.

Prince Rainier Dies

So the old rogue finally snuffed it within days of the Pope's death. What can be said about Monaco? The principality conspired with the Nazis during the Occupation of France and continues to facilitate money laundering. The marriage of Grace Kelly, which was arranged by the American mafia, gave a glamorous façade to the sordid economic edifice.

De Gaulle was right. The whole operation should be closed down.

The Greatest Frenchman

And De Gaulle was voted the greatest by French television viewers. A similar poll in Britain voted Churchill the greatest Briton and the Germans voted for Adenauer. Adenauer and De Gaulle shaped the post war era in their respective countries, while Churchill's influence on post war Britain was negligible.

The French poll threw up the usual absurdities. The tennis player and rock singer Yannick Noah finished ahead of the well known goalkeeper and writer Albert Camus. Brigitte Bardot was considered greater than Balzac and Maupassant.

But then again, who can say for certain that natural physical beauty is of less value than that which is crafted by great intellects?

Art And Poetry:

Two Reviews

Editorial Note: Rarely are we delighted to reprint an extract from the *Irish Times* but the following review by Luke Dodd deserves to be up in lights. We note that this piece is not reproduced in the electronic version of the *Irish Times*, the self-proclaimed 'journal of record'. This is regrettable as it sums up Roy Foster for the sham that he is.

REPORT: A Review of *Conquering England*, National Portrait Gallery, London

"*Conquering England*, curated by Roy Foster and Fintan Cullen, is an attempt to use the collections of the National Portrait Gallery in London (and loans from other institutions) to explore "the cultural and political diversity of the Irish presence in London" during the reign of Victoria, through visual representations of the key players. The players in question are members of the burgeoning middle class which emerged in post-Famine Ireland, who emigrated to London or spent significant time there, and includes O'Connell, Parnell, Years, Wilde, Boucicault, Carson, Shaw, Lecky, Maclise, etc.

"Despite the familiar nature of the subject matter, the illustrative material on which the exhibition is based is not particularly well-known and largely ephemeral—photographs, sketches, caricatures, and prints. Material such as this requires a large degree of contextualisation to impose a narrative on it. As is usually the case, representations of, or by, the Irish in England can rarely be taken at face value. The emigrant experience is very particular. It involves dislocation, a posture, a wariness, in the case of the Irish experience in England, it sometimes allowed a large degree of personal license.

"One of the great difficulties of the exhibition and catalogue is the attempt to lump together the exploits and influence of very diverse professions—politicians, artists, artists' models, writers, journalists. For example, none of the artists included in the show come close to the achievements of some of the literary figures. This difficulty is further compounded by a striking ahistoricism which is, presumably, intended. Scant reference is made to the massive exodus of Irish people to England, the historical context which had brought it about, and the general hostility toward the Irish which this exodus generated. The subjects of this exhibition were not pioneers—they only make sense in the context of a much larger experience. To be fair, the exhibition space is limited and the curators are explicit about the narrowness of their focus. But the picture that emerges is cosy to the point of blandness.

"References to the Union between Ireland and England are rare, its blatant inequality is ignored—the only reference to Ireland's colonial status is made by the Director of the NPG, Sandy Nairne, in his introduction to the catalogue. The Famine is represented by a single painting—Robert George Kelly's *An Ejection in Ireland* from 1847-8—although more than any other event, it led to the

growing dominance of a native middle class in the latter half of the 19th century (not to mention the obliteration of half the population through death and emigration between 1840 and 1850, and the crystallisation of the centuries-old grievance against England).

"Similarly, the wealth of overtly racist images of Irish people from the 18th century onward is sidestepped even where they exist for some of the key individuals in the exhibition. An 1835 print of Daniel O'Connell with two Irish Whig politicians by John Doyle has been included.

"Would the context not have been greatly enriched by its juxtaposition alongside McLean's 1829 broadsheet entitled *A Sketch of the Great Agi Tater* showing O'Connell as a bloated potato tuber urinating through an orifice entitled the "pope's eye" onto "Protestant Ground"? It's not that caricature is excluded—a Beerbohm watercolour from 1904 pokes fun at a foppish Yeats and befuddled Moore—but where it is included, the focus is decidedly soft.

"In a passage as insensitive as it is archaic, the catalogue refers to "the Irish penchant for street vending in the capital" in the context of a number of women who were discovered by artists while working as street sellers. The word "penchant" hardly conveys the dire poverty which characterised the lives of this underclass. Similarly, the language used to describe the models themselves in some instances perpetuates the stereotypical and patronising tone of contemporary accounts. Cullen writes of Julia Margaret Cameron's portraits of Mary Ryan, in terms of her "transformation of an exiled vagrant into an angelic beauty". One is reminded of de Valera's image of "comely maidens"!

"Cullen also refers to Kathleen Newton who modelled for Tissot as "the product of an Irish Catholic upbringing" and "convent-educated", seeming to assume that her background somehow precluded her transgressiveness. The curators fail to recognise that rescuing these women from obscurity only to re-cast them as muse, mistress or wife is a far cry from giving them a voice.

"A great deal might be revealed if all the elements of this exhibition minus the captions and catalogue were re-made elsewhere using two different curators with different political perspectives. I'm not saying that a different approach to the material would be any truer—material of this sort is amenable to any number of interpretations. However, a firm historical context and some degree of sensitivity to the representation of women would be fundamental starting points."

(*Irish Times* 18.3.05)

The second Report concerns a meeting in Cork by one of Foster's acolytes, Bernard O'Donoghue. It indicates that he is losing his way in his efforts to emulate his guru.

The Annual Yeats Lecture,
UCC 18th March 2005.

Yeats, The Love-Poet

"There is no doubt that, in the Western European literary tradition, it is decidedly against a poet's interests to descend to the political, in our era at least...."

(Involved Imaginings: Tom Paulin by Bernard O'Donoghue, p171 in *The Chosen Ground, Essays on the Contemporary Poetry of Northern Ireland*. Edited by Neil Corcoran, Wales, 1992.)

This year the Yeats lecture was incorporated into the George Moore Conference and was given by Professor Bernard O'Donoghue, Oxford. There was initial talk of the Professor's paper being about *Yeats And George Moore*. Given the occasion but for some reason this was dropped. It was finally given as *Yeats the Love-Poet* and that was a loss because it would have made for interesting listening to hear what O'Donoghue would have made of the Yeats/Moore association. As we assembled in Boole 2 at 2.30 p.m. after registering for the Conference, which was to run from the 18th—20th March, word came through that our speaker was circling over Cork and was unable to land due to fog. After an hour of this, the plane was diverted to Shannon and the Professor was ferried with due speed and arrived hastily, driven, as he later told us by a very kind man, Mr. O'Leary from Leap. John Fitzgerald, the Boole Librarian updated us from time to time about the whereabouts of our lecturer and we were given tea/coffee while we waited.

Mr. Fitzgerald also told us that this was the third lecture in the Annual Yeats series, which was sponsored by the ESB. Warwick Gould and Roy Foster had given the former two lectures and now our third lecturer in this series was a man from Cullen, Co. Cork who had moved to Oxford. He was also a poet himself with several major collections to his credit and had been awarded the Poetry Book Section Choice. (Fitzgerald neglected to inform the audience that O'Donoghue won the Whitbread Prize for his collection *Gunpowder* in 1995 and has since been shortlisted for the prestigious T.S. Eliot prize amongst others.) Fitzgerald told us that O'Donoghue had been published in the *London Review of Books* and the *Irish Times* and was a notable scholar in Medieval English and was a Director of the Yeats Summer School in Sligo. O'Donoghue's scholarly profile is again more

extensive than Fitzgerald concedes. He is a renowned lecturer in Old and Middle English Language and Literature and the History Use and Theory of the English Language in Wadham College where he is also the Warden.

The Professor began by thanking us all for our forbearance in waiting and by recounting his experience in modern air-travel, which everyone seemed to empathise with. He went on to say how honoured he was to be taking part in these prestigious lectures at UCC, following in the footsteps of the great Warwick Gould and Roy Foster. In a folksy way he recounted that this was the college where all his sisters studied and where he himself could have gone except he left the country in 1962. He had however studied for a year in Presentation College and spoke movingly of the great spell effected on him by his teacher there—the great Dan Donovan. Such was the latter's effect on him that his initial intention of studying engineering fell by the wayside as he found himself drawn more and more to Literature.

O'Donoghue intended to focus on Yeats's love poetry and Yeats as lover and therefore would be investigating the rather "private" Yeats rather than the "public" one. He said that this aspect of Yeats is neglected or sidelined in favour of the great "public Yeats"—but he quickly praised Roy Foster's "magisterial biography". Yeats had many themes for his poetry, the occult being very prominent, and then of course his great poems on old age, sickness, and exile—all put him in the foremost ranks of poets of the English language.

Yeats's great unrequited love was Maud Gonne—Love being one of the classic themes of poetry like Birds and Religion (Audience laughter). Elizabeth Butler Cullingford—a former Director of the Yeats Summer School—rather insisted on the issue of gender but for O'Donoghue the love poems were more important. A.N. Jeffares was one scholar who had written on this theme of what O'Donoghue was to subsequently term "courtly love poetry". But for the speaker what was really important about these poems was the "particularist" in them. *Prayer For My Daughter* might be thought unusual for a love poem, even surprising for an obvious reason but it was definitely constituted as a "medieval love poem".

Maud Gonne was Yeats's inamorata. Plutarch had Laura, Dante had Beatrice, and Keats had Fanny Bryce. But we didn't know anything about them; we don't know, for example, how big their heads were, so we were missing that "particularising aspect" that Yeats had supplied.

At the beginning of the lecture the

Professor had given leaflets to John Fitzgerald to distribute among the audience. On the A4 sheet were ten of the love poems by Yeats and now he referred to one of them, *Broken Dreams* (1915). He proceeded to read from the poem about Gonne's "small hands", a perfect example of the particularist in Yeats. What struck me was O'Donoghue's reading of the poem. He is a superb reader of poems—being a poet himself—yet he merely read the lines so *mundanely* as though they were mere ingredients in a food recipe.

The Spur was a poem addressed to another lover, Dorothy Wellesley and showed a survival of lasciviousness/lust into his old age. But Bernard O'Donoghue wished to address the fact that Maud Gonne had got written out as a major presence in the poetry of Yeats. She was a classic version of a classic presence, from the troubadours to present day for this love-lorn poet, this unrequited lover. His approach could be seen as "sexual harassment" in modern times. (Very little audience laughter here at the Professor's lame attempt at humour.)

From the 19th century to modern era, from Fay Weldon to Flaubert's Madame Bovary and Thomas Hardy's *The Well-Beloved*, we could see a tendency to fall in love with the unattainable. Arranged marriage was seen as a better business. But why set out to look for the object of unattainable love—the answer was "courtly love", "individual passion"—the modern word for it was "desire". He also alluded here to C.S. Lewis in 1932 and the Provincial troubadours of 12th century. (Though I would have thought it more interesting if he had acknowledged Lewis's reading of metaphor, relating it to Yeats's line, "wisdom speaks first in images", see *The Poetic Image* by C.S. Lewis. Jonathan Cape, London, 1947, p25).

All spoke of the pain of love and this was at its most compelling in *The Tower*. Yeats proposed to Maud Gonne in 1902 and famously wrote that "the troubling of my life began in 1884". O'Donoghue also referred to C.S. Lewis and "adultery"—another requisite for courtly love, though he didn't use this word with regards to Yeats. (He could have added that the writer Rosamond Lehmann, Lewis' lover for some nine years might quibble with the "courtly" part of his description as she never recovered from his betrayal of her with Jill Balcon. Of course Lehmann herself had affairs as did all the Bloomsbury set, though even they would never have had the effrontery to call their sexual doings and dallyings "courtly")

Love poetry was a Middle Eastern convention from Arabia. But this didn't suit the West; passion was inimicable to the formulation of good society and family. O'Donoghue theorised that writing love

poetry was in itself a kind of cure. Illicit love doomed by social edict. Fidelity was no reward at the cost of sexual fulfilment as James Joyce made abundantly clear, a man full of rage and lust.

Yeats referred to medieval romance but Christian peace and domestic beauty were not in Yeats's poetry. The hero of the German epic *Parsifal* prayed to his lover, not to God/Our Lady and this appealed to Yeats—to drink only the love potion. (I would think from what I know of *Parsifal* from Wagner's opera of that name that O'Donoghue is quite wrong about that epic as Mike Ashman makes clear: "*Pace* generations of (mostly British) critical opinion, *Parsifal* is not a 'religious or 'Christian' work", see *Parsifal*. Richard Wagner. John Calder. London. 1986.) O'Donoghue instanced Yeats's poem *Adam's Curse* and again the Professor read in a *leaden* way:

"I had a thought for no one's by your ears:
That you were beautiful, and that I strove

To love you in the old high way of love;"
This poem was written in 1902 after Gonne had refused to marry the poet. So courtly love becomes important for Yeats, who sees in himself a heretic, but also a figure of refinement and nobility. (G. Moore would have laughed at such Yeatsian delusions of nobility and indeed he did.)

O'Donoghue then talked of Constance Gore-Booth and *sotto voce* called her Countess Markievicz. But bizarrely he just mentioned her, promising to come back to her. He never did, and this happened a couple of times and always about the most interesting and political matters. There was a strong feeling that O'Donoghue was 'losing it' and incoherence had set in.

As O'Donoghue dilated about Maud Gonne and her presence in the poetry of Yeats, there was a bit of a commotion in the lecture theatre. One by hesitant one, a number of young people, some in school uniforms, began to get up and the slap of the upturning seats echoed throughout the room. Then gathering pace, a number of students and others left the lecture much to the bewilderment of the rest of us, not to mind the Professor himself. But I don't think that some of the audience were surprised that others wanted to leave at this point, or at any point. After O'Donoghue had finished his lecture, a smiling John Fitzgerald told us all that the young people had come up from a school in Cobh and had to leave to get their train back home. I could not blame for choosing their train rather than this lecture. Amongst many professors and fellow lecturers during the following days, there was much anger over the way this incident occurred. As I watched a grinning Colbert Kearney, Professor of English who mounted the stage to chair the Q & A session after O'Donoghue's lecture, I sensed an academic

jealousy being played out.

But the Oxford academic went on speaking of Jung and the way Yeats transmuted his love for Gonne into love for a kind of angel—this was a very medieval thing, but then ‘medievalism was in the air’. English tradition from the 12th century onwards became the archetype for all subsequent love poetry. Pre-Raphaelite poems, A.E. Houseman, influenced Yeats. *Joy* was one of the most frequently recurring words in his poetry.

Then came a reading from *Vacillation* (1931-32). Though Yeats had an affair with Olivia Shakespear, Gonne always remained in Yeats’s heart. Conor Cruise O’Brien wrote a “great essay”, *Passion And Cunning: An Essay On The Politics of W.B. Yeats*. Yeats could be quite calculating, as O’Brien points out, and this was important. O’Donoghue thought O’Brien was King Mark to Yeats’s Tristan.

The Gonne, in *When You Are Old* (1891), has a classic presence. Yeats maintained that the first four lines were not a translation—though O’Donoghue argued that they were clearly from Ronsard. Elizabeth Butler Cullingford called that type of attention “sexual bullying”, but one couldn’t have courtly bullying. John MacBride was the one who falsely loved Maud Gonne, according to Yeats, and so there were no prizes for guessing who was the “true lover”. True love loves the “pilgrim soul”—not the yellow hair, sexually.

Professor O’Donoghue put forward two propositions:

1. The political application of Yeats’s ideas derived from Courtly Love and this was his idea of the world.

2. Maud Gonne was a real “presence” in the poetry: she broke into his later years with a great shock.

Cyril Cusack’s voice reading *Broken Dreams* was very memorable for Bernard O’Donoghue. Yeats was 50 when he wrote that poem in 1915. Maud Gonne retained her power—the poem *Her Praise* has classic kind of love—her hands old, passion versus society. The courtly love lady was individualised and identified in Yeats—she was a “complete woman”. And this, according to O’Donoghue, was Yeats’s most remarkable and unique achievement and he asserted that it was slightly written out of the Yeatsian tradition.

A Q&A Session followed, chaired by Professor Colbert Kearney. As a lot of people left the lecture at this juncture, a second exodus, it was difficult to hear what was going on.

A young man who asked a question at the beginning on the significance of courtly love for Yeats, challenging the whole basis of the lecture. O’Donoghue quite

clearly was unable to answer it—and said so—which came as a shock to many.

Q: Did Maud Gonne reflect Yeats’s politics?

A: (Due to the noise I didn’t catch all the answer) More extreme and individual politics are involved with Yeats.

Q: Yeats was Gonne’s love?

A: Up to 1980 it was thought in scholarship that Yeats was sex-starved but he was doing very well. He was an advocate of physical love as well.

Q: Could you explain the lines from *Broken Dreams* beginning with “Your small hands were not beautiful...?”

A: (Silence) Pause while the Professor looked perplexed by this American woman’s question. He didn’t seem to want to be nasty but well the words are—self-explanatory—and he said quite kindly words to this effect and that people become obsessed by their imperfections and perhaps Yeats was so obsessed.

Q: You didn’t mention “romantic”?

A: (Long silence while Professor Kearney looked jolly.) Well... It was the “courtly love tradition” but the romantic poets do not name the object. (This seemed very lame indeed.)

Looking over these notes, did O’Donoghue substantiate his theory that Yeats innovated by particularising, whilst remaining in the courtly tradition? I would have to answer “no”. Just a quick scan of courtly love poetry reveals that “particularising” was quite common. The troubadour Bernard de Ventadour’s verses addressed to Eleanor of Aquitaine were full of it:

“Ah, my good and longed-for beloved, with well formed figure sweet and slender, with fresh, pretty coloured skin...”

Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde* also had this aspect of the particular:

“Hertender arms, her back full straight and soft,
Her slender flanks, all fleshy, smooth and white.....
Her snowy throat, her breasts full round and light”.

But to suggest, as O’Donoghue does, that Gonne has been written out of commentary on Yeats’s poetry is just wrong. In 1971, A. Norman Jeffares wrote a book on W.B. Yeats (published by Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. London) in which he devotes a chapter to *Yeats as Love Poet*. There is no suggestion of the “courtly love” tradition however. Terry Eagleton in the *Field Day* pamphlet *Crazy John and the Bishop* (CUP, 1998) gives a powerful, masterly reading of Gonne in the poetry of Yeats (see in particular pages 290-291 where he is profoundly at odds with what O’Donoghue says). And Roy Foster himself acknowledges that the great Richard Ellman biography of the poet, *The Man And The Masks*, centralised

intentionally the presence of Gonne and her effect on his work. All the biographers do likewise, some more than the others. So how can O’Donoghue assert that Gonne has been excised from the poet’s life? What indeed was all this brouhaha about “courtly love”?

Could the answer lie in O’Donoghue’s own words quoted at the beginning of this review in an almost forgotten essay? As a disciple/acolyte of Roy Foster, O’Donoghue has political baggage whether he likes it or not, but it is the type of baggage that drags him into an intellectual cul de sac. He seems a good man fallen among revisionists and a sorry sight if this lecture was anything to go by. The ESB should see the light and not waste our money on any more of this intellectual meandering.

Michael Stack

Letter to Editor

Kennedy at Chappaquiddick

The *Irish Political Review / The Northern Star*, April 2005, page 5, made a brief reference to the Senator Edward Kennedy / Chappaquiddick, Massachusetts, USA, July 18-19, 1969 incident, in which Mary Jo Kopechne drowned in his upside-down car that had entered the water from the side of Dike Bridge. The reference included the assertion that Edward Kennedy was the driver of the car.

In Edward Kennedy’s statement to the police he said that he was the driver. However, several years ago I saw a television documentary that suggested that this may not have been the case and that Kennedy might have exited the car a distance before the bridge, leaving it to be driven by a drunken Kopechne. The proposed reason for Kennedy leaving the car was that they were being followed by the police and he did not want to risk a traffic stop and possible subsequent scandal of him, as a married man and US senator, being found alone with a woman in a car late at night.

Kennedy admitted to leaving the scene and only contacting the police later in the day. He said that he did not contact the police at the time because he was in shock. He denied seeing nearby houses where he could have gone to for help, one of which he had passed 150 yards before the accident.

One might speculate whether Kennedy would have ever gone to the police if were not for the fact that his ownership of the car tied him to the death.

<http://www.ytedk.com>, an Internet site for “Everything You Ever Wanted to Know About Ted Kennedy”. This site contains extensive coverage of the circumstances surrounding the infamous accident at Chappaquiddick”, quotes Detective Bernie Flynn as saying that Kennedy was fleeing a policeman (though he thinks that Kennedy was driving when the car hit the water). Rather than reporting the accident immediately to the police, Kennedy got two lawyer friends to help him try and rescue

Kopechne from the car. Kennedy used lawyer-client privilege to prevent them from giving any information to authorities.

The story crosses time and space, and could be true of any place on any occasion: a child, who has received much help in the past from a powerful parent, does not take responsibility for their actions.

I saw a similar story related several years ago in the newspaper US Today. A wayward son of a brewing family, had an accident in an open top car, with a waitress, who was the only passenger, being thrown from his car and killed. The drunk son did not call the police. He called his father's lawyer, who in turn called the police. He refused to provide information to the police, and would not even admit that he was driving (as opposed to being the passenger, with the girl driving). He was never charged.

The Real McCoy, USA

Ulster's Hope, or The New Gerrymander

It has been mentioned in this publication that old Communist habits die hard. The successor bodies to the ex-Soviet Bloc Communist Parties have sometimes won elections fair and square—but lost them because they'd cheated. The Ulster Unionists were very fond of sometimes pointless bits of gerrymandering. As late as 1968 the Lord Mayor of Belfast a man called Allen, who had a Dublin accent, boasted that they had succeeded in gerrymandering Belfast's boundaries. This was at a big, televised, municipal bean-feast, which was only attended by Unionists in those halcyon days. He seemed surprised to be asked if this was the best way to run a democratic city. And the Labour Party had been caught red-handed attempting to do the same on London!

What the Unionists were up to was refusing to extend the boundaries out to their natural limits. There would have been too many Taigs in Belfast, and they would have voted for—probably the NILP (Northern Ireland Labour Party), or possibly the Liberals. At the time, both these essentially 'let's-pretend' groups were making serious inroads into the Unionist vote, especially the NILP. Sinn Féin and the Hibernian Nationalist Party were nowhere, especially in Belfast. The now-defunct National Democrats were an attempt to blunt the edge of the Liberal challenge, in particular among the growing Catholic middle class. But they were not really very successful, as they had to acknowledge the reality of the Welfare State and the 1945 Education Act (they

were the products of them, after all).

The boundary of Belfast has not changed since then, and the city has turned 'Taig: the Catholics are not quite in a majority, but they now dominate the politics of the place. There have been a number of Catholic Mayors, even a Sinn Féin Mayor, and several Deputy Mayors. Yes, it's a long way from dear old David Bleakley and the other Lay Preachers of the NILP.

One reason why the Catholics dominate the politics of the town is, as Jude Collins put in in *Daily Ireland* (Thurs. 17.03.05), "...because a lot of Protestants, notably the well-heeled variety who once lived in the Malone Road area, couldn't stand the thought of having taig neighbours and moved out...". It is a point worth making, especially as the middle classes are always in a hurry to blame the plebs for any sectarian bad vibes.

Apparently there are plans to change this state of affairs. The Electoral Commission is devising a new Council

area with "nearly 400,000" people as opposed to the current less than 300,000. This would ensure that the Unionists will again dominate the city—and would enable them behave in the dog-in-a-manger manner everyone remembers from the days when they were in the ascendant.

According to Collins, the Electoral Commission is also making a mess of the constituency boundaries of the Assembly and Westminster seats in the interests of maintaining Unionist majorities. This will entail some very unfair differences in seat sizes; for instance, one of 20,000 people between South Belfast (currently a Sinn Féin possible seat within the next few years), and North Down. (The populations are to be 106,000 and 86,000 respectively.)

Collins asks why the SDLP and Sinn Féin are allowing this to happen—but it is surely more apposite to ask what the Westminster Government is doing allowing this to happen?

Seán McGouran

Conclusion

Review of *Das Kapital*, Part 12

There is a difference in tone between the first two volumes of *Capital* on the one hand and the third volume on the other. In Volume 1 the capitalist system is described as a system of exploitation. The worker is a wage slave but not in the same way as the slaves of ancient times. He enters freely into a contract with the capitalist.

However the freedom of the worker is limited by the conditions in which he finds himself. He does not have access to the means of production so he is forced into a contract with the capitalist, who does own the means of production. The capitalist takes advantage of the weak position of the worker to give him a subsistence wage. The value that the worker produces for the capitalist is greater than the value that the capitalist pays for his services. This is the source of the capitalist's profit. All value is created by the worker but a portion of that value is expropriated by the capitalist.

The unfavourable conditions in which the worker finds himself are not an accident, but the product of a long period of historical development. As discussed

in Part 4 in this series, for capitalism to develop, the majority of the population must be denied a means of subsistence and therefore be made available for exploitation by a capitalist class.

In all of this Marx points to a glaring contradiction in the system. On the one hand capitalism abolishes private production or production by the producer for his own private needs. It "socialises" production in the sense that production is produced for society. On the other hand, the ownership and control of production remains in private hands.

Volume 2 continues some of the themes of Volume 1 but Marx also shows how vulnerable the capitalist system is to crisis. In particular, it has difficulties in reproducing the means of production because of time lags between the expenditure of capital and the return of that capital in the form of sales revenue. This problem is exacerbated by the tendency of capitalism to centralise and concentrate capital. In order to increase the forces of production more and more capital is sunk into fixed capital. This causes periodic crises of

overproduction with the tendency for such crises to become more intense and frequent.

Having read the first two volumes of *Capital* the reader might have expected the third volume to develop some of the themes in the first two volumes. In particular, if he has also read the *Communist Manifesto* it would have been reasonable to assume that Volume 3 would have been a detailed working out of how the capitalist system was going to collapse and maybe some hints as to how Communists might hasten the process.

Maybe even Marx himself intended Volume 3 to be something along these lines. However much of his analysis in the third volume would not necessarily lead to this conclusion. While there is nothing in this volume that contradicts the other two volumes, he shows that there is more to the system than exploitation and instability.

While capitalism has a tendency for instability, it is also constantly trying to find a state of equilibrium. The centrifugal force of competition forces companies to constantly change to avoid going bankrupt. Such changes constantly prevent the system from settling down into an equilibrium state. The centripetal force of the average rate of profit prevents innovations which have no profitable social use from continuing to be produced. As explained in Part 8, production gravitates around the average social rate of profit. If a branch of production achieves a rate of profit above the average social rate, there will be an increase in the amount of social resources allocated to it. The opposite occurs if a branch of production has a rate of profit below the average social rate.

Marx described the Capitalist system as revolutionary. Its historic task is to increase the forces of production. In none of his writings is it suggested that, under a Communist society, the forces of production would continue to increase. On the contrary, the task of Communism was to take advantage of the capitalist forces of production to benefit society as a whole. (The problem for Russian Communists was that they had to perform the historic tasks of both Capitalism and Communism.)

In many ways Communism is a conservative philosophy (See *Sir Tony's Nightmare* by Jack Lane, *Irish Political Review*, November 2003). Communism seeks to end the disruption and instability

of Capitalism. Marx was quite vague as to how the transition would be made from Capitalism to Socialism, but in Chapter 27 of Volume 3 he indicated that the greater consolidation of trusts or joint stock companies had paved the way for the future expropriation by the whole of society. He also indicated that the development of monopolies would require greater state interference.

In my view Marx anticipated that competition in capitalism would eventually diminish as a result of the growth of monopolies. These monopolies would be more amenable to state interference in the working class interest than numerous different companies competing against each other. The transition to social ownership of the means of production would also be easier if there were a few large monopolies in different branches of industry.

At present in most countries in the developed world a significant portion of the state bureaucracy is dedicated to preventing the developments which Marx anticipated. The brief of "Competition Agencies" is to prevent anti-competitive practices. Such agencies have draconian powers, including the searching of the private homes of executives for evidence of collusion among competitors. Apparently, the right-wing supporters of these agencies believe that the free market cannot be trusted to be left to its own devices. It needs strong state intervention to ensure that it works in the way it is supposed to.

In my view such agencies do not act in the working class or consumer interest. They are ideologically-based and exist purely to ensure that the virtues of "competition" are maintained. Such agencies believe that it's okay to break up companies, with all the disruption that that causes to the livelihoods of those affected. It is also okay to ban low prices if such prices are below the costs of a competitor. Again this is done in the name of competition. In my view there is nothing wrong with the development of monopolies. Usually the monopolistic company has achieved that situation by being better than its competitors. Often a monopoly can benefit from economies of scale. The socialist response to these "natural developments" of capitalism should be to use the state to control prices, or to tax at a high rate, the profits which have resulted from the monopoly position. Competition legislation and the bureaucracies which accompany it should be

opposed.

There are errors in some of the details in Marx's analysis of capitalism. But in all the essentials Marx was correct. There are two insights of Marx which, if anything, are more relevant today than they were in his own time. The first insight is the idea that capitalism *socialised* production. The manufacturer of machines cannot exist in isolation from the manufacturer of consumer goods. What happens in one branch of industry affects another branch. These tendencies which were in their infancy in Marx's time are now much more pronounced. The second insight is the idea that capitalism has a tendency to *incorporate the world* into its system. The current word for this phenomenon is "*Globalisation*".

SOCIALISED PRODUCTION

Marx noticed that capitalism had the tendency to eliminate private production or production orientated towards satisfying the direct needs of the producer. Instead, production becomes orientated towards producing for society. But this "socialised" production is mediated through the market system. It is through the market that commodities are allocated to the consumers in society. In a sense, production is "*indirectly social*" because the commodities are not directly allocated to the consumers in society.

Marx was also aware that the various branches of production did not work in isolation from each other. In Volume 2 he tried to understand the relationship between the production of means of production (i.e. plant and machinery, raw materials etc) and the production of consumer goods (See Part 6 of this series). You will have to look long and hard to find even an attempt to deal with this issue in modern economics literature. But the connections between the various branches of production are now much more profound than in Marx's time. Also the connection between the final consumer and the production process is much closer.

Modern computer software incorporating the principles of "Enterprise Resource Planning" recognises that a company is composed of different departments which have to be co-ordinated. Also, the company's activities have to be co-ordinated with the activities of its suppliers and customers. While such software responds to new business practices, it also encourages greater links between companies in the supply chain and helps to standardise best management practice.

Such software necessitates a re-organisation of management structures. It is sometimes said that the benefit of purchasing such software is not so much the software itself but that it forces companies to re-examine their business processes and develop stronger links with their suppliers and customers. Such software has become so powerful, all-encompassing and complicated that it may not be practical for it to be used by one company, even one large multinational company. The tendency to centralise data in one place in a multinational company may be replaced by the centralisation of data across whole industries. There are many people who believe that there will be no Computer Departments in companies any more. The Chief Executive of Oracle believes that in future Computer facilities will be bought as a service with each company drawing off the same centralised computer resource. The Internet will facilitate this development.

This process of greater integration or socialisation of the production process has changed the role of managers. It used to be the case that the job of a purchasing director was to bully his suppliers into giving lower prices. Although that aspect of the job has not disappeared, far more is expected now. The purchasing director must understand the production processes of his suppliers as well as the production process of the company that he works for. He must understand which spare parts or components that his suppliers produce are cheaper and which are more expensive. He then must see if the products in his own company can be redesigned to take account of the cost structure of his suppliers. In order for this process to work the relationship between the two companies must be very close.

It is now recognised that the success of a business is determined by the quality of its suppliers as well as the demands of its customers. I worked with a French baby food manufacturer with over 40% market share in France. A significant proportion of that company's resources were allocated to controlling the quality of its supplies. This included frequent visits to its fruit and vegetable suppliers. Such visits involved communicating with its suppliers what pesticides are or are not acceptable. For pesticides that are acceptable the company also instructs its suppliers when and how often they should be applied. Suppliers accept regular inspections by the company to check that its policies are implemented. It is difficult to see how a smaller competitor would have the

resources to ensure that its supplies were of the required quality. The main competitor to this company is a Swiss multinational. Between them the two companies control about 80% of the French market. Apparently, Heinz baby foods have no appeal to the discriminating palate of the average French baby!

A manufacturer supplying to a retailer must also have a close relationship with his customer. It is no longer just a question of sharing sales information. In many cases the manufacturer shares the same databases as the retailer so that he can respond to changes in the market quickly. Often he will have "on line" access to the stocks of his products in the retailer's premises.

Another effect of the greater socialisation or integration of the production processes is the tendency for production to become standardised. Henry Ford was supposed to have once said that you can have any car as long as it's black. Such a comment is greeted with derision nowadays. Modern manufacturers would not have such an arrogant attitude towards their customers, and yet modern car manufacturers produce cars which are far more similar to each other than the cars produced by different companies in Henry Ford's day. In many cases the same manufacturer supplies the same spare part to all the car manufacturers in the world. The other feature of the car industry is that it is centralised. There are hardly more than a dozen car manufacturers in the world. And among this exclusive group there are joint venture agreements among some of them. Although the car manufacturing plants might be dispersed throughout the world, the design and planning of production is centralised. Such centralised planning not only determines the production of the car manufacturers, but also determines the production of the suppliers of the automobile components. This is very far from the "Jeffersonian" ideal of rugged individuals competing against each other in the "free market".

This tendency for standardisation and centralisation is evident in most industries. In the Central Heating Industry practically all Oil burners, the main component in an Oil boiler are manufactured by a company called Riello. Practically all gas valves in Gas boilers are manufactured by Honeywell. An American company manufactures practically all the fluid used to close and open thermostatic radiator valves. A Danish company, Grundfos, dominates the pump market etc etc.

In the computer industry, Microsoft and Intel dominate their respective market segments.

This tendency for standardisation of production processes and component parts is not confined within industries, it cuts across different industries. The same components are found in washing machines, domestic boilers, televisions etc. In most cases the printed circuit board is manufactured by Siemens.

Some people complain that the products of capitalism have become bland and uninteresting. This criticism is often made of motor cars, but on the other hand most people would say that motor cars nowadays are more reliable than those of thirty years ago.

This tendency for product standardisation has had the effect of diminishing the ground on which products can compete. A few years ago I attended a business conference of a large multinational in which it was concluded that, because its products were essentially the same as those of its competitors, the only way that it could gain market share was by being better at marketing.

This tendency is exacerbated by "competition" legislation. In France the effect of introducing laws to ensure that all Supermarket chains received the same price and could not sell below their costs in any product has significantly reduced the scope for price competition. Instead of giving discounts on the invoice, manufacturers give "marketing support" to Supermarkets. Ten years ago such supermarkets saw themselves as distribution agents. Now each supermarket has become a "brand".

CONSUMPTION

In Volume 1 Marx described the "fetishism of commodities" as the tendency for exchanges between people to assume the fantastic appearance of a relationship between things. But Marx could have had only an inkling of how modern marketing would develop. Marketing gurus have succeeded in convincing people that commodities have magical properties. The BMW and Mercedes brands communicate an image about the owners of commodities with these brands. Nike and Adidas obtain a very significant premium in price over other similar types of sportswear. At least 10% of the price of most consumer products is accounted for by marketing expenditure. I would guess that the

percentage for the above mentioned brands is even higher. Marketing expenditure is one of the wasteful consequences of competition between similar products.

The links between the various production processes in the supply chain extend to the end point of the process, which is the act of consumption. It is sometimes said that in the “free market”, in contrast to a “command economy” like the Soviet Union, the consumer has freedom of choice. He is free in the sense that ultimately he makes the consumption decision within the constraints of his income. But he is not “free” to be left to his own devices in making such choices. Vast resources are devoted to understanding his fears, needs and desires with a view to manipulating those emotions for the purpose of buying commodities.

CREATION OF THE WORLD MARKET

Marx noticed that the capitalist system had a tendency for expansion which would lead to the creation of a world market. The tendency of Globalisation continues to be a characteristic of capitalism today. Capital has no national loyalties. Its ability to de-skill labour gives it the flexibility to locate almost anywhere in the world. This is undermining the living standards of the working class in the developed world.

An example of a company which is experiencing the vicissitudes of Globalisation is the French food company, Danone.

This company was founded in the 1960s by Antoine Riboud who comes from a Catholic family in Lyon. The culture was one of respect for the workers. It still boasts of this culture today. Although it is the biggest food company in France, it is small by comparison with other multinational food companies such as Nestle, Unilever and Coca Cola. Its size makes it vulnerable to a takeover. Although its exposure to the stock market has weakened its national ties it still has its head office in Paris. All of this will change if it is bought. It is likely that the culture of the group will change with adverse consequences for the workers. The best hope for the workers is an intervention by the French Government, which is not unlikely given that Jacques Chirac has in the past been willing to protect French national interests. The French Government party knows that there is a significant proportion of the working class that feels that the national bourgeoisie has “sold out” to international capital. Chirac’s party is not willing to lose such conservative votes to the National Front.

Such a move will, of course, be denounced by the Globalists. International capital wants unfettered access to national markets, including the market for companies (the stock market). But what is in the interests of International capital is not necessarily in the interests of ordinary people.

At present International Capital can play countries off each other in order to obtain favourable tax treatment and reduced wage costs. Ireland is an example of a country which has benefited from this game. It can be quite distasteful to listen to right wing politicians in Ireland, such as Charlie McCreevy and Mary Harney, boast about the virtues of their low tax policies. But if other countries, such as France and Germany, decided to reduce their Corporation Tax rates and reduce public expenditure, International capital would move to those countries at the expense of Ireland. All that such a policy would achieve would be to increase the wealth of international capital at the expense of the States in Europe.

A second reason why Ireland has benefited from this game is that it is part of the European Union. The protectionist, “anti free market” policies of this Union make a country within the Union more attractive for International Capital than, say, a country in the developing world.

Irish right wing politicians and journalists should stop pretending that the success of the Irish economy is for reasons other than the real reasons because in future Ireland might receive a taste of its own medicine. The accession of the Eastern European countries into the Union does not augur well for Ireland. Is it too late for the Irish to discover the benefits of tax harmonisation across the Union?

A POLITICAL RESPONSE

How should a political party, representing workers’ interests, respond to these developments? It should first of all understand the problem. The problem is that international manufacturing capital by definition can move to anywhere in the world. Rights which have been won in the developed world are being eroded as capital moves to countries with lower labour costs.

There are some who believe that such developments are inevitable, and even desirable, and that there will be a division of labour between manufacturing in the developing world and service industries in the developed world. But, as explained in Part 9 of this series, manufacturing and

agriculture are the industries which create value. In general, service industries facilitate consumption from the wealth that has been generated in the other two sectors. A decline in manufacturing in the developed world will also lead to a decline in its service industries.

Of course, some of the service industries could be sustained if the developed world was to “live off” the developing world. The wealth of the world would be generated in the Third World and the vast profits would return to the developed world to finance its service industries. But the wealth generated could only return to the owners of capital and maybe those participating in pension funds. These people’s consumption would be expected to support the service industries of the developed world. A minority of “oligarchs” would keep the rest of us in low-paying service jobs. This is not a vision that I find particularly attractive.

Some people say that farmers and workers in Europe are selfish for wanting to preserve their lifestyles. But why should such groups give up their lifestyles? Who will benefit from free access to the European market? The lifting of agricultural tariffs will benefit the Capitalist farms of the USA, South America, Australia, New Zealand and the owners (e.g. Unilever) of large plantations in the Third World. The European consumer might benefit from cuts in prices, but the quality controls in other countries are not as strict as in Europe. I think it is unlikely that the small farmer in Africa or Asia producing for his home market is too worried about EU tariffs. The lifting of trade tariffs will benefit international capital with no guarantee of any benefit accruing to the workers of the Third World.

The problem with these developments is that Capital is organised on an international scale. It seeks with the help of institutions like the WTO, IMF and World Bank to maximise its sphere of influence by disabling states from interfering with its activities. In contrast the State, which is the means by which political parties can implement their policies, is organised by and large on national lines.

Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to underestimate the power of the State. If the State was so impotent the supporters of the free market would not spend so much time castigating it.

At the very least a political party acting

in the working class interest should support national and supra-national institutions which preserve agricultural and industrial production in the developed world. In practical terms the Common Agricultural Policy should be supported and demands for European agriculture to be organised on free market lines should be resisted. If we want to support developing countries we should help them develop their own industries and the means to protect their fledgling industries. This includes allowing them to protect themselves from the dumping of cheap agricultural products (including EU products) from abroad.

If EU tariffs against imports are necessary to protect manufacturing industry in Europe so be it! International Capital wants it both ways. On the one hand it wants to avail of cheap labour from the developing world. On the other hand it wants to have unrestricted access to the purchasing power of the developed world. Why should it have it all its own way? Why should workers sacrifice their hard-fought gains? French workers might wonder: what is the point of having a 35 hour week if you don't have a job?

It is sometimes said that such protectionist policies would damage industry in the developing world. But the industry that is talked about is usually owned by American, European and Japanese capitalists. It just happens to be located in the Third World.

If it is accepted that the lifting of trade barriers by the EU would undermine the livelihoods of farmers and workers in Europe, the onus is on the advocates of Globalism to prove that such policies would ameliorate the position of the poor in the Third World. But does anyone, outside the Economics departments of Universities, seriously believe that the poor Third World farmer is bursting to launch his products on the European and American markets? Does anyone seriously believe that the only things preventing him from competing against the multinational food companies are the policies of the CAP and the protectionism of the USA?

The potential capitalists in the Third World in the twenty-first century are no different from the potential capitalists of Germany in the 19th century and those of Japan in the twentieth century. If they are to emerge they will have to be nurtured behind the protectionist walls of their respective states. Like the German and Japanese capitalists they will first have to

conquer their home markets and then, and only then, launch their products on the world market.

But such policies are vigorously opposed by the WTO, IMF and World Bank because they are not in the interests of international capital. If we want to help the Developing world we should oppose the policies of these institutions which impose free market policies on poor countries which even the most right-wing of governments in the Developed world would not consider implementing at home. If we want to help Third World countries we should oppose the policy of the European bank which only releases funds to Third World countries if those countries comply with the policies of the IMF.

OWNERSHIP OF THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION

So far in this article I have advocated policies which are conservative or defensive. They seek to prevent the living standards of working people in the developed world from being eroded. But Marx advocated the social ownership of the means of production. How can this be achieved?

There is an overwhelming argument for the state control of the transport infrastructure. This is because a transport system has what economists call positive externalities. This means that there are social benefits over and above the benefits to the direct supplier and consumer of the "product". For example a good transport system is a precondition for the development of the economy. Also a good public transport system is a means of reducing traffic on the roads. But such social benefits would not be taken into account by a private investor in transport. If left to the market, there would be investment that would be less than the social optimum. A cursory comparison of the transport systems of Britain and France illustrates this point.

The same arguments can be used for Health and Education. There are social benefits in having a healthy and educated society. Also, in the case of the health services, the supplier (i.e. the doctor) determines the demand for the service. A doctor operating in the free market would have a vested interest in oversubscribing. It is no accident that the USA has the highest per capita health expenditure.

A similar argument can be made for Pensions. The customer is dependent on the expertise of the supplier of the service. The recent scandals in Britain regarding overselling of pension funds show what

happens when such services are left to market forces.

However there are, to say the least, a number of practical difficulties in implementing such a policy of social ownership for manufacturing industry. The most obvious difficulty is that production is organised on an international scale. The subsidiaries of a multi-national located in one country often supply most of their products to another subsidiary of the same multi-national in another country and vice versa. A State which decided to expropriate such companies would quickly find itself cut off from the International production process. This would likely lead to a rapid diminution of that country's standard of living.

While the State has in the past been an effective engine for developing industry (e.g. the Soviet Union in the 1930s), the social, or at least the state ownership, of the means of production has not proved to be an efficient means of allocating society's resources (e.g. the Soviet Union in the Brezhnev era).

As I have indicated in Part 8 of this series Marx himself showed in Volume 3 that the capitalist system effectively allocated resources and was constantly adjusting itself in response to crises. He never indicated how such resources would be allocated under a system of social ownership. Also, many of the weaknesses of the system, which Marx identified in Volume 2, were solved by Keynesian policies pursued by the State (e.g. the "New Deal" and State expenditure policies of F.D. Roosevelt).

A few years ago Pat Murphy of the Larkin Centre expressed the view that the socialist movement made an error in trying to abolish private property and to seek to obtain the social ownership of the means of production. Arguably, such a view is not inconsistent with Marx's analysis in Volume 3!

Production is socialised but is privately owned according to Marx. But what does private ownership of production through the ownership of capital mean? Ownership can be thought of as a continuum. At one end there is individual private ownership, and at the other there is social ownership. In between these points there are various forms of collective ownership.

In Volume 3 Chapter 22 Marx refers to Money capital (i.e. deposits in the banks) as an undifferentiated mass, indifferent to which sphere of production it is invested in. It is controlled by bankers "*the*

representatives of social capital". Once the deposit is made, the depositor loses all control of his capital. The bankers decide how the collective funds are invested. At the time they make their investment or loans to borrowers, they are not interested in the individual sources of the funds. While ownership is individual the collective funds are controlled by administrators that don't own the capital.

In Chapter 27 he refers to the capital of Joint Stock companies as being "*capital directly endowed with the form of social capital*". The functioning capitalist is transformed into the mere administrator of other people's capital. There is a divorce between the owner of capital and the manager of capital.

Nowadays it is possible to buy "tracker bonds" which invest funds in the stock markets of Europe, the United States and Japan in order to give an average rate of return equal to these stock markets. The owner of such bonds has no more control over them than the depositor in a bank.

Marx believed that this consolidation or centralisation of capital paved the way "*towards the re-conversion of capital into the property of producers, although no longer as the private property of producers, but rather as the property of associated producers, as outright social property*" (Volume 3, Chapter 27).

It is clear that Marx believed that Socialism would develop within the existing forms of the capitalist system. Capitalism not only socialised production but had also the tendency to socialise capital. The only outstanding matter for the socialist movement was that capital was still owned on an individual basis.

The task of socialists should be to transfer the private property of the owners of capital to the workers. Such workers' capital would be owned collectively and workers would elect representatives to manage this collective property. I would see this as a gradual process which could be facilitated by the tax system or by state loans, as was done to transfer Irish landed property from the British landlord class to the native Irish tenant class.

Such collective property would not be "social property" in the sense that it would extend to all aspects of production, but would be connected to individual enterprises. However, as the connections between the various branches of production deepen, such collective ownership

might approach the form of social property.

CONTROL OF THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION

Ownership of capital is one thing and control is something else. I have indicated that the owners of capital don't have control of it. But neither do the bankers, fund managers or chief executives of large multinationals. In a sense they are just as much slaves to the system as the workers, even if their chains are made of gold. The system has a logic of its own which is beyond human control.

The system demands more production, more consumption. Desires are stimulated and new desires are manufactured: all in the interest of maximising "shareholder return" or the rate of profit regardless of the consequences for the environment and people participating in the system.

On the other hand, workers' representation, underpinned by the collective ownership of capital, might modify the system. While such a representation will also want to maximise the return on its capital, this will be only one of many considerations. It might be willing to sacrifice production for reduced working hours or to avoid damaging the environment. Workers' representatives might be less willing to spend money on marketing expenditure, since such expenditure will be superfluous if there is a more democratic organisation of production.

This would seem to be the best hope of bringing some sense to the system and to finally make it act in the social interest. The alternative of frenzied production and consumption if continued will make life unbearable.

John Martin

Editorial Note: A slightly amended version of this review of *Capital* will be appearing in book form from Athol Books.

Audio

A DEFENCE OF CORK POLITICAL CULTURE IN THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE 1919-22

Dr Brian P Murphy osb

You can listen to this public meeting, which was held in Cork on 15th April, on the Internet at the following address:

[http://radio.indymedia.org/news/
2005/04/4572.php](http://radio.indymedia.org/news/2005/04/4572.php)

There is no charge.

Report

"Frank Ryan, a great Irishman who always put Ireland first"

I presume that when Ryle Dwyer denounces Frank Ryan's November 1932 slogan of "No free speech for traitors", in his review of a new Ryan biography by Adrian Hoar ("Irish Examiner", April 9), it is not the word "traitors" that he is objecting to. Indeed, in your issue of April 17 last year, it was Ryle Dwyer who used the term "treacherous" to describe the April 1932 conspiracy between the leaders of the Cumann na nGaedheal opposition and the British Government to try and bring down de Valera's newly-elected Irish Government.

If he is objecting to its "no free speech" component, he will also find that on the very day after it had been uttered de Valera himself denounced Ryan on that account and, not for the first time, called him a fool. But within a matter of years Ryan was to achieve political maturity, and Hoar's biography proceeds to portray, in the author's own words, Ryan's "conversion to democratic politics".

It is a pity then, that Ryle Dwyer trivialises Ryan as "the Communist agitator who died in a Nazi bed". For one thing, as Hoar also details, at no stage of his life was Ryan ever a Communist, and he also remained a devout Catholic throughout. More importantly, during his final years in Germany, Ryan unequivocally pledged his 100 percent support for de Valera's policy of wartime neutrality, and worked tirelessly on its behalf. Small wonder, then, that towards the end of his own life, in a 1975 interview with the veteran journalist Michael McInerney, de Valera now described as "this great Irishman" the man whom, with good reason, he had previously denounced as an "amadán" or "fool" during the 1931-32 period. As Dev further stated: "Frank Ryan always put Ireland first, at home or abroad. He has earned his place in history".

I have addressed this issue in greater detail, under the heading of "Was Frank Ryan a collaborator?", in an appendix that appears in the recently-published second edition of my father Michael O'Riordan's book, "Connolly Column—The story of the Irishmen who fought for the Spanish Republic". **Manus O'Riordan**
(Sent to *Irish Examiner*, 19 April 2005)

Check out what's new on
the *Athol* site:

www.atholbooks.org

WORK continued

episode in which Cork played a unique and magnificent role and the conflict shaped the political culture of Cork for generations. Reference to it (and its celebration) would be most appropriate in the year of Cork as Cultural capital of Europe. Instead we have nothing short of an exercise in cultural vandalism by Ms Quill caused no doubt by her total ignorance of the significance of what MacSwiney had written. No wonder Cork's official celebration of culture is such a pathetic affair with people like Ms. Quill at the helm.

To seek to partly rectify the matter we reproduce MacSwiney's introduction below.

Author's Preface

It was my intention to publish these articles in book form as soon as possible. I had them typed for the purpose. I had no time for revision save to insert in the typed copy words or lines omitted from the original printed matter. I also made an occasional verbal alteration in the original. One article, however, that on "Intellectual Freedom", though written in the series in the place in which it now stands, was not printed with them. It is now published for the first time.

RELIGION

I wish to make a note on the article under his heading to avoid a possible misconception amongst people outside Ireland. In Ireland there is no religious dissension, but there is religious insincerity. English politicians, to serve the end of dividing Ireland, have worked on the religious feelings of the North, suggesting the danger of Catholic ascendancy. There is not now, and there never was, any such danger, but our enemies, by raising the cry, sowed discord in the North, with the aim of destroying Irish unity. It should be borne in mind that when the Republican Standard was first raised in the field in Ireland, in the Rising of 1798, Catholics and Protestants in the North were united in the cause. Belfast was the first home of Republicanism in Ireland. This is the truth of the matter. The present-day cleavage is an unnatural thing created by Ireland's enemies to hold her in subjection and will disappear with political Freedom.

It has had, however, in our day, one unhappy effect, only for a rime, fortunately, and this is disappearing. I refer to the rise of Hibernianism. The

English ruling faction having, for their own political designs, corrupted the Orangemen with power and flattery, enabled them to establish an ascendancy, not only over Ulster, but indirectly by their vote over the South. This becoming intolerable, some sincere but misguided Catholics in the North joined the organisation known as *The Ancient Order Of Hibernians*. This was, in effect, a sort of Catholic Freemasonry to counter the Orange Freemasonry, but like Orangeism, it was a political and not a religious weapon.

Further, as a political weapon, it extended all through Ireland during the last years of the Irish Parliamentary Movement. In Cork, for example, it completely controlled the city life for some years, but the rapid rise of the Republican Movement brought about the equally rapid fall of Hibernianism. At the present moment it has as little influence in the public life of Cork as Sir Edward Carson himself. The great bulk of its one-time members have joined the Republican Movement. This demonstrates clearly that anything in the nature of a sectarian movement is essentially repugnant to the Irish people. As I have pointed out, the Hibernian Order, when created, became at once a political weapon, but Ireland has discarded that, and other such weapons, for those with which she is carving out the destinies of the Republic. For a time, however, Hibernianism created an unnatural atmosphere of sectarian rivalry in Ireland. That has now happily passed away. At the time, however, of the writing of the article on Religion it was at its height, and this fact coloured the writing of the article. On re-reading it considering the publication of the present work I was inclined to suppress it, but decided that it ought to be included because it bears directly on the evil of materialism in religious bodies, which is a matter of grave concern to every religious community in the world.

T. MacS.

*Brixton Prison,
Sept., 1920*

THEY WILL EVEN PAY FOR UNIFICATION!

"Finance Minister Brian Cowen will have an additional 1.6 billion Euros to spend on infrastructure next year following changes to the EU's Stability and Growth Pact.

"Development aid and the cost of any future unification of the country could also be allowed under the revised rules,

which EU leaders are expected to sign-off at their summit in Brussels tomorrow.

"The Pact, designed to keep the Eurozone economy stable, was all but scuppered two years ago when member states refused to take action against France and Germany for continuously having budgets more than 3% in the red.

"The key to breaking the log jam in the end was to agree to let Germany offset the cost of reunification and reconstruction of the former Eastern Germany against its budget deficit.

"The wording agreed by finance ministers at an emergency meeting in Brussels over the weekend however does not specifically refer to Germany but to the 'unification of Europe' if it has a detrimental effect on the growth and fiscal burden of a member state.

"This would allow other countries to make similar claims to Germany in the future, including if Ireland was to be unified, a Government source confirmed.

"However, economic studies carried out in the past suggest that scrapping the Border would have a beneficial rather than a detrimental effect on the country as a whole" (*Irish Examiner*, 22.3.2005).

"A referendum North and South on the unification of Ireland should be held sooner rather than later, SDLP leader Mark Durkan said yesterday.

"The Good Friday Agreement allows for a referendum to be held, built specifies that another cannot be held thereafter for a period of seven years.

Mr. Durkan declined to give an exact timeframe.

"Meanwhile, Foreign Affairs Minister, Dermot Ahern said last night the Fianna Fail economic model is a workable template for a united Ireland.

"The Fianna Fail goal of an equal opportunity society, could be 'practically and credibly advanced' on an all-Ireland basis because it is coupled with policies of wealth creation, he told an SDLP meeting in Newry.

"It guarantees that a United Ireland will not mean a return to high unemployment, emigration and national debt," he said.

"He congratulated the SDLP on their Irish unity document unveiled yesterday, saying it was timely and significant." (*Irish Independent*, 22.3.2005).

POETRY

"Poetry is the last activity left in the world which is practised by people with no commercial expectations and that gives it a great dignity, I think.

"If you have 'things to say', or a mode of seeing things that nobody else has, so that no matter how good or how bad you might be there would be nobody else like you, then you have the essential characteristic of a writer" (Anthony Cronin, the poet. *Ev. Echo*, Cork, 5.2.2005).

would be celebrated, he not only changed our concept of May Day, but he also broke the link that had always existed between our May Day festivities and those of the old pagan religious festivals.

“With the coming of Communism, May Day began to be associated with a massive show of power on the part of the Soviet Union, and other communist countries. Their annual military parade, and political speeches, became a trend which worried the Catholic Church, to such an extent that Pope Pius XII resolved to turn the day into a religious feast, rather than a festival of socialism.

“He declared, in 1955, that 1st May was to be observed as a day of veneration for St. Joseph, who, up to this date, had, since the fourteenth century, always been honoured on 19th March.

“From now on, the saint was to have two holy days a year, but on May Day, to bend somewhat to the ideal of socialism, he was to be known as St. Joseph the Worker” (*Ireland’s Own*, 6.5.2005).

“WORKERS IN HISTORY”

“Workers In History—The First of May or Labour Day” by Ita Marguet.

“The origins of Labour Day date back to demands for better working and living conditions. Its centenary year was celebrated around the world on May 1st, 1986.

“The blossoming of workers’ solidarity as a result of the industrial conglomerations of the nineteenth century gave workers a chance to know one another, organise and formulate their demands as one body.

“It was at this time that there emerged the phenomenon of ‘class consciousness’ which was to become more and more clearly defined as the working class began to understand its role in society.

“The First of May 1886 was launched as the first Labour Day in history. The Chicago Arbeiter Zeitung issued in this new dawn with ‘The First of May, whose historical significance will only be understood and appreciated in the years to come, is here.

“Workers abandoned their machines on 1 May, 1886, and the first slogan was ‘8 hours of work, 8 hours of rest, 8 hours of education’.

“Two days later, following a three-month strike at the MacCormack factory in Chicago, an incident between strikers and strike breakers degenerated when police shot two strikers” (*Ireland’s Own*, 6.5.2005)

On 4th May, 1886, a further eight workers were killed, along with seven police, this was the Haymarket Square incident, which led to the hangings on 11th November,

1887. Of the Haymarket Five, four were Germans.

“It is highly likely that the American workers’ initiative of 1 May, 1886 would have had only the faintest echo in the country and abroad if the Chicago events, alongside those of May 1, had not stirred up sympathy for the labour movement in all countries of the world.

“In 1889, the International Congress in Paris adopted a proposal to hold an international demonstration again on May 1, 1890 in favour of a shorter working day.

“As a tribute to the martyrs of Chicago, from one who was hanged on 11 November, 1887, it might be opportune to quote the dying words of August Spies, a hero with prophetic vision: ‘The day will come when our silence will be more powerful than the voices you stifle today’” (*Ireland’s Own*, 6.5.2005).

In the *St. Joseph The Worker* article by Ms Lawler, she refers America and Canada: “...but, for reasons best known to themselves, both America and Canada chose the first Monday in September as their national holiday for the workers”.

The following article explains why:

“To counteract the growing, militant tradition of May Day, the American Federation of Labour leaders fostered the observance only of Labour Day, the first Monday in September. This day had originally been adopted on a local scale in 1885 and later was recognized by the various State governments as an antidote to the May First celebrations. Another antidote was inaugurated by the Hoover administration with the aid of the A. F. of L. leaders by proclaiming May 1 as Child Health Day.

“The real meaning of this sudden interest in child welfare, however, may be gleaned from the following reference to the subject in a report submitted by the Executive Council to the 1928 Convention of the A. F. of L. ‘The Communists still maintain May 1 as Labor Day. Hereafter, May 1 will be known as Child Health Day, as the President is directed by the resolution passed by Congress to issue a proclamation calling upon people of the United States to observe May 1 as Child Health Day. The object is to create sentiment for year-round protection of the health of children. It is a most worthy purpose. *At the same time May 1 no longer will be known as either strike day or Communist Day*’” (*History Of May Day*, Alexander Trachtenberg, New York, 1929).

“Millions of workers from Tokyo to Havana and across Europe took to the streets yesterday in May Day rallies” (*Irish Independent*, 2.5.2005).

In the land and city of Connolly and Larkin, they decided to march on April 30, the Dublin Council of Trade Unions organised a march and public meeting on the theme of “*Fight for the rights and entitlements of migrant workers*”.

But by far the most riveting, if not revolutionary action of the world’s May Days, was that organised by the Cork Council of Trade Union’s “Sponsored Wax by Union Officials and Activists” at a local beauty saloon. ‘*Fair Dinkum!*’

Could it be that some members of the CCTU mistook May 1 for April 1?

There was a time when the CCTU held a place of respect in the life of the city, alas, the local Freemasons would have a higher profile than today’s ‘wax’ men! It is surely sad!

Mao Tse Tung sent the academics and students into the countryside with spade and hoe, and called it the “The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution” 1966-1969. Maybe we should start thinking about doing the same to some of today’s Trade Union leaders! We should at least start thinking!

“TO WORK OR NOT?” by the late Bob Cotter, a Cork Postal worker, published in “Labour Comment” November, 2004.

Cultural vandalism in Cork

Terence MacSwiney’s *Principles Of Freedom*, was republished recently by Cork City Libraries with a Foreword by Maureen Quill to mark the Cork 2005 European Capital of Culture. What was rather odd was that Ms Quill saw fit to dispense with MacSwiney’s own Preface which appeared in the original edition and formed part of the work. This was his last published work, written as he began his hunger strike. She replaced it with a Foreword of her own which tells us absolutely nothing new about MacSwiney. His introduction was one of the most interesting parts of the book because it dealt with a very practical issue—the demise of Hibernianism and specifically its demise in Cork. The fact that he wrote about this issue in the circumstances in which he did shows the importance he placed on it and he was quite right to do so. The background to this whole episode of Hibernianism is one of the most interesting, significant and ignored aspects of the Irish independence movement. It was also an

continued on page 25

“... labour is best overseen by the people who actually perform it.”

Booker T. Washington, one of America's great educators, was born into slavery. He worked as a labourer in furnaces and mines to pay for his education and later created a university, Tuskegee Institute, for 3,000 black students.

Washington, who died aged 59 from overwork, wrote:

“No race can prosper until it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem.”

We have to work : so let's make the best of it, let's attempt to get some satisfaction out of it, but alas, it is the total opposite in the workplace today. Work is portrayed as a misery—it is the lowest form of life.

The prevalent culture is the quick buck. Cop it and hop it! From the overpaid thugs of Old Trafford to the wailing Millionaires of U2 churning out their defeatist and nihilist culture day and night.

The money you earn is always appreciated much more than the money that comes your way by chance—well, that's how it used be! Not anymore.

This is now being replaced by a something-for-nothing culture. The new peers are the Pop and Sport gurus.

More people say that there is no point working for something when you can get it by just taking it easy. A lot of younger people see their parents working longer hours and stressed and don't want to do that.

Consumption is the new god and Production (Work) is the enemy:

“...a new focus of popular attention away from production and towards consumption” (*The Image*, Boorstin, Pelican, 1960, p69).

HOW WORK WORKS!

“Learn How Work Works”, no four words could more aptly sum up the contemporary workplace. Modern management do not know how ‘work works’. The proof is there to see.

Stress has seeped into our working and personal lives to such an extent that we almost take it for granted. It is the biggest health risk in the workplace today.

In the year 2000, The Charles Fellowes Partnership, a recruitment consultancy,

discovered that while getting married, moving house and having a baby may top the list of life's traumas, handing in your notice of work outranks them in the stress league.

Only the trauma of family bereavement ranked higher than pre-resignation nerves. Tim Bates, the consultancy's managing director, says: “When we ran our first lifestyle survey five years ago, job resignation was barely mentioned as a high stress factor”.

As a former long-term Unilever executive-turned-consultant, Peter Bolt, in his book, *The Whole Manager*, has this view:

“The way we work does not favour individuals...uncertainty is stressful but the reasons for it should be thought out. There is not right or wrong, according to the book, and once managers at all levels can manage themselves stress will be minimised.

“The key to achieving this is preparation. Just as professional athletes need to prepare for specific events and maintain levels of fitness, so executives should plan for events, using a diary to map out what needs to be done day by day, and set aside time to think through ongoing problems. Many people feel that work pressures are so great that they don't have time to indulge in forward planning, to which Mr. Bolt says that work is pressurised because they do not plan ahead.

“There are talented people who stumble when promoted because they don't have a clue what to do next. As the pressure mounts they feel that the only way to survive is to work harder, watch their backs and engage in questionable practices.”

He does not blame individuals for any failure to manage well, but says it is the system that gives them little help and understanding of the way that work works.

“The long-hours syndrome, imported from America where the past millennium ended with talk of sleeping in the office, is being sustained by bosses who say that gaining work experience is more important than earning salaries,” he says.

“But there is little help given in how to move forward. When I ask young people coming into the workplace if they are benefiting from this work experience, many say they find the system confusing.”

“Those new to the workplace should stick to their personal values because there is nothing wrong with feeling confused. They shouldn't feel they have to play the corporate game. There are many senior managers who have climbed to the top and are still not happy.”

“Graduates starting out on their

careers should take time to learn about themselves by listening to themselves because many have a false impression of what they are really like,” says Bolt. Today's workforce is all hip, spitting with confidence, not like the old gang. But one unchanging, and irrefutable fundamental is that we still all work for a wage!

“CHOOSE a job that you love and you will never have to work a day in your life.”
CONFUCIUS

The image creators used tell us that the cultural merit of ‘Coronation Street’ was its capacity to reflect ordinary working-class life, now some sensible people are beginning to think the opposite is happening : life is a mere reflection of the new ‘Coronation Street’.

The editor of “Labour and Trade Union Review” puts it a much better way. After a couple of recent visits to Ireland, John Clayden said he thought we were losing it a little: “Before long people will need counselling after a shower of rain”.

Charles Haughey made a remark to the effect that “most people lead miserable lives”. Millions of people in the Anglia world spend huge chunks of their spare time watching television—could you think of anything more miserable or soulless than that!

“HE had come away with the knowledge that physical work is the best bedfellow for despair” (*The Trick of the Ga Bolga* by Patrick McGinley, Flamingo)

IRELAND'S OWN

A lot of people, especially on the left of politics would find it hard to believe that on this May Day, the only serious reference to the day of the worker the present writer could find was in the May week edition of *Ireland's Own*. Yes, *Ireland's Own* published in Wexford.

What was even better, this magazine which is a source of great reading satisfaction for thousands of ordinary working people, especially in rural Ireland, provided two perspectives of May 1st. We include extracts from both!

“ST. JOSEPH THE WORKER”
by Teresa Lawler.

“When Pope Pius XII decreed, in 1955, that May 1st should be the day on which the Feast of St. Joseph the Worker



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 23 No. 5

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

WORK

—a couple of thoughts

“Work as punishment implies a curious equation. Punishment is society’s response to a criminal act, and the sentence of ‘hard labour’ was deemed the most severe punishment, short of death, that society could administer. Using this reasoning the vast multitudes of everyday workers all over the earth who were engaged in hard labour all the days of their lives might have asked what crime they had committed.

“None asked, of course, but the presumption was clear : work is base and degrading and those who do it are equated with slaves and criminals and rightfully assigned to the lowest level of society.”

The above extract comes from an American book titled: *How To Tell When You’re Tired—A Brief Examination Of Work* by Reg Theriault, a former San Francisco longshoreman. It is a gem, the 188 pages are full of insights from the workplace, but that single statement would stick in the mind of any worker!

In the month of May, we celebrate the day of the worker : *May Day*. While secularists lay claim to sole copyright, you’d have difficulty coming across too many elaborations of the intrinsic or philosophical meaning of work.***

Francis Bacon first published his famous series of essays in 1625. He wrote of Truth, he wrote of Death, he wrote of Fortune. His essays dwelt on the most essential concepts of both spiritual and material life—but he never mentioned Work!

A. C. Grayling, who is Reader in Philosophy at Birbeck College, University of London, wrote a series of Essays in similar vein in 2001, explaining the whys and wherefores of objective and subjective life like Hate and Fear but again no mention of Work.

There have been many books about work—how to motivate staff, how to beat the office bully, how to time-manage working hours—there have been very few books by workers and even fewer on the subject of work itself.

PROTESTANT WORK ETHIC

Of course, the Reformation and its Protestant offspring take tremendous pride in proclaiming “the Protestant work ethic”, claiming it created the modern world, with all that is materially progressive emanating from the sturdy, unyielding principles of Protestantism.

According to them, the rest of us Christians and Pagans were all slackers—OK, we never gave the task of labour our full effort in the way Protestants did.

Max Weber’s theories about the influence upon economic life of Protestantism in general and Puritanism in particular are a good example:

“In his well-known study of capitalism, Max Weber quotes the saying, that ‘one does not work to live, one lives to work’, which nowadays no one has much difficulty in understanding : it expresses the current opinion” (Josef Pieper, *Leisure, The Basis Of Culture*, 1952).

Subscribers to the magazine are regularly offered special rates on other publications

Irish Political Review is published by the IPR Group: write to—

PO Box 339, Belfast BT12 4GQ or
PO Box 6589, London, N7 6SG.

Labour Comment,
C/O Shandon St. P.O., Cork City

Subscription by Post:
Euro 25 / £17.50 for 12 issues

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

You can also order both postal and electronic subscriptions from:

www.atholbooks.org

Despite this : Protestantism, Socialism and Communism in their scholarship and propaganda dwell little on the intrinsic concept of work or what it is all about. It seems to be a mere means to an end.

For all their faults, it has been the Catholic scholars who have searched at greatest length to reconcile the need to work, to come to terms with that need, and I suppose, make work a friend instead of an enemy.

You can divorce your mate, but in the main, work is a partner for life!

Karol Wojtyla, could claim to be the only Pope who worked in a factory—he was the first to accept that such an experience stood in his stead.

In choosing the title, *Benedictus*, the German Joseph Ratzinger acknowledged that the carpenter was just as entitled to a say in the world as the Bishop or the Broker!

“Idleness is the enemy of the soul, and so monks should be occupied at some times with manual labour and at certain times with holy reading” (Rule of Benedict).

John Coffey, who runs the Uneeda Bookshop in Cork summed it all up a few years ago, when asked by the *Evening Echo* who his heroes were:

“The ordinary man who clocks on for work from nine to five to support his family. I think those kind of people are amazing.”

I believe Joseph Ratzinger was petrified with what he witnessed in the 1968 Berlin and Paris student faction-fighting—if the new Pope based his fears on the political outcome and the roles played since by that crop of socialist student leaders—was the man far wrong—Jose Manuel Barroso, Jack Straw, Tony Blair, Pat Rabbitte.

continued on page 27