

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

APRIL 2011

Vol.26, No.4 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.25 No.4 ISSN 954-5891

Irish Election Result:

Labour Opts For Permanent Fringe Status

Labour came within reach of realising its dream of putting an end to "*Civil War politics*", and establishing a class-based party system at the heart of the state. It became the second party in the Dail in the February 25th Election, with almost twice the seats of Fianna Fail. But it did not have the will, the ambition, to take advantage of success by taking up the position of official Opposition—alternative Government—and putting Fianna Fail effectively out of the game. It went tamely into Coalition again, as if nothing had really happened, giving Fianna Fail the status of official Opposition and boosting its chances of recovery.

It claims to have done this in the interest of the country. It did not coalesce with Fine Gael, and sacrifice its future prospects, just in order to get on the gravy train—Perish the Thought!—It got on the gravy train as a sacrifice in the interests of the country.

The 'interest of the country' line should be, and usually is, received with great scepticism in a democracy which functions through adversarial politics—the only kind of Democracy that is recognised as legitimate in this region of the world. And the scepticism is well merited in this case. The Labour leaders say they joined the Government as a junior partner in order to curb the *laissez-faire* capitalist inclinations of Fine Gael. But it is evident that Fine Gael could be much better curbed by a strong, critical Opposition which had the capacity to defeat it, if it tried to get out of hand.

Fine Gael, as the biggest party by far, might have formed a Government without Labour. With so many Independents of various kinds now in the Dail, it could have formed a Government without entangling itself with any other Party. Many of its supporters urged it to do this. It chose not to do so. It chose to have a Coalition with Labour, and to give it many more seats in Cabinet than was strictly necessary, going by the election result.

And it arranged the matter astutely. It did not approach Labour. It acted as if it was going ahead with some Independents. It made Labour come and beg. And it treated it handsomely when it begged.

continued on page 2

Libya

UN RESOLUTIONS

Standing beside US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in Washington on 18th March, our new Foreign Minister, Labour leader Eamon Gilmore, gave Ireland's backing to regime change in Libya and the Western intervention aimed at bringing it about. He said:

"As regards to Libya, I believe that Colonel Qadhafi has lost all legitimacy to rule and should be encouraged to leave the stage."

The encouragement is contained in two Security Council resolutions, number 1970 passed unanimously on 26th February and number 1973 passed on 17th March by 10 votes (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, France, Gabon, Lebanon, Nigeria, Portugal, South Africa, UK and the US) to none, with 5 abstentions (Brazil, China, Germany, India & Russia).

Resolution 1970 imposed an arms embargo on Libya, a travel ban and assets freeze on the family of Muammar Al-Qadhafi and certain Government officials. It also referred "*the situation in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya since 15 February 2011*" to the International Criminal Court (paragraphs 4-8).

Resolution 1973 authorised UN member states—

continued on page 3

EU Summit:

Comprehensive Solution Of Continuing Crisis?

The 'comprehensive package' that was planned for the EU Summit on 24th March was overtaken by events and turned out to be a damp squib and the prospects for such a package remain problematic. The omens are not good. One definite result is that EU project has taken a battering in this crisis from which it may never recover. In any political project a crisis is an oppor-

tunity taken to advance the project or an opportunity missed that retards or ruins the project.

So far the clearest victim has been the decline in the EU as an integrating and co-ordinating force and any affection for the project is almost extinct. All solutions to this Europe wide banking issue are nationally focused and conflated with national budget deficit issues which are a quite different issue. This is a fundamental flaw in EU approach to the problem. It has maximized national feelings and resentments.

Free movement of capital as we now know it took off on the basis of Maastricht Treaty in 1992 which authorized the full freedom of borrowing and lending across Europe which has formed the basis for the current crisis. This new freedom was not properly regulated as the Anglo Saxon view had become dominant, one which tells us that the market is essentially self regulating. Former Labour Chancellor Gordon Brown assured the world that his "*prudential*" running of the British economy had cut out 'boom and bust'. He continued the freeing up of the market

To page 2, column 3

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Irish Election Result: Labour Opts For Permanent Fringe Status. Editorial	1
Libya. David Morrison	1
EU Summit: Comprehensive Solution Of Continuing Crisis?	1
Poems: Mad Dogs And Englishmen; Saving Lives;	
Second-Hand Peace Sale, <i>Fits Most Nations.</i> Wilson John Haire	3,5,6
Libya: Fooled By The Humbug? Report	4
The Life, Times And Legacy Of Terence McSwiney. Cathal MacSwiney Brugha	5
The End Of Class Politics? Jack Lane	6
Shorts from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (Ireland & Iceland; The <i>Irish Times</i> Election Campaign; The Laws Of Libel; <i>Sunday Times</i> & Fintan O'Toole; Real Journalism; Hypocrisy Over Sarah Carey)	7
Madam Retires! John Martin	9
Gerard Murphy's Fairytales. James Fitzgerald	10
Gerard Murphy's Disappearing Sources. Padraig Og ORuairc (Report)	11
Population Questions. Editorial	12
On The Blatant Hypocrisy Of Referring Libya To The ICC. David Morrison	13
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (War & Peace; State of Ireland; Triple Alliance; Threat To Britain; Irish Culture)	14
Naval Warfare. Pat Walsh (Part 9)	17
Bolshevism From Larkin To Lozovsky. Manus O'Riordan (Part 1)	19
The Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee: Some Context. Editorial	22
Biteback: Japanese Holocaust Forgotten? Philip O'Connor	23
Gilmore's Recipe For Inaction On Palestine. Report	24
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Nuclear Power; Democracy; Libya & USUK; What About The Irish Banks?; The Irish Army; Cork City Council)	25
Saying What He's Meant To See? Seán McGouran	26

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

MacCurtain/McSwiney Legacy:

A Slap In The Face For Cork

(back page)

Labour is now safely back where it thinks it belongs. It lacked the will to go it alone, and it will not now lightly undertake to rock the boat. And the Opposition is negligible.

If the Government is a success, Fine Gael will get the credit for it. If it is not a success, it is Labour that will be punished. Fine Gael represents a substantial interest in the country that will sustain it. Labour does not. It was in the process of remaking itself into a party that appealed to flighty elements of the middle class when its moment of opportunity came. It was incapable of seizing the opportunity in a way that would justify its name.

The *Irish Times* supported the formation of this Coalition with the argument that this is what 55% of the electorate voted for. It got this figure by adding the First Preferences of the two parties. In a two-party system it can be said that what the voters want is what they get, but not in a multi-party system in which the elected Parliament is itself the electorate of the

Government.

Labour launched its electoral campaign against "*the two Tory Parties*" and only in the latter stages sold itself as a junior partner of fine Gael. And the Second Preferences show anything but a meeting of minds between the two parties. Only 35% of Labour's Second Preferences went to Fine Gael, while only 16% of Fine Gael's went to Labour.

In multi-party systems what you get is only what you get. Wants are not sufficiently hammered into shape, so that it could be said that what the electorate gets is what it wants.

Does the electorate want the privatisation of public assets to raise money to be used to subsidise an increase in demand for the building industry? That is what Fine Gael wants. If it won the election outright, it could be said to be what the electorate wants.

And God only knows what Labour wants. What it presented to the electorate was little more than waffle.

EU Summit:

continued

started by Margaret Thatcher. The rulers forgot that the market had been shackled for good reason. A free market is indeed self-regulating. It maintains long-term equilibrium by a process of boom and slump—provided that people are willing to put up with the depth of slump that follows a wild boom. Regulation of the market does not cut these out altogether, but reduces the highs and lows. The Anglos thought they could have evened-out markets without regulation, and Europe believed them. What is worse, the Irish believed them. Hence the present predicament.

There was a credit merry go round created, a pass the parcel scenario, and when the music stopped some were left holding parcels of rubbish. The solution decided on was to make the unlucky holder take responsibility for the rubbish in the parcel and not share the solution among all the people who played the game.

The banking crisis may be solved now and the Euro may be stronger at the expense of the 'losers' but one thing that is more certain is that the attractions of political integration will be diminished by the way it's being solved.

In keeping with this self-regulating philosophy, the Europe Central Bank was given independence by Maastricht. But independent of what? The most important aspect of its independence was that it was not to be part of the EU institutions. It has no Treaty base. This is probably the most important institution in the Eurozone, after the major states, yet it is independent of it; strictly speaking it is a law unto itself. This is an absurd situation as we are left with a bank dictating to the politicians when it should be the other way round.

This means the market and the interests of the banking/financial sector in particular are dictating to politicians. This is a recipe for ongoing crises, as crisis-making is the nature of the beast that is doing the dictating.

Jack Lane

On-line sales of books, pamphlets and magazines:

**[https://
www.atholbooks-
sales.org](https://www.atholbooks-sales.org)**

Libya

continued

"to take all necessary measures, notwithstanding paragraph 9 of resolution 1970 (2011), to protect civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, including Benghazi, while excluding a foreign occupation force of any form on any part of Libyan territory" (para. 4).

"*All necessary measures*" is the traditional Security Council euphemism for armed force. The Resolution also imposed

"a ban on all flights in the airspace of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in order to help protect civilians" (paragraph 6)

that is, a *No Fly Zone*.

The *Irish Times* editorial of 21st March 2011 said that Resolution 1973 was "*binding on Ireland to assist*", which implies that Ireland is required to assist in military operations against Libya. That is not so: the Resolution allows UN member states to engage in such operations and requests member states to assist by, for example, allowing overflights, but a state is not obliged to do either.

However, it is binding on all member states, including Ireland, to apply the arms embargo, the travel ban and the assets freeze, that is, those aspects of the resolutions that do not involve military action.

REGIME CHANGE?

Will the provisions of Resolutions 1970 and 1973 allow France and Britain, the prime movers in getting them through the Security Council, to achieve their goal of overthrowing the Qadhafi Government?

It's unlikely that the rather limited economic sanctions in these resolutions will bring down the administration, certainly not in the short term. And it is by no means certain that the military action authorised in these Resolutions are sufficient to break the present stalemate, in which the opposition forces are largely confined to the Benghazi area.

On the face of it, by "*excluding a foreign occupation force of any form on any part of Libyan territory*", Resolution 1973 bans the use of French or British ground troops to effect regime change, in which case they will have to rely on the opposition forces in the Benghazi area, supported by foreign air power.

Currently, these forces are poorly armed and utterly disorganised. Chris McGreal wrote in the *Guardian* on 22nd March that "*rebels manning an anti-aircraft gun were probably responsible for shooting down the revolutionaries' only fighter plane*".

The question arises: do the resolutions permit the arming and training of this rudimentary force so that, coupled with foreign air support, it might be capable of overthrowing the Qadhafi regime?

The answer to that appears to be Yes. Whereas paragraph 9 of Resolution 1970, imposes an arms embargo on Libya, paragraph 4 of Resolution 1973 cancels the embargo in the context of member states taking military action to protect civilians authorising member states "to take all necessary measures, notwithstanding paragraph 9 of resolution 1970 (2011), to protect civilians".

A further question is: what restrictions, if any, does Resolution 1973 impose on the use of foreign air power against Libyan military forces? A subsidiary question is: does Resolution 1973 empower foreign states to target and kill Colonel Qadhafi and other Libyan leaders?

At the time of writing, foreign air power has destroyed the Libyan air force and its air defence systems. This has been said to be necessary in order to make overflying Libya safe for foreign planes enforcing the No Fly Zone.

In addition, French planes destroyed an armoured column moving in the direction of Benghazi. This was justified on the grounds that the column was about to attack Benghazi and kill civilians.

However, it is clear that, as far as France and Britain are concerned, Libyan ground forces are fair game, whether or not they are acting in an aggressive manner. At the time of writing (25 March), military bases are being bombed and deployed forces are being attacked from the air, even though they are not on the offensive.

No doubt, the 'justification' for this will be made that, so long Qadhafi has any military forces at his disposal, he will use them to kill civilians—and therefore destroying these forces is a measure necessary to protect civilians, within the terms of Resolution 1973, paragraph 4. It follows from this that providing air support for attacking anti-Qadhafi forces would also be within the terms of Resolution 1973,

MAD DOGS AND ENGLISHMEN

Éamon de Valera, Ireland.

Stopped the Oath, downed the Blueshirts.
Old perfidious couldn't stop his '32 stand.

Aung San, Myanmar.

Dead by Imperial-inspired gunmen.
Whitehall tries *democracy* implant with daughter.
Military junta stars.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, India.

Partition via the Viceroy Lord Mountbatten Plan,
then phantasmagoria.

Mohammad Mossadegh, Iran.

Victim of the Anglo-Persian Oil bagman.

Gamal Abdel Nasser, Egypt.

Took the Suez Canal out of the Anglo-French grip.

Kwame Nkrumah, Ghana.

Torn to pieces by the Brit media piranhas.

Cheddi Jagan, Guyana.

MI6/CIA rigged elections,
tore up freedom banners.

Jomo Kenyatta, Kenya.

Public hangings, torture:
democracy bespoke to fit by Britannia.

Archbishop Markarios, Cyprus.

Lanced the Imperial boil, ran its
red, white and blue pus.

Saddam Hussein, Iraq.

His murder set the country on the
sectarian track.

Robert Mugabe, Zimbabwe.

Restarted the revolution when
Brits stalled it halfway.

Maummar Gaddafi, Libya.

England sang until the chorus of NATO
nations took up its murderous aria.

Wilson John Haire

20th March, 2011

paragraph 4. The possibility of killing large numbers of civilians is the only restraint on this action.

Targeting and killing Colonel Qadhafi and other Libyan leaders could also be 'justified' under Resolution 1973 on similar grounds. After all, since he has said to be giving the orders for his troops to kill civilians, then it's not too much of a stretch to argue that killing him is necessary to protect civilians.

There has been a public dispute in

Britain between the military and politicians on this question. When asked if Colonel Qadhafi was a legitimate target, the Chief of the Defence Staff, Sir David Richards, said: "Absolutely not. It is not allowed under the UN resolution". However, the politicians were quick to deny this—a spokesman for Prime Minister Cameron explained that it was lawful to target Qadhafi if he was seen as organising the threat to civilians, since the Security Council's objective was to protect civilians (Guardian, 22 March).

CARTE BLANCHE

So, the provisions of Resolution 1973 with regard to the protection of civilians are extremely wide. They are being interpreted as giving *carte blanche* to attack and destroy Libyan Government forces wherever they may be found. Nevertheless, without foreign troops on the ground, the likely outcome is a continuing stalemate with Qadhafi in power and controlling most of Libya.

Such an outcome, with Qadhafi remaining in power, would be intolerable to France and Britain and the US. Success for them is the unseating of Qadhafi and it's difficult to believe they will settle for less. For that, ground troops may be required.

It has been generally assumed that Resolution 1973 doesn't permit that, since "a foreign occupation force of any form on any part of Libyan territory" is specifically excluded from the "necessary measures". But, that doesn't actually exclude a foreign liberation force to overthrow the Qadhafi regime, which, as British Foreign Minister, William Hague, told the House of Commons on 24th March, is a *sine qua non* of Libyan civilians being protected. No doubt there are some there already.

DOUBLE STANDARDS

Why has Qadhafi's Libya been singled out for attention by the West when a matter of weeks ago he was a valued ally? Around 400 people were killed by state forces in Egypt without any suggestion of military action and all of them were unarmed, whereas some at least of the Libyan opposition forces are armed. Unarmed protesters are being shot down in the street in Yemen, Bahrain and Syria, without any suggestion that similar action is being contemplated.

It is inconceivable that the Governments of France and Britain and the US embarked on this mission out of concern for the lives of Libyan civilians. In recent years, the US itself has killed hundreds of civilians in Pakistan in drone attacks, triggered from the safety of mainland US. The

slaughter has intensified under the Obama administration and it is still going on. Has France or Britain has ever expressed any concern for these civilian killings, carried out regularly by their close ally? Of course not.

Israel killed around 1,500 Lebanese civilians from the air in the Summer of 2006 and around 1,500 Palestinian civilians in Gaza in 2008-9. The chorus of demands for a No Fly Zone in Libya was prompted by claims that the Qadhafi regime was massacring civilians from the air, evidence for which is hard to come by.

But there is no doubt that Israel has killed thousands of Arab civilians from the air in the last few years, without any call for a No Fly Zone from Britain or France or the US. In the case of Lebanon in the Summer of 2006, the US and Britain acted to prolong the conflict, and the killing, in order, they hoped, to give Israel time to wipe out Hezbollah.

It isn't credible that these Governments are motivated by humanitarian concern for Libyan civilians. For them, humanitarian concern is merely an instrument for whipping up domestic and international support for action they want to embark on for another reason.

Nor are the Imperial Powers motivated by a desire to see political systems in the Middle East that are responsive to the popular will. Such an Arab world would act far more in accord with its own interests, rather than being manipulated by Western interests. The idea therefore is to support limited change in countries like Egypt, Tunisia, Bahrein and Yemen, on the understanding that there is no revolution. The situation in Libya is different, where regime change is sought. Though Qadhafi has accommodated himself to Western interests in recent years, and opposes Al Qaida, he has maintained the coherence of the Arab nationalist State he has built, and retained a form of Socialism in its structures. This is intolerable to Western interests, which prefer to see a mess a la Iraq, rather than a strong State pursuing the interests of its people in its own way. The plan, therefore, is to destroy the Libyan State under humanitarian and democratic guise. It is no concern of the West that it may be unleashing a bloodbath.

First Iraq, then Libya: that leaves the last Arab Socialist State, Syria. That's why France and Britain and the US are bombing Libya.

David Morrison

Libya: Fooled by the Humbug?

Below are some responses to the bombing of Libya. The first, from Republican Sinn Fein, takes a straight-forward anti-Imperialist position. Sinn Fein, on the other hand, seems to have accepted the pretexts offered by the bombing coalition

REPUBLICAN SINN FEIN

"March for Tripoli's dead

Friday 25 March 2011

by Tom Mellen

Hundreds of Libyan citizens marched in a funeral procession in Tripoli on Thursday for civilian victims of Western bombing raids.

Nato military officials maintain that no civilians have been killed since France, Britain, the United States, Denmark and Italy kicked off the aerial assault last Saturday.

They insist that "surgical strikes" have only hit "Gadaffi regime" facilities.

But a Libyan government spokesman said that the civilian toll from the blitz is nearing a hundred.

Moussa Ibrahim said: "The city airports have been targeted. These airports are civilian airports and people work there. What do you call them? They are civilians.

"When you hit an airforce academy there are students studying there, so when these students die they are not army people, they are not armed soldiers, professionals, who are fighting—they are students."

On Thursday night Libyan government officials showed sceptical Western journalists the bodies of 15 victims of the Nato bombing campaign at Tripoli Central Hospital.

Hospital spokesman Ahmed Hussein said: "Those bodies were from air strikes today and yesterday where they attacked civilian and military sites."

Three of the corpses were women in civilian clothing.

Some of the dead were wearing military uniforms.

Some were charred beyond recognition.

Mr Ibrahim asserted that the Libyan government was doing all it could to protect civilians as it battles a Western-backed insurgency.

And he charged that, far from protecting civilians as set out in the UN mandate authorising force in Libya, Western governments were actually providing air cover for the rebels."

foreigneditor@peoples-press.com

SINN FEIN

Dail Statement

24th March

Deputy Aengus Ó Snodaigh:

"Níúsaídfidh mé iad go léir. Libya, Egypt, Tunisia and the entire African continent suffered for centuries as a consequence of colonialism and imperialism, when the west carved up territories and pillaged their resources. In recent times, the need for oil has resulted in the west supporting despotic regimes in a number of countries in the region. The region has also been militarised to an extent that has not been witnessed previously. In parti-

cular, during the Cold War era, the west and the Soviet Union played one country off another by arming groups and setting them against each other in pursuit of the natural resources in the region. When it suited western powers, they turned a blind eye—they continue to do so—to the excesses of those in charge against their civilian populations or against the members of particular groups and religions in their countries. It is hypocritical that the western powers are willing to impose a no fly zone on Libya, yet when the Israeli regime was bombing the hell out of Gaza not so long ago, there was no move by them to impose a no fly zone on the Palestinian territories to prevent the Israelis from bombing civilian targets.

We need to be careful when endorsing no fly zones to ensure they are not one-sided and to ensure the signal goes out to all other regimes in the region that the UN and the west will not stand by and will impose the same restrictions they are imposing on Libya on any regime willing to target civilians.

..." [Two paragraphs in Irish omitted.]
<http://debates.oireachtas.ie/dail/2011/03/24/>

GERRY ADAMS, 25th March

"Sinn Fein president Gerry Adams has called on Libyan dictator Colonel Gaddafi to step down and allow his people to have full democratic rights.

Adams said, 'My sympathies are with those demanding democracy and freedom. The Libyan government, like Egypt and many other Arab governments, have been partners in business and oil with Britain, the US and the EU for many years.' "

OTHERS

Michelle Mulhern of Fine Gael and Michelle Wallace, an Independent, have defended Libyan sovereignty.

SAVING LIVES

The pink-cheeked one rants, storms and turns blood-red.

His government of Imperial blue wants blooded, and old colonialist queue. The screens, papers are full of these fatheads vying for the murder of Gaddafi.

New Napoleons rehearse the dance of death to the tune of a liberal shibboleth, while the UN plots more choreography.

Turning back the clock to a sun dial is killing the mother to save the son.

Babies must die—the good live, not the vile. Saw your tiny face on radar outgunned.

It's called saving lives NATO style.

So, pink-cheeked, blooded one, your reign's begun.

Wilson John Haire

18th March, 2011

Speech given by Professor Cathal MacSwiney Brugha of University College Dublin at a well-attended meeting to commemorate Thomas MacCurtain and Terence MacSwiney in Cork on 11th March 2011. This speech was given no report in the press, while other speeches given at the same meeting were

"MacCurtain and MacSwiney: A Legacy Squandered or Fulfilled?"

The Life, Times and Legacy of Terence MacSwiney

A hundred years ago when Terence MacSwiney was in his 20s, James Connolly was warning that Britain and its Tsarist ally Russia were preparing to go to war to prevent the growth of Germany as an economic rival. This war cost 16 million dead, of which an estimated 49,000 were Irish. Against this background a few people decided to call the Easter Rising to offset the threat of conscription. For young people growing up in a British colony, without Home Rule, its people the subjects of an English King, the surest job available was to join the British Army.

Terence MacSwiney had particular advantages that helped him to question the idea that the mighty British Empire was right. Firstly, he had a strong belief in God, as an authority higher than any Empire. Secondly, the MacSwineys had a long tradition of resisting invaders. And thirdly, his mother was English, which means that his family could observe at first-hand how the British had so little regard for the Irish. Families such as the MacSwineys and Pdraig Pearse's (whose father was English) readily understood why the Anglo-Irish such as Sir Roger Casement, Robert Emmet, Wolfe Tone, Thomas Davis, Lord Edward Fitzgerald challenged British rule, a rule based on hypocrisy.

What disturbed MacSwiney most was that a corrupt and corrupting Empire was causing cynicism amongst young people, who ordinarily should be full of the highest ideals. By stunting the natural flowering of youth, the Empire was blocking young people's development of faith and confidence in the world and in God.

The question was how to inspire people to have hope, to feel free to grow. He tried to do this first through his poetry, and published a book containing a long poem, the *Music Of Freedom*. He became engrossed in the problem of what one person could do to be effective in freeing the Irish people from oppression.

Thomas Davis inspired in him the idea that the exploitation of Irish people could most effectively be countered if the Irish were to see themselves as a nation. Charles Stewart Parnell developed this idea with: *"No man has the right to set a boundary to*

the onward march of a nation. No man has the right to say: 'Thus far shalt thou go, and no further'".

Terence wanted to do more to rouse the people. He learnt Irish and then cycled around Cork teaching the language. He wrote plays, the most important was called *The Revolutionist*. He took part in protests, and was frequently arrested.

There was always a possibility of another insurrection such as those in 1798, 1803, 1848 and 1867. However he felt uncomfortable about secret societies such as the Irish Republican Brotherhood, and about the lack of preparedness for a Rising. He wrote a series of articles, which were later published as a book, *Principles Of Freedom*, which is still relevant today.

But how does one fight a war in defence of a small nation that has been swallowed up by a great Empire? The answer was to not take on the British army in open battles, but instead to set up institutions that served the people, and then defend them. When the Auxiliaries and the Black-n-Tans terrorised the people in the countryside, Flying Columns attacked these convoys. When Volunteers were captured, the Irish captured corresponding British officers. The key was to frustrate British attempts at escalation by minimal retaliation, hoping that Irish persistence would show the pointlessness of Britain trying to hold Ireland.

But how does one win such a war? MacSwiney took inspiration from Thomas Davis's song, *A Nation Once Again*, with its famous chorus *"Ireland, long a province, be a Nation once again"*. It showed how a few individuals making a sacrificing stand could save a nation, such as the three hundred in the Battle of Thermopylae, and the three who held the bridge over the Tiber to save Rome.

Terence MacSwiney added to this his strong religious faith. If going to war to save the Irish people from enslavement and corruption was justified, then a personal sacrifice was even more justified. He became inspired by Thomas à Kempis's *The Imitation Of Christ*. One of the lowest points in his life was when the Rising was called for Easter 1916, then cancelled, then called again. Should he and Tomás

MacCurtain go ahead without any element of surprise, and endanger all the Cork Volunteers? He spent the night in their headquarters, reading *The Imitation Of Christ*, pacing up and down, looking for inspiration. I have his copy in Irish, with his detailed hand-written notes. He read it during the many times he was in prison, including in Brixton. Towards the end of his Hunger-Strike his sisters read it to him.

As Dave Hannigan shows in his new book *The Hunger Strike That Rocked An Empire*, Terence MacSwiney's ideas and action had a huge impact internationally. He understood what he was doing as a soldier of the Republic. If he was released the British lost moral authority. If he died, their hypocrisy as a benign Empire would be exposed internationally, and this would pave the way for Irish freedom. There are many examples of people he influenced, such as Mahatma Gandhi, and the young Ho Chi Minh, who was working in London at the time of the Hunger Strike. He said of MacSwiney— "A Nation which has such citizens will never surrender".

Terence MacSwiney showed that it pays to stand up for what is right.

A pure spirit acting out of hope can have a greater and more lasting positive effect than one driven by anger or revenge. That is his legacy.

Cathal MacSwiney Brugh

NB: See also *Labour Comment* (back page)

Report

The end of class politics?

At the Irish Writers Festival in Hammer-smith (London) on 4th March, Michael D. Higgins, Diarmaid Ferriter and Fintan O'Toole spoke about the aftermath of the Election. There was obvious delight amongst all at the decline of FF.

MICHAEL D.

Higgins, who is President of the Labour Party, supported the (then) proposed coalition on the grounds that Labour could thereby control and contain the worst policies of Fine Gael. He said Labour had a great result but still only 37 seats and therefore there were limits to what it could do and he put forward the traditional case for coalition with FG. He seemed not to acknowledge that the situation was quite different this time.

Michael D.'s argument is redundant, however, because it fails to take into account the most obvious outcome of the election—the decline of FF and the fact that Labour could now lead the Opposition.

On the other hand, Fine Gael has not enough seats to govern alone and Labour could honestly fulfill all its election pledge to control and contain the Government very easily, by picking and choosing what to support and oppose. But Labour does not have the confidence in itself of doing this, which would mean taking responsibility for government on the best possible terms for itself.

This decision to enter Coalition has more consequences than just the actions of the next Government. As this is the greatest crisis in capitalism since the 1930s, the resulting politics will be determined by reactions to it. This is what happened in the 30s. FF dealt successfully with the crisis then and prevented a fascist solution. Just one of its great historic achievements.

By its decision, the Labour Party is alone responsible for avoiding a left-right division emerging in the Dail. The Opposition will now be led by Sinn Fein or Fianna Fail. The new Irish polity will be shaped by the outcome of which party succeeds in doing the best job in opposition, as it is they who will form the future government(s). A Fine Gael Government with a SF/FF opposition will give us 'civil war' politics with knobs on. Labour can never again bemoan the lack of a left-right in Irish politics as they have openly decided to opt out of establishing it.

As a left-right divide is equated by all as class politics it means the end of that type of politics as well, thanks to the present day Labour Party leadership—the historic achievement of the Stickies!

Michael D's attitude to the election result is regarding it as similar to the result of an opinion poll. That's the result and there you are. That is the sociologist's approach. But an election result is a dynamic, a call for action not a call for static reflection on the result. Treating an election result as he does is paralysing, and that is what has happened to Labour.

FINTAN O'TOOLE

Fintan O'Toole was delighted at the "slaying of another dragon" in Irish life. He did not seem to notice that this result also meant the creation of a new dragon—a revival of the party founded on the fascist theories of the 1930s. There is no doubt that Ernest Blythe would feel comfortable in the Fine Gael of today. There is no way of avoiding 'dragons' of one sort or another in politics, i.e., there has to be structures that have an organic life of their own. But Fintan thinks political life (and society itself) can operate on the basis of individuals giving vent to their wishes, demands, outrages, etc and that structures should and could be easily

dispensed with and rearranged on whims. Otherwise it's a case of having to put up with oppression and corruption which is all that seizes him when he looks at viable political structures. But it is difficult to take Fintan seriously anymore on political issues, since he chickened out of participating in the election. A substantial group of leftists and independent candidates was ready to stand as an alternative, but O'Toole refused to jump at the last moment. The weak excuse was that there was not enough time to mount a serious campaign! This revolutionary wants rebellion by appointment! It is now proven that those who can, *do*, and those who cannot, *comment*. It's all just 'scribble, scribble, scribble'. He could not organise the proverbial piss-up in a brewery.

DIARMAID FERRITER

Diarmaid Ferriter added his tuppence worth of commentary on the demise of Fianna Fail by quoting his MI6 professorial predecessor, T D Williams, to the effect that the party's historic secret of success was to be the party of "principle with intricate qualifications". This was said by Ferriter with a sneer and given as a reason in itself for celebrating the demise of Fianna Fail. But it is a most accurate description of any successful party. The world outside academia and the opinion columns of the *Irish Times* is a very intricate place indeed. So intricate and complicated that nothing is fully knowable or predictable. Any person or party that successfully deals with these intricacies for about 90 years is a marvel. Reports of Fianna Fail's death might turn out, like Mark Twain's, to be exaggerated.

Jack Lane

SECOND-HAND PEACE FOR SALE,

FITS MOST NATIONS

Heard about Gerry's visit to Gaza?
Saw it on Gaza TV through YouTube.
Israeli reaction, as usual, crude.
Adams did not bring a tabula rasa,
his war over, he came to sell peace
to people that have yet to win a war
against this nation-eating carnivore
who, with bulldozers, continues to feast.
Peace can mean: yet another piece of land.
Peace can mean: stay still while I cut your
throat.
Peace can mean: your head buried in the sand.
Peace can mean: raiding the siege-breaking
boats.
Peace can mean: olive groves as contraband.
Peace can mean: Holocaust victim
scapegoats.

Wilson John Haire
25th March, 2011

Shorts

from *the Long Fellow*

IRELAND AND ICELAND

The impression has been given that Ireland has made serious policy errors in the last two years. If it had pursued an alternative set of policies we would not have had to endure the economic downturn. Iceland is held out as an example that we should have followed.

But what set of policies did Iceland pursue that Ireland rejected? The Left points out that Iceland rejected the repayment of private banking debt in a referendum. She certainly did. But does that mean that she will not repay any of her banking liabilities? It appears not! The IMF is still in Iceland as it is in Ireland. Its purpose is to 'help' Iceland repay her sovereign as well as banking liabilities.

There is one indisputable difference, however, between Iceland and Ireland. Iceland has her own currency and therefore has the option to devalue. Has this given Iceland an advantage? The answer would appear to be *no*. In a series of articles in *The Irish Times* (18.2.11, 25.2.11) Dan O'Brien attempted to make a comparison.

The Gross Domestic Product figures, which measure output, indicate that Ireland has done marginally better. Both countries reached a peak in the second half of 2007 and a trough in the second quarter of 2010. Iceland's GDP fell by 15.1 per cent whereas Ireland's fell by 13.3 per cent.

But GDP does not measure a country's well being. If a country buys less imports its GDP rises, but it may be denying itself the consumption of better and cheaper products from abroad. If the exports and imports figures are stripped out, the country is left with domestic demand. Iceland's domestic demand contracted by 36.3% in the second quarter of 2010 from its high point. Ireland's contracted by 27.2% in the third quarter of 2010 from its high point.

However, this does not tell the full story. The composition of the contraction in domestic demand was very different in the two economies. In Iceland, most of the contraction (27 per cent) was explained by a decline in private consumption—that is spending by households on goods and services. In Ireland the peak-to-trough decline in private consumption was 10.7 per cent.

The main reason for the collapse in Iceland's consumption was the huge decline in real wages as a result of the inflationary shock of the króna going into freefall. While the price level was 1 per cent lower in Ireland in December 2010 compared to January 2008, it was 38 per cent higher in Iceland over the same period (as measured

by the EU's harmonised inflation rate in both cases). Very high interest rates, which were hiked to 18 per cent in an attempt to stabilise the currency, further hit heavily indebted Icelanders.

The only economic measure that Iceland scores better than Ireland is in the area of employment. This arises from the nature of our bubble rather than any policy differences in response to the crisis. Our bubble had a greater domestic component. In this country housing completions peaked at four times the long-run average whereas in Iceland the peak figure was about twice the long-term average. As a consequence, when the bubble burst, Ireland lost one in seven jobs whereas Iceland lost one in ten. More than half of the decline in Irish employment is accounted for by the 155,000 fewer people working in construction.

It has been said that the current recession is a "*balance sheet recession*". This means that the decline in wealth has been far more significant than the decline in income. The pessimists argue that for this reason our current economic crisis is worse than that of the 1980s. The decline in wealth is not measured by the normal economic statistics such as GDP, which are measures of annual income.

Dan O'Brien thinks that the net financial wealth of Irish households fell by 55 per cent from late 2006 to early 2009, a far larger peak-to-trough change than registered in any output or employment measure. However, the good news is that, since then, half of that wealth decline has been clawed back owing to the paying down of debt, which reduced liabilities, and a rise in the value of assets—mostly of non-Irish assets held by Pension and Insurance Funds.

Iceland's wealth statistics are less comprehensive than Ireland's, therefore only a partial comparison can be made. However some idea can be obtained by the performance of the stock markets. Iceland's main share index suffered one of the largest falls anywhere when the crisis broke, losing 95 per cent of its value over the course of the crash. It has since recovered almost no ground. Dublin's main index lost four-fifths of its value. It has since made up significant ground, standing at 30 per cent less than the peak.

The fact that Iceland's currency has depreciated by more than half has ballooned the value of its foreign liabilities. This, along with her high interest rates, will result in a far greater restructuring of private and corporate debt than is even contemplated in Ireland. Unfortunately for Iceland there has been no significant upside in having its own currency. Her exports have performed quite well since the crisis, but no better than Ireland (both up by about 7 per cent). O'Brien notes in passing that the UK, which also has its own currency, has not made any recovery in her exports. They remain below the pre-

crisis level despite the falling value of sterling.

The conclusion that can be drawn from O'Brien's articles is that Ireland has suffered far less than Iceland by every measure except Employment. Having our own currency would not have mitigated the crisis. Indeed quite the opposite. The hardship endured by both countries was not caused by their response to the crisis, but by the size of the bubbles before they burst. While Iceland did not have a sectoral bubble such as our building industry, which at its peak accounted for one eighth of total employment, her banks were—incredibly—even more reckless than ours. The balance sheets of her on-shore banks grew to almost ten times her GDP compared to that of our banks, a—still bloated—figure of just over three times GDP.

THE IRISH TIMES ELECTION CAMPAIGN

The Irish Times made an important intervention on the morning of the election (25.2.11). Its front page had a story about former Anglo Irish Bank Chief Executive David Drumm. It claimed that in a three year period from 2004 to 2006 he earned over 10 million euro and yet only paid taxes of 10,000: an effective tax rate of 0.1 per cent! The author of the article Colm Keena went on that morning's *News-talk 106* to discuss this scandal.

What were people to make of this shocking story as they headed for the polling booths? Was it a reflection of a corrupt relationship between senior Bank Executives and the Government, in particular Fianna Fáil?

There was just one problem with the story: it was completely false. The following day—after the polls had closed—the newspaper revealed that Drumm had in fact earned 12.47 million during the period and had paid tax of 6.31 million: an effective tax rate of over 50%. After giving the details of his annual returns, the newspaper acknowledged half-way down the article that its story of the previous day was incorrect.

It took another week before the newspaper felt it necessary to issue an apology to Mr. Drumm (4.3.11).

Perhaps Colm Keena is an incompetent fool, but what are we to make of the newspaper? The *Long Fellow* suspects that its 'errors' are not mistakes but policy.

THE LAWS OF LIBEL

It was once explained to the Long Fellow by an *Irish Times* journalist—one of the few good ones—that a newspaper cannot libel someone who has "*no reputation*". So, for example, if it is accepted that Sean FitzPatrick and Michael Fingleton have little or no reputation, such people cannot sue a newspaper for libel since their reputation could not suffer any further damage. Perhaps, *The Irish Times* felt that

David Drumm was in the same category.

The *Long Fellow* has often thought that the laws of libel are inadequate. There does not appear to be recognition of collateral damage. For example, in the above case, David Drumm was not the only victim. Fianna Fáil, was adversely affected even though that party was not even mentioned in the story. The general public was given false information at a time when it was about to vote in a General Election. But it would be impractical to attempt to assess the damage done to either Fianna Fáil or the public.

It is occasionally the case that juries award damages way in excess of the damage caused to the plaintiff. Part of the reason is the jury has been outraged by the behaviour of the media outlet. In other words part of the award is "punitive" rather than "compensatory". In the *Long Fellow's* view the punitive element should be paid to the State rather than the plaintiff.

SUNDAY TIMES AND FINTAN O'TOOLE

The *Sunday Times* apologised to Fintan O'Toole last December for falsely claiming that he was on a salary of 100k and that he "got into his five-series BMW and returned to Glasnevin" after the ICTU protest in Dublin. It turns out that this was completely false. His salary is in fact 85k and he doesn't own a car because he doesn't drive!

This is an example of lazy, malicious journalism, which shows contempt for the newspaper's readers, but it is difficult to know which is more embarrassing to O'Toole: the truth or the lie.

The *Long Fellow* was surprised at the relatively low salary: it's far lower than Geraldine Kennedy's 319k. O'Toole's duties, of course, are far less onerous. For example, it is not at all clear what responsibilities attach to the job description "assistant editor": it may be just an honorific title. Nevertheless, O'Toole does write at least two articles a week and occasionally has a feature article, which is longer than the standard opinion piece of about 1,200 words. He is regularly on television and radio. While such media exposure could be construed as self promotion, it also serves to promote *The Irish Times*. Although the *Long Fellow* does not rate him, O'Toole has been described as being the only world class columnist in the country. It is also likely that there are people who only buy the newspaper to read him.

Is it possible that O'Toole is satisfied with his relatively modest salary because he considers *The Irish Times* a worthy cause?!!

Geraldine Kennedy has recently announced that she will be standing down as Editor of *The Irish Times* at the end of her current contract, which expires this September. Inevitably there has been speculation about who will succeed her. If salaries are anything to go by—and they usually are—Fintan O'Toole is quite low on *The Irish Times* pecking order.

REAL JOURNALISM

It is sometimes necessary to sample foreign journalism in order to realise the shortcomings of journalism in this country. The *Long Fellow* has never read anything from an Irish journalist quite like Pierre Péan's description of the horrors of Rwanda. The French journalist's observations are impressive because he places them in a historical and political context. Fintan O'Toole, on the other hand, knows the truth in advance. And his truth is not tempered by time, place or engagement with the issue at hand. His virtue is unsullied by experience. There is no doubt that O'Toole satisfies many of his readers. The *Long Fellow* recently attended a public meeting in which a speaker suggested, quite seriously, that we look to the likes of O'Toole for inspiration now that the Catholic Church has collapsed.

The *Long Fellow* does not agree with many of the conclusions of Michael Lewis's recent, long *Vanity Fair* article on Ireland, but he has to admit it is a fine piece of journalism. A reader could learn more from a few paragraphs of this American journalist than a shelf full of O'Toole's books. Here is what Lewis says about alleged Irish corruption:

"The Irish real-estate bubble was different from the American version in many ways: it wasn't disguised, for a start; it didn't require a lot of complicated financial engineering beyond the understanding of mere mortals; it also wasn't as cynical. There aren't a lot of Irish financiers or real-estate people who have emerged with a future. In America the banks went down, but the big shots in them still got rich; in Ireland the big shots went down with the banks. Sean Fitzpatrick, a working-class kid turned banker, who built Anglo Irish Bank more or less from scratch, is widely viewed as the chief architect of Ireland's misfortune: today he is not merely bankrupt but unable to show his face in public. Mention his name and people with no interest in banking will tell you with disgust how he disguised millions of euros in loans made to himself by his own bank. What they don't mention is what he did with the money: invested it in Anglo Irish bonds! When the bank failed Fitzpatrick was listed among its creditors, having (in April 2008!) purchased five million euros of Anglo Irish subordinated floating-rate notes.

"The top executives of the three big banks all operated in a similar spirit: they bought shares in their own companies right up to the moment of collapse, and continued to pay dividends, as if they had capital to burn. Virtually all of the big Irish property developers who behaved recklessly signed personal guarantees for their loans. It's widely assumed that they must be hiding big piles of money somewhere, but the evidence thus far suggests that they are not. The Irish Property Council has counted at least 29 suicides by property developers and construction workers since the crash—in a country where suicide often goes unreported and undercounted. "I said to all the guys, 'Always take money

off the table.' Not many of them took money off the table," says Dermot Desmond, an Irish billionaire, who made his fortune from software in the early 1990s, and so counts here as old money."

Lewis calls it as he sees it; not as he would like it to be in order to pander to the petty bourgeois prejudices of his readers.

HYPOCRISY

What a hypocritical organisation *The Irish Times* is!

It could not silently sack Sarah Carey, but instead had to give a moralistic sheen to its squalid act.

Following her honest performance on *Prime Time*, Carey was ordered to confess her 'crimes' in her Wednesday column (23.3.11). In the following days, the newspaper published letters denouncing her and then she was sacked . . .

And what were her crimes? She did not want to reveal her sources!!! She lied to her legal counsel but NOT to the Tribunal under oath, where she admitted her action. The reason why she lied was that silence was not an option under the Tribunal's powers. But, unlike the leaks published by *The Irish Times* from the Mahon Tribunal, the source document did not come from the Tribunal. In no sense could it be said that the Tribunal owned the leaked document or that the document was stolen from it. The paper that prides itself on whistle-blowing sacked a whistle-blower!

The document that Carey revealed was a letter to Denis O'Brien's company Esat from Michael McDowell of the Progressive Democrats acknowledging a party contribution of 15,000 pounds. At the time Carey was an employee of Esat. There was a public interest in the revelation of this document because it undermined the impression that the Moriarty Tribunal wished to give that Esat was only giving money to Fine Gael. If Fine Gael was not the only beneficiary of O'Brien's largesse the evidence of a corrupt relation between O'Brien and Fine Gael, which was in Government at the time of the awarding of the licence, becomes unconvincing.

But all of this was known to *The Irish Times* before it hired Carey 2 years ago. So why all of a sudden has—in the words of Geraldine Kennedy (the *Irish Times* Editor)—Carey's "credibility...been damaged"?

The real reason is that the Tribunal is under attack and *The Irish Times* has decided that Carey must go because giving her a platform would not help the Tribunal. The agenda of the Moriarty Tribunal is similar to the newspaper, both wish to "prove"—albeit for different reasons—that the Irish State is corrupt.

In normal circumstances Carey would have been useful to give a human antidote to the arid ideological pronouncements of Fintan O'Toole *et al.* But the devastating attacks on the Tribunal by powerful interests in the society have meant that Carey is a luxury that the newspaper can no longer afford.

Madame Retires!

"Sally: But Sidney, you make a living. Where do you want to get?

Sidney Falco: Way up high, Sal, where it's always balmy. Where no one snaps his fingers and says, "Hey, Shrimp, rack the balls!" Or, "Hey, mouse, mouse, go out and buy me a pack of butts." I don't want tips from the kitty. I'm in the big game with the big players" (from the film, *The Sweet Smell Of Success*, starring Tony Curtis and Burt Lancaster).

When Geraldine Kennedy started out as a journalist in the early 1970s could she have imagined the success that would follow? From a provincial paper to the *Cork Examiner* and on to *The Irish Times* as one of Donal Foley's "babes"; she then made her mark in the *Sunday Tribune* and the *Sunday Press*.

She came to national attention when Michael Noonan, in one of his first acts as Minister for Justice, revealed in 1983 that she and the English journalist Bruce Arnold had had their phones tapped. The reason for the tapping was that Cabinet Confidentiality had been breached at a time when Haughey had been adopting an independent foreign policy during the Falklands/Malvinas War. The details of Cabinet meetings were being recounted by Kennedy and Arnold in their respective newspapers.

Haughey told his Justice Minister, Sean Doherty, to find out the source of the leaks. The Garda Commissioner did what he thought was necessary, including phone tapping, which was authorised by Doherty. If an individual sets out to undermine the functioning of the State, should he or she have any complaint if the State takes measures to protect itself? To believe otherwise is to hold that the individual is entitled to eavesdrop on Cabinet meetings but the State in response to this is not allowed to eavesdrop on the individual.

However, Doherty behaved in a disgraceful manner. He should have let the Garda investigation run its course and then report to him. But it seems that he forgot that he was no longer a Special Branch man and participated in the investigation. He obtained copies of the transcripts of the phone taps and tried to show them to Haughey. This constituted a breach of the perceived convention regarding separation of powers.

When all was revealed, Kennedy and Arnold were able to sue the State. Kennedy had become more than just a journalist; she was now a player. In 1987 she was elected to the Dáil for the anti Haughey *Progressive Democrats*. But the euphoria of the high moral ground was transient and she failed to be re-elected in 1989.

When the tide went out she was stranded. A woman in her late thirties could hardly retire. But could a failed politician resume a career as a journalist?

She was allowed return to *The Irish Times*, but had to spend a period in 'quarantine', meaning that she could not write political commentary because she could not pose as 'neutral'. Her rehabilitation only came when she broke a story that toppled a Taoiseach and his Government. She was now back in the game.

When Conor Brady retired as Editor in 2002 and a new Editor was sought, he advised her to concentrate on the members of *The Irish Times Trust*. Nobody else mattered when it came to appointing his successor. And so the first Catholic Editor was succeeded by the first woman.

She must have savoured the sweet perfume of success when she opened the Letters Page on her first day as Editor. In its 150 year history nobody had ever before addressed the Editor of *The Irish Times* as "Madame"!

But success is never quite what it seems. She had stormed the citadels of the State under the banner of openness and transparency and yet as Editor of *The Irish Times* was obliged to swear an Oath of Secrecy before a Commissioner of Oaths, a requirement repeated every year. She was appointed a Director of *The Irish Times* but was never allowed to be a member of the *Trust* which controls the newspaper and obliges the Editor to appear before it as a subordinate.

And then there was THAT story which she was not allowed to tell. The story which THAT magazine had revealed: that the dominant personality of the newspaper in the last 40 years wished to place it under British State influence following the outbreak of war in Northern Ireland and described his Editor (Douglas Gageby) as a "white nigger". That was some story about a newspaper which was the home of political correctness! Refused by the *Irish Times*, the story was published by the *Sunday Independent*—after which a rebuttal appeared in the *Irish Times*. But, when she was asked about it, she had to pretend that she had published it of her own volition and not in response to the *Sunday Independent*. And, when other documents came to light, she had to allow them to be misrepresented in order to present a false impression of what Major McDowell was up to.

Of course, there were some stories she could tell. She could examine in painstaking detail the bank transactions of Bertie Ahern amounting to thousands while the newspaper's Property Supplement gorged itself on the boom which was sustained by loans amounting to billions of euros. Was the Ahern story so important that it justified breaking the law?

As her past triumphs recede into the

distance, they seem less significant. Perhaps she wonders whether she was told the full story or if the targets from the crusading had been set up for her in advance. Years after the phone tapping scandal, it emerged that Vincent Browne and Tim Pat Coogan had also had their phones tapped, but that was under a Fine Gael Government. Fianna Fáil did not seek to make political advantage of it; it is more protective of the State. And it was noticeable that, during the anti-Haughey heaves, journalists were more interested in the fact that Ray McSharry bugged a conversation with his Cabinet colleague, Martin O'Donoghue, than the latter's statement that "money would be made available" to opponents of the party leader.

When Kennedy was asked by Eamon Dunphy about the events surrounding the toppling of the Reynolds Government following her story in *The Irish Times*, she was unable to talk about the event that relaunched her career. It seems there was no great issue of principle involved; it was merely a personality clash between Albert Reynolds and Dick Spring, which *The Irish Times* exploited and which led to the appointment of a Redmondite Taoiseach.

A couple of years ago Kennedy interviewed Major McDowell over a period of three evenings, but the publication of the interview was suppressed. The veto was exercised by his daughter, even after the Major's death. Kennedy has come a long way since she thought she was at the cutting edge of Irish journalism ... or maybe the distance was far less than she had thought.

When she announced her retirement last month, there were some carping comments about her legacy. She could hardly be blamed for the purchase of *Myhome.ie* and the other foolish investments. It is said that journalistic standards declined under her watch, but *The Irish Times* was never as good as it pretended to be. Under Kennedy its circulation stalled and then slipped back, but the newspaper was not unique in this respect and she had less resources than her predecessors. Perhaps she will claim credit for the decline of Fianna Fáil, for so long the newspaper's nemesis?

In a few months she will be free of *The Irish Times*. The newspaper will have difficulty restraining her after she has gone, notwithstanding the legal obligations which it imposed on her. At 60 years of age she will have time to defend her legacy.

It is to be hoped that she will redeem her journalistic reputation!

John Martin

Irish Times: Past And Present,
a record of the journal since 1859
by John Martin.
Index. 264pp. 2008. €20, £15.

Suppressed Article:

James Fitzgerald forward this article to the *Irish Examiner* after it carried a full page of Senator Harris promoting a book by Gerald Murphy, *The Year Of Disappearances*, which misused sources—including work published by Mr. Fitzgerald—to foster a sectarian view of the War of Independence and the Treaty War. He also sent it to the *Irish Independent*, where Kevin Myers had acted in a similar way. But Mr. Fitzgerald was refused publication, indeed he did not even receive a reply from either paper.

Such is 'press freedom' in modern times!

Gerard Murphy's Fairytales

As Chairman of the Knockraha History Society, I read with horror the recently published controversial book by Mr. Gerard Murphy, *The Year of the Disappearances—Political Killings in Cork 1920-1922*, which seeks to demonise the well known politician, the late Martin Corry TD, for his role in the fight for Irish Freedom. In this book he gives me a full chapter and quotes my writings as a source of his information in relation to Martin Corry and Knockraha. He gravely misquotes my book and makes many completely false statements. In the book he states that Martin Corry was the executioner for the Cork No.1 brigade and that he was involved in the ethnic cleansing. That is totally false and as my name is mentioned so much I have no other option now but to put the record straight.

Despite his long life, including 42 years in the Dail, having taken an active part in the War of Independence himself and no member of the Knockraha Company submitted sworn witness statements to the Bureau of Military History. However, other members of the Cork No.1 Brigade who submitted such statements did not link Martin Corry with Murphy's allegations. He made one effort to record his memories, having booked a room in a hotel but the typist never turned up and it was not activated again.

In the Knockraha History Society in the early 1970 we decided it was very important for historical purposes to record for posterity what happened during the War of Independence in our area. We conducted detailed research including many interviews with Martin Corry. At these interviews for accuracy purposes he had two members of the old IRA Company present. These interviews were taped. We also spoke to the other 26 members of the Company alive at that time. They all spoke freely to us and anyone who knew Martin Corry will recall how happy he was to talk of his involvement in the war as it happened. He would state the facts with no apology and there would be no cover-up. When our research was over we presented this book as a history of the parish.

Gerard Murphy says in his book that

Martin Corry tried to block me publishing this work—it is totally false. Martin Corry in no way tried to influence what I wrote. This book was launched at a function in the Hall in Knockraha on 11th July 1976 attended by all living members of the Company. Martin Corry spoke at the launch and welcomed the publication. The old veterans accepted it as a reasonable record of the war in our parish as it happened. This book is still available today. For writing this book I allowed Mr. Murphy full access to my research and tapes, believing that he could give an accurate account of my findings. I am disgusted how he misused this privilege from false statements to conclusions not warranted by the facts.

During the War of Independence Martin Corry was the Captain of the Knockraha Company and he had no role either in the battalion or the Brigade, except as a back-up to other companies such as in the attack on Carrigtwohill RIC Barracks. To suggest he was the Brigade executioner shows a lack of knowledge of how the Brigade worked. Knockraha had a special status in the Brigade with two operating bomb factories and Sing-Sing prison, which again the book states was Corry's prison. This is totally false—it was under the control of the Cork Brigade; its Governor, Ned Maloney as he was called, was answerable to Sean Hegarty and not to Martin Corry

The figures given by Martin for Sing-Sing were not his own figures, rather they were the numbers given by Ned Maloney before the Board when he was applying for a military pension in 1940. How many were executed from it is pure speculation. No Knockraha member brought prisoners to Sing-Sing. There were no women put into Sing-Sing nor were any prisoners in the jail tortured as Mr. Murphy asserts. They were brought from the entire Brigade area. Their fate was already decided by the Brigade officers but on the odd case where the local Company had to make a decision it was made with regard to the Brigade policy.

In several parts of the book Mr. Murphy states that Martin Corry says that he shot

a number of people—not true. Corry never said he shot anyone. Neither is there any evidence in the Military History Bureau that he shot anyone. None of the members of the Company that I spoke to could ever remember Martin Corry being a member of such a firing party, even though later in life many of those were his political enemies.

In the book Gerald Murphy mocks Martin Corry for a photograph of him appearing in my book wearing an Irish Volunteers uniform. That is an insult to all brave Irish men who wore the tunic. In the book Gerald Murphy says a body was dug up under Corry's floorboards—false. There is no anti-Sinn Fein Members buried on his farm. We had no prayer session at the unveiling of the plaque at Sing-Sing for those Mr. Murphy said were buried in the bogs. He further states that Martin Corry used his influence to stop enquiries, after bones were discovered in the Rea in 1963—false. There was a Mrs. Prendergast who raised questions but that was in 2001, 22 years after Corry's death.

Mr. Murphy insists that Corry was involved in ethnic cleansing in the Brigade area—wrong: he had no role outside his own Company. In his farm at Sunville, Glounthaune, many of his neighbours were Protestants. None were ever intimidated by Corry or any of his Company in any way. Indeed, he was the best of friends with his minority religion neighbours before, during and after the War of Independence. Martin Corry was working for the ideals of the Protestant patriot Wolfe Tone to create a republic of Protestant, Catholic and dissenter. Indeed the descendants of these Protestants still living in the area near Corry's are appalled by the suggestion that they were loggerheads with Corry ninety years ago.

The greatest threat to a Guerilla army is spies and informers who over the centuries were responsible for thwarting many uprisings. In the War of Independence spies gave information which was responsible for the wiping out of the Flying Column at Clonmult, in which 12 Volunteers lost their lives. In the Dripsey Ambush spies again had given information that led to a number being executed. When the Brigade was satisfied that people were informers, they could not expect much sympathy. Spies were not shot for their religion but rather for their deeds and to suggest that their religious background was responsible for their end is irresponsible, mischievous and an insult to the Protestant population. Throughout the book there are many 'quotations' from Martin Corry but, since

there is no reference for them, they must have been made up to suit the story.

In this book, it is as if Mr. Murphy had air-brushed out the history, the atrocities created by the Black & Tans, Auxiliaries etc. Don't forget that they pulled three people out of their houses in Carrigtwohill, one a cripple, and executed them. They burned our city, took two Delaneys from their bed in Dublin Hill and shot them. Not forgetting what was done to our Lord Mayor, Tomas MacCurtin. And it was not unusual for the Black & Tans as they drove along the road to take a pot shot at people working in the fields. Some died in this way. So the IRA terror campaign was in response to the enemy's tactics.

Commenting on the book, Kevin Myers said that bodies were dug up in Corry's farm in the 60s—wrong. As is John Paul McCarthy's assertion in *The Independent* that the Rea is in Corry's farm—false. It is 7 miles from Corry's.

It is a sad fact today that many writing historical books try to sensationalise them, presumably that more books would be sold. So money is taking precedence over historical accuracy. And today, if the Tricolour floats majestically over the GPO with no British gunboat shelling it from the Liffey, it is due to the efforts of people like Tomas MacCurtin, Martin Corry and Michael Collins. And if we have a few in our community who have an anti-nationalist agenda and who will use anything including fiction to promote their agenda, then such people are a disgrace to the land of their birth.

James Fitzgerald

Chairman, Knockraha History & Heritage Society, Ballinagoul, Glanmire, Co. Cork

Report: Pdraig Og ORuairc reviewed the claims in Gerard Murphy's *Year Of Disappearances* in *Irish History*, 9th March 2011. The review is reproduced below

Gerard Murphy's Disappearing Sources

Professor Eunan O' Halpin of Trinity College, was prophetic in his endorsement of Gerard Murphy's recent book, *The Year Of Disappearances. Political Killings in Cork 1921–1922*. O'Halpin stated the book "...is bound to stir up controversy". Murphy claims that the IRA murdered dozens of Protestant and Unionist citizens of Cork between July 1921 and August 1922. However close analysis reveals that the historical documents Murphy uses as

evidence do not always support the claims in his book. Questions need to be asked about the reliability of Murphy's research.

Murphy's book examines the execution of suspected British spies by the IRA. In 1921 the IRA was a secret guerrilla army where many orders would have been given orally and where written communication would frequently have been destroyed. As a result the evidence for the guilt or innocence of those the IRA executed is often fragmentary. Murphy links these fragments together, using supposition, coincidence, and local rumour. Murphy frequently relies on anonymous sources for information. Given the long-running controversy caused when the late historian Peter Hart used anonymous sources to make controversial claims about the War of Independence, Murphy should not have made contentious charges about the same period without definite written evidence.

Murphy believes that the IRA abducted teenagers from Unionist families during the conflict to put pressure on the British. He suggests many of these were killed and secretly buried, but often fails to produce verifiable evidence to prove this. Even Murphy's definition of what constitutes a teenager is problematic. Murphy refers to four British soldiers Privates Cannim, Powell, Morris and Dacker, who were killed the night before the Truce, as "*teenage soldiers*" (p16). None of the four were teenagers. They were aged 20, 20, 21 and 28 respectively. When questioned about this inaccuracy, Gerard Murphy told the *Sunday Tribune* newspaper, "*They are usually referred to in Cork as teenagers and this is why I referred to them as such. I did not look up their ages*".

Rather than conducting a quick Internet search of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission which would have confirmed the soldiers' ages in minutes, Murphy relied on incorrect second-hand information and treated it as factual.

The lists of those killed by the IRA in Murphy's book also pose difficulties. Murphy states that a person named Duggan was abducted and killed by the IRA in Cork sometime in July of 1921. There is no record of a person named Duggan being abducted at that time. Murphy does not state Duggan's full name, sex and date or place of death in the book. He admits that, "Little or nothing is known about Duggan" (p35). Yet he automatically accepts Duggan's death as historical fact.

THREE PROTESTANT BOYS

Murphy's lists of Cork civilians killed by the IRA also lacks essential detail. It includes groupings of anonymous fatalities, including "*Three Merchants*" and

"*Six Prominent Citizens*" (p338). Crucially Murphy claims that the IRA in Cork did not target Protestants because of their religion until the War of Independence ended in July 1921. He writes that, "...the IRA campaign in the city, at least up to that point, was not sectarian" (p42).

Murphy states that the IRA killed three Protestant teenagers from Cork between 11–15 July 1921. According to Murphy, the trio confessed they were British spies before being killed. Murphy sees this as a key event which launched the Cork IRA on a murderous sectarian campaign in late 1921 and early 1922. In his book Murphy insists that this event "...set in motion a whole witch hunt fuelled by suspicion and paranoia that led to dozens of deaths" (p.306). The three victims are unnamed in Murphy's work and he refers to them as "*Three Protestant Boys*".

There is no record of three Protestant youths being abducted together in newspapers or police reports of the time. Nor is there any record of their existence or death in archival collections such as the Mulcahy Papers in the UCD Archives. Other youths who disappeared were abducted individually, and secretly executed by the IRA in Cork in the same period, as was recorded. How could the disappearance of this group of three have escaped the attention of their families, the press, the police and the British authorities?

The logical conclusion is that the disappearance of the "*Three Protestant Boys*", which Murphy claims sparked a sectarian campaign, was not recorded because it did not happen.

Murphy's only information about the fate of the "*Three Protestant Boys*" comes from one anonymous source. Murphy states that he was told "*the story*" (his description – p302) by the 89 year old son of an IRA veteran. Murphy states this man was informed ...by a Volunteer who waited until all connected to the event were themselves dead" (p302). Murphy does not state how the IRA veteran his 89 year old source supposedly heard the story from someone who knew of the killings. Nor is he named anywhere in Murphy's book. This third hand anonymous information cannot be verified or examined and therefore completely lacks credibility. Yet it is Murphy's strongest evidence, not only for the fate of the "*Three Protestant Boys*", but also of their existence.

THE DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

Murphy claims that the killings of these three were referred to by Connie Neenan in an account of his IRA activities recorded in writing by Ernie O'Malley (Ernie

O'Malley Military Notebooks, UCD Archives P17b/112 p126). Murphy gives the following as an extract from this interview: "*Three were friends and they confessed to their trackings and they were killed*". This sentence is so central to Murphy's thesis that he refers to it no less than 15 times in the book. Murphy also entitles the book's 27th Chapter, *Three Were Friends*.

However the phrase, "*Three Were Friends...*" is not found anywhere in the document cited by Murphy.

The sentence in the account quoted by Murphy actually reads: "Both kids confessed their trackings, and they were killed". This transcription of the sentence has been confirmed by two other historians who have specialised in transcribing O'Malley's notebooks. Namely O'Malley's son, Cormac K. H. O'Malley, and Dr. John O'Callaghan of the University of Limerick. While O'Malley's handwriting is difficult to read, this document is amongst the most legible interviews he recorded. It is clear beyond doubt that there are only nine words in the sentence. A comparison between Murphy's transcription of the passage and the original (above) shows that Murphy frequently misidentified words, in one case reversed the order of two words, changed numerals to words and inserted several words that were not in the original.

Presumably Murphy mistook the B in 'Both' for the numeral '3'. Regardless, Murphy provides an extremely poor and misleading transcription of the sentence. It is clear from the original that Neenan was referring to two suspected spies executed before the Truce and therefore could not possibly have been referring to "*Three Protestant Boys*" killed afterwards.

Gerard Murphy insists that the transcription of the document in his book is fully correct and accurate. This claim is paradoxical since Murphy gives at least three slightly different transcriptions of the sentence in his book (pp109,149,306). When questioned about the accuracy of his transcription of this sentence, Gerard Murphy told the *Sunday Tribune* newspaper, "*To my eyes at least the word 'friends' is clearly legible. A blind man could see that the sentence has ten words not nine, excluding the 3.*"

When contacted concerning the accuracy of Gerard Murphy's transcription of the sentence and provided with a copy of the document in question, Gill & Macmillan, Murphy's publishers stated: "*It is not our intention, to insert ourselves into this scholarly dispute*".

Given the lack of any verifiable proof

whatsoever that this incident ever happened, serious questions need to be raised about the dozens of deaths that Murphy claims were a result of it. Murphy makes over forty references to O'Malley's handwritten documents in his book in support of his various claims. If Murphy was unable to read and accurately transcribe O'Malley's interview with Neenan, then the other references Murphy makes to O'Malley's notebooks must also be treated as circumspect by the reader until they have been checked in the original.

By omitting three key words from his transcription Murphy has completely changed the meaning of the sentence. The original sentence implies that IRA methods of gathering information were competent and precise. Murphy's incorrect transcription of the sentence gives the opposite impression.

Finally Murphy's inaccurate transcriptions are unfortunately not confined to handwritten documents. Murphy reproduces part of a typed IRA document issued by the 1st Cork Brigade. (O'Donoghue Papers National Library of Ireland MS 31 230) According to Murphy it directs IRA intelligence officers to examine letters

addressed to "... *any address or firm with which people generally deal...*"

The document actually states that the IRA should be on the alert for letters sent to "... *any address or firm with which people locally do not generally deal...*" By omitting three key words from his transcription Murphy has completely changed the meaning of the sentence. The original sentence implies that IRA methods of gathering information were competent and precise. Murphy's incorrect transcription of the sentence gives the opposite impression.

The flaws in Murphy's work are often evident only when his original source material is examined. If Murphy can not accurately transcribe either the handwritten or typed documents he uses as evidence, then the claim that his book is a work of historical fact based around these documents is seriously questionable.

Pádraig Óg Ó Ruairc

The author is a Ph D student at the University of Limerick. He is the author of *Blood On The Banner—The Republican Struggle in Clare* and *The Battle For Limerick City* both published by Mercier Press, Cork. He administers the website www.warofindependence.info

Population Questions

There has been some criticism of comment in our columns on Immigration and Abortion.

There seem to be two major causes of large-scale immigration in modern times. The first was the need to people the North American continent after its native peoples had been exterminated. The Puritan colonists, fleeing to freedom from some minor irritants in England, constructed a kind of liberty for themselves in America in which there was no room for the ungodly—meaning the adherents of other, less savage, gods. So they created empty spaces too big to be filled immediately by their own reproductive power and they called on "*the poor, the huddled masses*" of Europe to come and fill them—white people who could be shaped to the Anglo-American dream. A little over a hundred years after the last of the native American peoples were broken, there are still large empty spaces in the USA.

Large-scale immigration *into* Europe is a post-1945 phenomenon. It began with large-scale Turkish immigration into Germany. Thanks to the conflict that soon developed between the forces that defeated Nazi Germany—those of Soviet Russia predominantly and secondarily those of

the USA—the plans of the Western Allies to take Germany apart and remake it were not put into effect for fear that this should result in Soviet power extending to the Rhine. Germany was not re-made. It was bolstered up and heavily subsidised by the USA—which again had profited handsomely from the 2nd World War—as a barrier against the main foe that had destroyed Nazism. So, instead of being poor, Germany was wealthy. And, instead of grubbing around in a "*pastoralised*" economy, in accordance with the first American plans, Germany had its 'economic miracle' on the basis of its own industry and American money. But it had a serious manpower shortage because of heavy losses in the War. So there was large-scale migration of labour into Germany in the 1950s.

And then Britain became a country of large inward migration too. It had had a rich source of labour in Ireland for its industrial revolution but in the 1950s the demand for labour exceeded the Irish supply, even though the industrial revolution was over and the country was heavily in debt to the USA. It actively recruited labour from the West Indies, and labour also began to pour in from the recently

independent States of India and Pakistan. This post-industrial revolution British demand for labour seems to have resulted from an initial boost from the US, combined with the skill of the City of London in exploiting the international money system.

The American funding of post-War Europe was no more altruistic than the opening of its borders so that the empty spaces it made should be filled. It was absurdly wealthy and powerful after 1945 as a result of its aptitude of profiting in war, and it needed a world to be wealthy and powerful in.

Ireland had always been a country of emigration from the English destruction of Irish life in the 17th century until the 1990s. Then it became a country of immigration through Haughey's success in gaining a large European subsidy (when he made it appear that Ireland had ceased to be a post-colonial English appendage) and launching the country on the globalist financial system.

There was a moment in the 1990s. When it seemed that America and Britain were on the brink of making the world into an integrated capitalist system in which the main business of every Government would be to secure a commercial environment for the investment of capital from anywhere. If this had been accompanied by a determination that labour should be as free as capital to flow around the world, it could at least be said that America and Britain were in earnest about Globalism as an ideal. But it soon became clear that the Globalist propaganda was deceptive camouflage for an exploitative system, with certain things being free and others not as Ameranglian interests required.

If comprehensive Globalism had been pursued in earnest, the concepts of immigration and emigration would have become redundant. There would only have been migration, such as occurs within states. But more and more states began to see that it was the camouflage of a national exploitative system (that of America and Britain). They dissented, and the World Trade Organisation operation broke down. A general return to nationalism is now in process. And, without a general right of migration, immigration is a matter for national policy.

At the present time, Globalism has a tendency to disrupt and de-stabilise traditional societies with progressive notions. Also, outside interference prevents national developments from taking their societies in hand and developing in the light of their own mores. These societies then produce an unsettled element which seeks to travel to the prosperous heartlands of Globalism in order to participate in what is perceived as the good life, or in

order to support their families at home. This is resented by the settled populations of the heartlands, who nevertheless are content to benefit from the fruits of Globalism. Moreover, the incomers have a tendency to distort the labour and social services market to the detriment of the home population. But, if they wish to be protected from the free movement of labour, an inherent part of Globalism, they have to accept that their countries can no longer benefit from the free-wheeling movement of capital. America and its imitators must accept that the free trade era is at an end.

That said, it must be said that Ireland has benefitted in the past decade from the bulking out of its population by an element which looks as though it will settle permanently and become part of its national life.

The question is whether Ireland is capable of returning from the globalist illusions of the past twenty years to coherent national existence.

Abortion, which now seems to be asserted as a universal human right, was a crime almost everywhere within living memory. Under the universal idealism launched by the French Revolution, consolidated by the UN Declarations, and given effect chiefly by the USA, everything is either a universal right or a crime. Particular arrangements made by particular peoples are not to be tolerated. But the

USA in its actual life remains undecided over whether there is an absolute right to abortion, in which case it is virtuous, or it is a crime.

The universal right to abortion goes along with the ideal of the household as consisting of the single individual, and any concern about reproduction of the species being a reduction of women to the sub-human status of breeding animals. The single person is an end subject to a moral obligation of self-fulfilment. Reproduction, with or without marriage or partnership, is an individual life-style choice with which society has no concern (as Ruth Lea, Secretary of the British Institute of Directors, put it).

It does not seem that a society—perhaps 'state' would be a better word—organised in accordance with this ideal would be viable. It would not reproduce itself. It would run out of people.

But, since that mode of life is not yet general (and is not yet thoroughly developed even in England)—and since much of the world still lives in societies that are networks of families which, however, are continuously subject to disruption by the economic and military power of the individualist human elite and therefore produce migrants—people can still be imported free to make up the shortfall of reproduction as a by-product of personal lifestyle choice.

On The Blatant Hypocrisy Of Referring Libya To The ICC

Libya is not a party to the International Criminal Court (ICC) and does not accept its jurisdiction. In this respect, it is no different to about 80 other States in this world, for example, the US, Russia, China, Israel and Sudan.

But on 26th February the Security Council voted unanimously, in Resolution 1970, to refer Libya to the ICC. To be precise, it decided

"to refer the situation in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya since 15 February 2011 to the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court;"

Amongst those States who voted for this referral were five States—China, India, Lebanon, Russia and the US—who are not parties to the ICC and don't accept its jurisdiction. This is blatant hypocrisy.

Writing in the *Irish Times* on 12 March about US support for this referral, Siobhán Mullally, a senior lecturer in international law at University College Cork, said:

"This support reflects the Obama administration's policy of positive engagement, a welcome reprieve from

the Bush administration's open and hostile opposition to the court."

What planet does she live on? What is positive about the US forcing Libya to accept the jurisdiction of the ICC, when it refuses to accept the jurisdiction of the ICC itself?

SUDAN

This referral by the Security Council of "*the situation in the Libya*" to the ICC closely parallels the action of the Council on 31st March 2005, when it passed resolution 1593, which decided—

"to refer the situation in Darfur since 1 July 2002 to the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court".

Like Libya, Sudan is not a party to the ICC. On this occasion, the US and China abstained, but three States—Philippines, Russia, Tanzania—which don't accept the jurisdiction of the ICC voted for it.

As a result of this referral, the ICC charged the President of Sudan, Omar Hassan al-Bashir, with genocide and two other Sudanese nationals with lesser charges. None of them has been taken into custody or tried.

ARTICLE 13(B)

How were these referrals possible? The answer lies in Article 13(b) of the ICC statute (aka the Rome Statute), under which the ICC may exercise jurisdiction in respect of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity if:

"A situation in which one or more of such crimes appears to have been committed is referred to the Prosecutor by the Security Council acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations;"

So, the ICC is not an independent judicial body, the jurisdiction of which States can choose to reject, as the US and others have done. On the contrary, its jurisdiction can be extended by the Security Council to apply to states that have chosen to reject its jurisdiction.

Of course, this cannot happen to veto-wielding members of the Security Council, who have chosen not to become a party to the Statute—since they can wield their veto to block any attempt by the Security Council to extend the ICC's jurisdiction to their territory. So, China, Russia and the US, which have chosen not to ratify the Statute, will never have ICC jurisdiction extended to their territories.

And neither will Israel, since the US can be relied upon to use its veto to block it.

A Court with universal jurisdiction is fair. A Court, the jurisdiction of which states can choose to accept, has a semblance of fairness. But a Court, like the ICC, the jurisdiction of which can be extended by the Security Council to some states that have chosen not to accept its jurisdiction but not to others, is grossly unfair.

PROTECTING OWN NATIONALS

The ICC has jurisdiction in respect of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity, committed in the territories of states that are party to the Statute, or by nationals of states that are party to the Statute. However, the primary duty for prosecuting these crimes lies with the state in which they were committed—and the ICC only acquires jurisdiction to prosecute them if the state fails to prosecute them. In principle, the ICC can prosecute any individual responsible for these crimes, regardless of his/her civilian or military status or official position.

This means that, in theory, a national of a State that is not party to the Statute, for example, a US national, may be tried by the ICC for crimes committed in a state that is a party to the Statute. The US is particularly opposed to this, since it has civilian and military personnel in lots of States around the world, many of which are party to the Statute. It is US policy to prevent the ICC trying any US nationals.

Because of this, Resolution 1970 includes a paragraph exempting nationals from States not party to the ICC, including US nationals, from the jurisdiction of the ICC for acts committed in Libya. This is

paragraph 6, which says that

"nationals, current or former officials or personnel from a State outside the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya which is not a party to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of that State for all alleged acts or omissions arising out of or related to operations in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya established or authorized by the Council, unless such exclusive jurisdiction has been expressly waived by the State;"

The hypocrisy surrounding this is staggering: States that are not party to the ICC support the referral of matters occurring in the territory of one of their number to the ICC, but exclude their own nationals from the impact of that referral.

ARTICLE 98 AGREEMENTS

Since the ICC came into operation in 2002, the US has gone to extraordinary lengths to prevent its own nationals from being subject to the jurisdiction of the Court. Under Article 89(1) of the Rome Statute, states that are party to ICC are required to "comply with requests for arrest and surrender" by the Court. In principle, these may be for the arrest and surrender to the Court of US nationals.

To prevent a State acceding to such a request, the US has sought to take advantage of Article 98.2 of the Rome Statute, which states:

"The Court may not proceed with a request for surrender which would require the requested State to act inconsistently with its obligations under international agreements pursuant to which the consent of a sending State is required to surrender a person of that State to the Court, unless the Court can first obtain the cooperation of the sending State for the giving of consent for the surrender."

Starting in 2002, the US negotiated agreements with more than a hundred States in which they agree not to surrender US nationals to the Court. These agreements are variously known as Article 98 agreements, bilateral immunity agreements (BIAs) and bilateral non-surrender agreements. To the best of my knowledge, Ireland has not made such an agreement with the US.

States that are parties to the ICC cannot receive military aid from the US in the absence of such an agreement. Section 2007(a) of the American Service-Members' Protection Act passed by the US Congress in 2002 includes a prohibition of military assistance to the Governments of countries that are parties to the ICC. However, Section 2007(c) allows the President to waive the prohibition of military assistance if an Article 98 agreement exists.

Such are the lengths that the US is prepared to go in order to exclude its own nationals from the jurisdiction of the ICC, while voting in the Security Council to extend the jurisdiction of the ICC for others.

David Morrison

March 2011

es ahora *

Aldous Huxley, novelist and prominent member of the British Peace Pledge Union, once wrote an article for *Time And Tide* about "collective security"—the idea that groups of countries should band to threaten belligerent dictatorships with violent consequences.

Was it of any use, Huxley wondered, to have a large bomber force at hand to deter a dictator from doing objectionable things? No, it wasn't, because a dictator may well weigh risk very differently from the way we expect him to. "If he is crazy, he doesn't perceive the risk. If he is coldly Machiavellian, he sees that in desperate circumstances he personally may risk less by going to war than by submitting to the threats of foreign governments."

It may be very difficult, Huxley admitted, to keep some nations from attacking others.

"What is quite certain is that threatening them with war if they do so or making war upon them, even with a collective bombing force, will not achieve what is desired.... An evil act always produces further evil acts".

7th March, 1936.

Winston Churchill published an article in the *Evening Standard* called *How To Stop War*. It was 12th June 1936. Fine speeches were useless, Churchill said, and platitudes were a crime. They was only one way to stop war, and that was through military might. "Safety will only come", he wrote, "through a combination of pacific nations armed with overwhelming power and capable of the same infinity of sacrifice, and indeed of the ruthlessness, which hitherto have been the attributes of the warrior mind..." (*Human Smoke*, Nicholson Baker. Simon & Shuster. London. 2008).

There has been so much of war again lately with images filling our TV screens of bombings, French bomber jets taking off and one American jet landing flat in the Libyan sands due we were told to "technical error". Watching Sky News, France 24 and Al Jazeera we were treated to shots of video taken in skewed snips, showing that either the camera-man was totally plastered or they were giving us the usual propaganda take of fleeing rebels.

I have never seen so many arms as those held by the Libyan "rebels" in my life. They even have their caps festooned with big power bullets and ribbons of them thrown across their chests. Unfortunately when a gun goes off close by, they flee like the devil and as I watched France 24's special Libyan "rebel" programme they did exactly the same by falling behind a sand-dune. When they started off in their

truck, each man had two hand-grenades and one rocket grenade and they leapt off in the desert, close "to Gaddafi's troops", threatening hell. It took only one burst of gunfire from someone else and our brave boys were running for safety.

May I make a suggestion to whom ever is responsible for such awful propaganda: that they either take it seriously or just give it up. Who comprises this so-called "rebel government" that President Sarkozy of France seems so keen on recognising? What are David Cameron's interests here—OK other than oil, gas and arms sales? And as *The Guardian*, 12th March 2011, has revealed, the UK has none other than the English Queen's son, Prince Andrew, to "flog their arms and get friendly with shifti Sheiks" under the umbrella of the 'Foreign Office and UK Trade & Investment'. In the *Observer*, 13th March 2011, they went on record to say that—

"the Prince in his role as the UK's special trade ambassador, organisations including Human Rights Watch, Index on Censorship, Global Witness and Campaign against Arms Trade all state that the affair has underlined fundamental failings in the country's supposedly ethical foreign policy."

"Richard Alderman, director of the Serious Fraud Squad and a key figure in cracking down on business bribes to win contracts told Ken Clarke of growing concerns over delays to implementing the Bribery Act. Alderman reportedly warned that the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and the US justice department had been unhappy with the coalition's decision to push back the legislation's introduction, originally planned for next month".

The Duke of York, as Andrew is known, has been outed as having links with the despots of Tunisia, and Azerbaijan "whose country is one of the most corrupt in the world": everyone knows of the regime's involvement with torture of political opponents and rigged elections by President Ilham Aliyev. Of course, the UK's former Prime Minister, Tony Blair, speaking from Jerusalem in his capacity as Middle East do-gooder (!) jumped in early in the riots in Egypt and "warned against rushing to oust Hosni Mubarak" but he didn't of course declare that he had deep ties with the dictator as he and his family holidayed over five Christmases from 2000-2005 as "guests of the Egyptian government at two private government villas at the New Tower Hotel in Sharm-el-Sheikh" and even had Mubarak pay for their flights on at least one occasion according to *Private Eye*, No.1282, 18th February— 3rd March 2011 and so too did the Clintons at various other times. This article was filed under the heading: "Tony's Crony". Under this article there is reference to Tony's millions and we are

advised to turn to page 28. Under *High Finance* there is listed such a pyramid of companies feeding into others that it is impossible to know what is going on unless one happens to be a forensic accountant but I may have got to the bottom of it for the next issue.

Now of course Europe is being inundated with refugees from Tunisia and all the surrounding countries that seem to be imploding inwards. Already Italy and Malta have appealed for help as the refugees arrive in their hundreds—literally swarming in boats. They seem to be mostly young men with no families with them. They tell us how much they had to pay the people smugglers and as these are youths—they don't seem to be particularly stressed; perhaps sensing an opportunity for adventure and travel that they wouldn't otherwise get. I was appalled to see the Prime Minister of the little island of Malta getting shouted at by a fat American who said we (in Europe) all had to pitch in. Well please America don't lecture us when you have frozen *all* the *assets* of nearly all these countries. These assets belong to the people of the countries which are in turmoil. They most certainly should not be held for the payment of your war on them or on their leaders which is the same thing really. No one buys the "surgical strikes" tactic that you have quoted interminably since Iraq, Afghanistan etc. Please stop the bombing. And give those youths the money to return to their countries with the offer of education and jobs as it *is their right*. Europe cannot take any more, but if France is so intent on its bombing campaign—then Malta, Italy and any other country affected should see that these guys are put on trains to Paris and let Sarkozy deal with a crime of his own making—he is a pure *scuit!* Look at how ethically Germany, Russia and China are behaving.

As Ireland is neutral, we are well out of such blackguarding and anyway it is in our national self-interest (like those already quoted) to keep out of the belligerence fronted always by USUK. I can't see them not going after Iran with the US fifth fleet parked nearby. And by then the balloon will well and truly have gone up. And who is watching Israel—that so-called beam of democracy when their leaders have all been Generals with a total commitment to war as just a means to an end—never politics! Besides pirating ships *in international waters* and killing the children of Gaza—when is the world or USUK going to call time on their activities? Prime Minister Ehud Barak is a decorated soldier but it is his Foreign Minister, Avigdor Lieberman, that is the one to watch. He was born in Moldova and is a far-rightist, keen to be seen as a hard man. This is a man who has advocated that "Israeli Arab members of the Knesset who have contact with Hamas or do not celebrate Israeli Independence Day should be

executed" (See *The New York Review of Books*, 21st December 2006).

THE STORY OF IRELAND

I often record programmes that I want added to my DVD box set and one great drama is *Waking the Dead*. So, once I had absorbed all the news stations and their various perspectives, I put on my Planner and waited for my programme. There is usually an overlap with the last programme and as I watched a classroom of children I thought it was a commercial. But no—it was Fergal Keane's BBC/RTE co-funded programme of *The Story of Ireland*. I had heard friends talking about it and they—if I can generalise their attitudes—didn't like it. But I don't watch such documentaries and so I was faced with listening to a voice-over that was recorded by me completely by accident. "The old concept of an Irish identity that I grew up with which was that being Irish was Gaelic and Catholic—that's gone really." President Mary MacAleese then replies:

"I think that there are still plenty of Gaels around and still plenty of Catholics (faint laugh from her) around but I think what's nice about the time we are entering now is that you don't have to be both of those things to be Irish and that Irish identity can draw from many many many wells and we are going to build between us the Ireland of tomorrow and who can say what Irish identity will morph into..."

There is beautiful music and visually we see seas crashing on rocks and a voice-over from Keane saying:

"The first inhabitants of this island came from Europe. They were open to change and absorbed waves of invasion. They embraced a spiritual revolution and carried it to distant lands. The old hatreds have not vanished but the Irish have moved to peaceful co-existence. There has been famine, revolution and civil war but in an age of uncertainty, we can surely draw strength from the memory of what has been overcome. {Visuals of Keane now walking on a strand.} The Story of Ireland has always been a narrative of change, unpredictable and dynamic. The past is no longer a melancholy burden or a reason to hate. We are never entirely free of the claims of history but neither are we its prisoners. Ireland today it is an island of possibilities — an open island."

As I watched the names involved in the making of this series, I was not unduly surprised to see that under "Series Consultant" was one—Roy Foster. I was only recently wondering what had become of him and there he was. Then I got my *TLS*, 11th March 2011, No.5632 and there in an advert for Spring Books from Oxford University Press was *Words Alone—Yeats and his inheritances* by R.F. Foster. The last time Foster was interviewed after his foray into literary biography, he had said

that he was going back to history which according to him was his *forte*. After his two-volume books on Yeats (which included the proverbial kitchen sink)—can he really have more to say on this subject? According to the blurb advertising the book:

"Was Yeats part of a literary tradition? Going against the grain, Roy Foster argues that the rich seed-bed of nineteenth-century Irish—romantic national tales, political polemic, occult novels, and 'peasant fictions'—gave Yeats his literary inheritance."

Yes really! But the part I liked particularly was that bit about Foster "*going against the grain*". Is this where he kicks revisionism to touch? Or has he got fed up over the goings-on of the younger set of academic historians with their news-making controversies? The book is out in April so we will see for ourselves if we are still interested—that is.

THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE

In *Warships—International Fleet Review*, February 2011, there is a very good article, with great photos of the ships involved, from a "*report based on material provided by UK Maritime Component Command, Bahrain, and the US Navy*". The three navies involved are British, French and the US.

"The British frigate HMS Cumberland rode shotgun on the French aircraft carrier Charles de Gaulle, on the lookout for any threats as they passed through the narrow Straits of Hormuz from the Arabian Sea into the Gulf. Hormuz is dominated by Iran, both from missile batteries arranged all down its coast and also Iranian maritime forces based on islands off the Arabian Peninsula.... Cumberland has been in company with the French fleet flagship while the latter was cruising on the Indian Ocean, to launch Combat Air Support for NATO troops in Afghanistan. The type 22 frigate—one of four powerful warships declared surplus to UK requirements and to be retired from service this year under government cost-cutting plans—continued to escort the Charles de Gaulle. Captain Steve Dainton, Commanding Officer of HMS Cumberland, said of his ship's role as guardian to Europe's most powerful surface warship: "It has demonstrated the long-standing and close working relationship between the French Navy and UK maritime forces. The Straits of Hormuz is a vital sea lane and this is a role we have performed for other high-value shipping since we've been on task in the area". Cumberland took over as the on-watch Gulf RN warship from Type 23 frigate HMS Somerset at the end of October. She will return home to Devonport Naval Base in March before decommissioning a few weeks later. Prior to Cumberland joining forces with the Charles de Gaulle, it was the turn of US Navy vessels to demonstrate interoperability with the French fleet. Carrier

strike group escort ships from France and the USA—in the form of the destroyer USS Halsey, from the Abraham Lincoln CSG, and frigate FS Tourville, from the de Gaulle GSG—participated in a joint gunnery exercise in the Arabian Sea. Both escorts engaged in exercises. And the Halsey's CO, Commander Jordy Harrison, said the joint scenario showcased the two ships' ability to manoeuvre and communicate as a unified force. Another carrier the Truman CSG participated in an event to mark the 100th anniversary of French naval aviation. Rafale strike jets landed and catapulted off Truman, while Hornets and Hawkeyes touched down on the Charles de Gaulle. French naval aviation maintenance crews embarked aboard Truman to conduct a practice engine change on a Fafale F3 in the American ship's hangar bay."

THREAT TO BRITAIN

Vice Admiral Sir Jeremy Blackham, General Sir Michael Rose and Air Commodore Andrew Lambert declare in their joint UK "National Defence Association discussion document" that British defences are alarmingly low. "*The (current) government appears to have failed to appreciate just how dangerously run down all three services have become under previous governments, to the point where national security is already severely comprised*". In a long article the political correspondent for *Warships*, Francis Beaufort, wrote about the top brass pleading with the Government not to implement the savage cuts that it was intent on imposing. There were calls for a rethink of the Government's Strategic Defence and Security Review (SDSR) but they fell on deaf ears. Even a hard-hitting direct appeal to the Prime Minister from former First Sea Lord and Government Minister Lord West of Spithead could not deflect the Con-Dem administration from discarding the Royal Navy's strike carriers and their Harrier strike jets. But the game was up and Lord West lamented to the PM that: "*I fear you have been a victim of bad and biased briefing*". David Cameron dismissed Lord West with the cutting comment that "*the SDSR's decision had been based on 'military advice'*". So much for the Royal Navy's much vaunted maritime prowess within this island nation's history.

But there is an Irish dimension to this story—well, with Britain, isn't there always? Despite the gagging sentimentality of our President, as shown in that short clip from *The Story of Ireland* programme, the British see themselves in *real geopolitical terms* and they don't care who knows this. And so we come to the "*tiny islet of Rockall*". We learn that Denmark has now registered a claim to it with the United Nations. What is dismissed out of hand is Ireland's claim. Because the British state unequivocally that: "*The first*

people to set foot on Rockall were Royal Navy sailors in 1811". This claim is a load of cobblers. The Irish were back and forth the whole time in the sea and landed there in 402 at least if not before!! But why Rockall—which is a tiny uninhabited islet—only 25m broad and 31m long? Well, "*there are potentially large reserves of oil and gas to be exploited in the environs of Rockall*". Iceland also has put in a claim and, according to the British, the United Nations are to deliver judgement over its ownership this Spring. And so the owner will get "*to exploit all the natural resources in its vicinity*". Maybe our President will do some act of duty towards those of us who pay her salary and tell the English Queen that this time *we* get to hold onto Rockall and that she should convey that to her Government once and for all. All in the spirit of mutual interests and co-operation—no need to fall out over such a *mere bagatelle* between old friends as we are now—*n'est ce pas?*

IRISH CULTURE

Though the revisionist historians have warned us that we have no more heroes—especially that 'fine' educationalist Elma Collins, still there is a vacuum—and after all wasn't Jerry Ryan canonised as one in the days after his death. But there is always Bono. And guess who has been put on the shortlist for the inaugural Mikhail Gorbachev, *The Man Who Changed the World* awards! The prize to mark the 80th Birthday of the ex-Soviet leader will go to those "*who changed the world we live in*". Nominees include Director Stephen Spielberg, Google co-founder Sergey Brin, and world-wide web inventor Tim Berners-Lee. In the glossy magazine *Hello*, No. 1164, 7th March 2011, there is an exclusive interview with "*the veteran champion of democracy*", and there are the details of a "gala charity event in Mikhail's name at the Royal Albert Hall in London on 30th March where the winners will be named". The attendees include a Who's Who of the great and the not so good. A lot of the Middle East monarchs may be not make it, owing to more pressing events at home due to their people getting ideas from the internet—or so we are told. Nevertheless, former PM John Major, London Mayor Boris Johnson, former Californian Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, Israeli President Shimon Peres, former US Secretary of State George Shultz, and many more will be attending with a huge contingent from the world of show business and fashion. As Mikhail admits, he has been filmed in diverse adverts such as Louis Vuitton, Pizza Hut and the Austrian Railways. I will keep an eye on the evening's proceedings and fingers crossed—our home grown boy Bono will be acclaimed—oh and he too has filmed adverts with his lovely wife for Louis Vuitton. Small world and all that!

Julianne Herlihy ©

Naval Warfare

Thomas Gibson Bowles MP wrote *The Declaration Of Paris Of 1856* at the turn of the twentieth century. It had the full subtitle of *An Account Of The Maritime Rights Of Great Britain; A Consideration Of Their Importance; A History Of Their Surrender By The Signature Of The Declaration Of Paris; And An Argument For Their Resumption By The Denunciation And Repudiation Of That Declaration.*

On the first page it quoted Lord Salisbury to the effect that "*Since the Declaration of Paris, the fleet, valuable as it is for preventing an invasion of these shores, is almost valueless for any other purpose*".

Tommy Bowles, who was known as 'Vanity Fair Bowles' because he founded the socialite magazine, was a Tory who, like Churchill, went over to the Liberal Party on the issue of Free Trade. He is notable as the man who asked the question in Parliament to Balfour in 1903, that forced the Prime Minister to admit British interest in developing the Baghdad Railway with the Germans. The subsequent Liberal Imperialist campaign scuppered the venture and Bowles took the credit for changing the course of British policy.

Bowles was also an enthusiastic naval man and a prominent opponent of any diminution of British sea power. He had published *Maritime Warfare* (1878); *Flotsam And Jetsam* (1882); *The Declaration Of Paris Of 1856* (1900) and *Sea Law And Sea Power* (1910).

Bowles's book of 1900 was one of many that argued Britain had given away its trump card in naval warfare by signing up to the Declaration of Paris in 1856. Chapter X of his book entitled, *The British Method of Warfare; its Effect*, gives a good description of its subject and is worth quoting from, to explain what British naval warfare was all about before Lord Clarendon signed the Paris Declaration:

"The British method of waging war was to assert and to establish a complete supremacy on the seas, and to utilize that supremacy for the distress of Britain's enemies by the extinction of their commerce. The establishment of the supremacy was no more than a means to the end. The end was the utilization of the supremacy, and the final object the material distress of the enemy to such an extent as to force him to a peace.

"By battle and by blockade was the supremacy established, in capture were

its fruits reaped. No neutral flag then availed to cover enemy's property; so long as it was enemy's property it was exposed to the imminent risk of capture, and the certainty, if and when captured, of condemnation and confiscation. Moreover, the risk of capture was so great that few would face it.

"British supremacy at sea meant that the enemy could keep no ships at sea capable of doing battle with the British fleets, and could therefore offer no protection to his trade. That trade could not be carried on for him by neutrals. Consequently, it practically stopped altogether. In all things that had to come overseas there was a famine, and for all those things famine prices in every European country at war with England, so long as that war lasted.

"On the other hand, for all things that had to go overseas there was an arrest of trade, if not complete at least so considerable as seriously to distress all those subjects of the enemy engaged in producing commodities to be sent abroad. The import trade overseas was stopped, to the great injury of the enemy's subjects who were consumers, upon whom the prices of such imports were increased sometimes as much as twelvefold; the export trade overseas was equally stopped, to the equally great injury of the enemy's subjects who were producers, from whom were withdrawn the profits hitherto gained by the free sale of their produce to the foreigner.

"There remained only such trade as could be carried on by land, and such trade as, on the seas, could escape the British cruisers and Privateers, which was little indeed. And the result was great injury to the enemy in his material resources, great distress to all his subjects, and, after a time, great exhaustion, great impatience of the war, and an equally great desire to bring the war to an end, and to make peace with the country which was producing so great a distress to the land by so effectual an action upon the seas...

"This distress of the land by the full use of power on the sea was, during the last war (1798 to 1813) in which that power was used, of the most severe character; and that it was this and nothing else that enabled Great Britain to sustain that war during so many years against so many powerful nations, and at last to bring it to a successful termination.

"Moreover, the British method was as merciful as it was effectual. For it touched the Pocket rather than the Person of the enemy; it spilt his Money not his Blood; it struck at Livelihood not at Life. The loss of life caused by the great sea battles, which established the supremacy of Great

Part Nine

Britain on the water, was absolutely insignificant, was as nothing compared with the loss of life caused by the land battles, which were fought during the same struggle; and when once the supremacy was established and admitted the loss of life caused by its exercise in capture, and in prevention of commerce, was almost nil.

"Finally, the British method was found not only to bring distress to the enemy, but to procure, even during time of war, increased trade, and to that extent increased prosperity, to Great Britain herself. When acting on this method Great Britain not only stopped the trade of the enemy, but she also invariably increased her own, so that the gain to herself was twofold" (pp101-3).

Bowles's view was that the lesson of history, whether in peace for trading or in war for fighting, showed that the sea had always dominated the land and navies were more potent fighting weapons than armies. As he himself put it: "*The Trident is mightier than the sword*".

According to Bowles the sea offered to Britain the enormous advantage of a sole frontier as a barrier to invasion. It presented many problems to neighbouring powers by its mere existence—by the difficulties of crossing it and landing from it, securing communications across it and lines of retreat if necessary. These difficulties were so great that Britain had for eight centuries secured itself against hostile armies.

The sea also benefited Britain in peace time. Trade, which brought prosperity and plenty and protected against starvation was more effectively conducted on the sea than on land. The sea was much cheaper than land for carriage and was an easier mode of transport. And the sea could always be used to coerce the land; and navies to defeat armies in order to deny trade and bring nations to their knees.

In his Preface to *Sea Power and Land Power* (1910) Bowles wrote: "*For Great Britain the sea is the only road. For her it is the strongest rampart of defence. For her it is the only battlefields of offence. The Trident is her sole weapon. Preserved and used, it is mightier than the sword. Broken or blunted, it leaves her but a rich and defenceless prey.*"

Bowles saw the history of *Sea Power and Land Power* as having developed in the following manner:

"When England wrested from the Dutch their monopoly of sea fisheries and sea-borne trade, and first asserted herself as a great sea power, she did but take what nature had marked as hers. Yet so soon as her predominance became evident, there began among the military

powers of the Continent a common effort to check the growth of forces which even then seemed capable of becoming formidable to military domination. The effort resolved itself into attempts, not to destroy navies, but to prevent their effectual use by introducing into the recognised laws of war at sea, changes destructive of those maritime rights whereby sea power is asserted and established.

"These attempts, begun in the seventeenth century, were for two hundred years defeated by the courage and constancy of many successive British ministers. When the French revolutionary wars broke out, British maritime rights were intact; and such was the effect of their exercise that when Napoleon had beaten down all the military nations of the Continent, Britain alone remained upright and resisting. The very powers of which these very nations had sought to deprive her were now seen in their overmastering effects... Once again the trident had proved mightier than the sword.

"In 1856, however, a ministry was for the first time found either without the understanding or without the courage to maintain the proud and prudent refusal to surrender the maritime rights of their country. By the Declaration of Paris they abandoned the right to capture enemy merchandise in neutral ships, receiving, as a compensating condition, the abolition of privateering—which nevertheless was not then and is not now abolished except in name only" (Preface, *Sea Power And Land Power*).

The Declaration of Paris arose out of the Crimean War. In 1853 at the start of the war England and France agreed to waive the right of seizure and to respect some rights of neutral commerce. At the close of the war they adopted in April 1856 the Congress of Paris provision: "*Privateering is, and remains, abolished; The neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war; Neutral goods, with the exception of contraband of war, are not liable to capture, even under the enemy's flag; Blockades, in order to be binding, must be effective, that is to say, maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy.*"

Previous to 1854, the English practice was founded on the simple theory that the property of enemies was seizable wherever it was found by the Royal Navy. But when the Scandinavian countries gave notice to the belligerents in England, France and Russia, that they intended to again assert the rights of neutrality that the Armed Neutrality of 1780 and 1800 had asserted, Lord Clarendon unexpectedly assented to these demands.

According to Bowles, the British signature to the Declaration deprived the country of its most effective weapon of war.

Because this was such a strong argument in the years between the Declaration of Paris and the Great War the question must be posed: Why did England sign up to it?

Part of the reason was that, in entering into alliance with its old enemy France, which had the policy, from the time of the previous Napoleon, of only interfering with the cargoes of enemy ships rather than neutral ones, a common policy was required for the war.

However, Sir Francis Piggott, writing in the tradition of Urquhart and Bowles, but during the Great War, saw the abandonment, at Paris, of England's former position as a surrender to Napoleon Bonaparte's demand for "*free ships, free cargoes*":

"England... did not accept Bonaparte's doctrine; yet it lived, and found a tender spot in the minds of some Englishmen who were greatly prominent in the middle of the nineteenth century. The pacifists, of course, for we have always had them with us. The Manchester School of politicians, headed by Cobden and John Bright, who believed that commerce was a greater power in the world than war: and commerce would greatly benefit if cargoes could be saved from confiscation and merchant ships from seizure. Large numbers of ship-owners, foreseeing immunity for their property in spite of war, supported it. And a certain sect of the Radicals who were ready to adopt anything which smacked of philosophy; and, with sorrow be it said, the remnant of the great political party, the Whigs, headed by Lord Clarendon, who, in some incomprehensible fashion, had come to persuade themselves that England had been wrong in the methods by which she had conducted and won her great wars. They talked of the days of Nelson and of Pitt as belonging to the 'age of barbarism'.

"They forgot... that Bonaparte was the originator of this doctrine, and that he had specially devised it for the undoing of their country.

"Can you be surprised that the Germans are doing all they can to revive it to-day. It is not that it is their last chance of winning the war—that has gone. It is their one chance of salvation in the future. Can you not see the danger of it; should it be allowed to prevail, not merely to England, but to the world at large? So full of danger is it for the future, after the war is over, that I must beg you to be patient yet a little while longer.

"The seeds of this great illusion, which masquerades in the name of 'humanity', are still to be found in English soil, and germinating in English minds" (*The Free Seas In War*, pp31-2).

Two generations after Trafalgar this was the high-point of British naval supremacy. The world market had been established by Britain under the control of the Royal Navy. The Navy had established bases across the world to control the maritime trade routes: in Heligoland, Malta, Gambia, Sierra Leone, Ascension, Cape Town, Mauritius, the Seychelles, Malacca, Ceylon, St Lucia, Tobago, Guiana; to which were added: Singapore in 1819, the Falkland Islands in 1833, Aden in 1839 and Hong Kong in 1841. England's trade dominated the global market and commercial competitors had been seen off by the Balance of Power wars it had fought since 1690. These wars had secured a preponderance of overseas colonies for England and a virtual monopoly of world-wide naval power.

The capture of the lion's-share of the world market had stimulated the industrial revolution in England, led to enormous growth in commerce, finance and shipping and created the first single world-power.

England had not fought a significant war for two generations and the world-view of the Manchester School of Free Trade, which had the fullest expression of global trade penetration as its objective, had come to prevail. The Cromwellian Navigation Laws which gave England a monopoly of trade with the colonies had been repealed and British gun-boats patrolled the world to impose Free Trade on it (as was the case in the Opium Wars that forced the drug-trade on the reluctant Chinese.)

The belief was that, with British world-dominance an accomplished fact, the Royal Navy had become a policing weapon of the *status-quo*, rather than a fighter of large wars. Within such a situation it would be more likely that other nations would go to war than Britain, particularly since the foreign policy of Palmerston was to promote instability within other states to preserve England's splendid isolation and free hand in the world.

It was thought therefore that Britain would most likely be neutral in future wars and would have more to gain than lose by a general right being proclaimed in favour of neutral shipping. And so England pulled out the ladder that she had used to climb to the height of her supremacy on the seas.

Pat Walsh

Look Up the
Athol Books
archive on the Internet
www.atholbooks.org

Bolshevism From Larkin To Lozovsky

Writers of both American and Irish labour history have hitherto shown little inclination to dispute the negative characterisation of Solomon Lozovsky, the Soviet founder and inter-War leader of the Profintern (the Red International of Labour Unions), that was provided by Theodore Draper, a 1930s Communist Party of USA member who later became a militantly anti-Communist historian of that party. In his undoubtedly pioneering and otherwise keenly researched 1957 *magnum opus*—but in obvious ignorance of Lozovsky's fate in 1952—Draper wrote:

"To some extent, Lozovsky's personality moulded the Profintern. For some years before the Russian Revolution, he had been closer to Trotsky, with whom he had collaborated in putting out a Russian émigré paper in Paris, than to Lenin, whose high-handed methods had irritated him as they had many other future Soviet leaders. Under his real name, Solomon Abramovich Dridzo, Lozovsky had headed a small trade union of Jewish hat-makers in Paris. A short, nervous man with a broad black beard, Lozovsky never played an independent role. He became an expert at guessing which way the wind was blowing in the Russian party and in changing his course accordingly before it was too late. He prided himself on his ability to shift position without notice. He was so successful that he outlived all the top leaders of the Comintern. They came and went; Lozovsky remained entrenched in the Profintern, assiduously building up his own machine, encouraging his agents and protégés to make bids for more power in their own parties. Such a man was peculiarly useful to Stalin in his struggles against Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin, and their sympathisers in the international movement. Since the Comintern and Profintern networks were often in bitter competition, the latter provided an alternative source of leadership in party crises" (*The Roots Of American Communism*, p319),

Lozovsky's bad press in Irish labour history has been particularly influenced by his cameo appearances in the 1965 biography, *James Larkin—Irish Labour Leader*, authored by the latter's namesake—but no relation—Professor Emmet Larkin of Columbia University, New York. This is how he described the Larkin/Lozovsky clash in the wake of the Fifth Congress of the Communist International in Moscow that had opened on 17th June 1924:

"At the closing session of the Comintern

on 8 July 1924 Larkin was elected to the Executive Committee ... That same day, the Third Congress of the Red International Labour Unions, or Profintern, began its deliberations ... The final contribution by Larkin to the Third Congress of the Profintern was in the debate that centred on the report by Lozovsky, another top Bolshevik, on 'The Strategy of Strikes'. Larkin objected strongly to any firm analogy being drawn between military strategy and the strategy of strikes. *'Is this a new application of Leninism?'* he asked. *'Does one have to study Clausewitz in order to galvanise the working classes into action?'* he asked again. *'If so, why not follow the Hindenburg school?'* *'I have taken part in a great many strikes'*, he continued, *'and I dare assert that I know their mechanics. I have led campaigns among the most heterogeneous elements in Latin America and the United States, where one finds subjects particularly impervious to propaganda.'* *'Why, I declare'*, he continued, *'that when someone tells me that a strike is a movement that can be run on paper, or directed from an information bureau, I assert that those who say that don't know what they are talking about.'* *'One must see men as they are'*, said Larkin, *'one must understand human emotions, the psychology of the workers. A motive that will find an echo among Russian workers will encounter indifference among British workers. That is why one must approach them differently. The ends may be the same, but the tactics must be different.'*

"The pragmatic roots ran deep in Larkin, and doctrinaire approaches to ways and means, when they were not his own, did not impress him much" (p278).

"Larkin made his second and last visit to the Soviet Union in February 1928 ... Oblivious of the vast implications, Larkin viewed the Trotsky-Stalin debate as simply a struggle for power in the Party. During a full-dress Comintern debate, at which both Stalin and Trotsky spoke, Bukharin, who had replaced Zinoviev as President of the Comintern, asked Larkin if he would like to speak. In refusing, Larkin explained that *'the issue was one between the men and women of Russia'* and that *'it would be an impertinence on his part to take sides'* (Jack Carney Memoir). He did, however, speak at a meeting of the Moscow Soviet of which he was a member. For over an hour he spoke to an audience of 2,000 people, of whom perhaps not a hundred understood English, yet *'he held the meeting in the hollow of his hand'*. His theme was Ireland, and of the necessity for the trade union movement to understand the

peasantry... *'During his speech'*, wrote Carney, *'he must have been thinking of the proceedings of the Communist International for he wound up by asking the audience to hold up the hands of Stalin, a Biblical reference to Joshua. When the interpreter came to this part of his speech the audience rose and cheered for several minutes'...*" (p290).

"The most important single factor in accounting for Larkin's popular decline in the early thirties was, undoubtedly, his 'Communist' affiliations. At the general election in 1932 he was listed as a 'Communist' candidate in the Press. Though he did not protest the label, it was, in 1932, a good deal less than the truth. Actually, after his last trip to Moscow in the winter of 1928, he had drifted out of the Communist current. Until 1928 he had made no secret of his membership of the Comintern and Profintern. He had in fact received financial aid, though modest indeed, from the Comintern. The breach had been opened in 1928 in Moscow, when Larkin quarrelled so violently with Lozovsky, Chairman of the Profintern, that the two men very nearly came to blows (source: a personal interview with Big Jim's son, James Larkin Jnr, who was in Moscow attending Lenin College at the time). He had already crossed swords with Lozovsky in Moscow in 1924, it will be remembered, when the Russian maintained there was a parallel between military strategy and strategy in strikes" (pp296-7).

In such confrontations with Lozovsky, Big Jim came across at his most reasonable—which, of course, was far from always being the case with Larkin!—and Lozovsky accordingly suffers by comparison. Emmet Larkin, in fairness, had nothing more to say about him and can in no way be held responsible for blackening Lozovsky's name. But Draper's work remains a pioneering source for the leading role played by Larkin in the birth of American Communism, and those who pursue Larkin on that score have been led to Draper's contemptuous and scathing assessment, not only of Lozovsky's politics, but of his very character.

Half a century later, however, on this side of the Atlantic, it was quite another anti-Communist historian to whom we became indebted for presenting a very different picture of that character. In his 2003 *magnum opus*, *Stalin—the Court of the Red Tsar*, the British writer Simon Sebag Montefiore wrote of how the USSR's Jewish Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinov had been replaced by Vyacheslav Molotov in 1939. {See <http://free-magazines.atholbooks.org/c&s/cs90.pdf> for my article in the Autumn 2007 issue of *Church & State* on Litvinov's relations

with Ireland, including his sojourn with his sister's family in Belfast; and see also http://free-magazines.atholbooks.org/irishforeignaffairs/ifa_1.pdf for its reproduction in the first issue of *Irish Foreign Affairs*, April-June 2008. In September 1936 the Irish representative to the League of Nations reported on a conversation in which Litvinov had said to him: 'I like your President de Valera, except for one thing—he is too religious'; and later: 'The British people do not like frank speaking.' } Sebag Montifiore went on to describe how, simultaneously with Litvinov's displacement, Stalin had also made a point of assigning Lozovsky as Molotov's Deputy Foreign Minister:

"The Munich agreement (1938) convinced Stalin that the West was not serious about stopping Hitler. On the contrary, Stalin was sure that they were willing to let Hitler destroy Soviet Russia. Munich rendered Litvinov's 'collective security' bankrupt. Stalin warned the West that the Soviet Union would not be left to 'pick their chestnuts out of the fire' ... At the Plenum Stalin attacked Litvinov. 'Does that mean you regard me as an Enemy of the People?' asked plucky Litvinov. Stalin hesitated as he left the hall: 'No, we don't consider Papasha an Enemy. Papasha's an honest revolutionary'. This sort of courage counted for something with Stalin. Litvinov, who was three years older than Stalin, could never curb his tongue. {'Papasha'—Russian for 'Daddy'—was Litvinov's Bolshevik nickname—MOR.} Molotov said that Litvinov remained 'amongst the living only by chance', yet Stalin just preserved him, despite Molotov's hatred for a much more impressive diplomat, because he was so respected in the West that he might be useful again... Litvinov's English wife Ivy was terrified of imminent arrest and, when she confided this to some American friends, the letter ended up on Stalin's desk. He phoned Papasha: 'You've an extremely courageous and outspoken wife. You should tell her to calm herself. She's not threatened.'... There was a story that Litvinov had saved Stalin from being beaten up by Dockers in London in 1907. 'I haven't forgotten that time in London', Stalin used to say. Stalin realised that, while he had to be seen to oppose anti-Semitism, his Jews (in the Soviet leadership) were one obstacle to rapprochement with Hitler, particularly Litvinov (Wallach) ... The removal of the Jews was a signal to Hitler—but Stalin always sent double messages: Molotov appointed Solomon Lozovsky, a Jew, as one of his deputies." (pp309-12).

"Early in the war, Stalin realised the usefulness of Soviet Jewry in appealing for American help ... Stalin ordered Beria to set up the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, controlled by the NKVD but

officially led by the famous Yiddish actor, Solomon Mikhoels ... The JAFK was supervised by Solomon Lozovsky, a grizzled Old Bolshevik with a biblical beard who was the token Jew in the highest echelons of Molotov's Foreign Commissariat" (p559).

"In 1947 Stalin supported the foundation of the Jewish state, which he hoped would become a Middle Eastern satellite. On 29 November, he voted for it at the UN and was the first to recognise Israel. He gave Mikhoels the Stalin Prize. But it soon became clear Israel was going to be an American ally, not a Russian one. In the cauldron of Stalin's irrational prejudices, razor-sharp political instincts and aggressively Russian sensibilities, Mikhoels's dream of a Jewish Crimea became a sinister Zionist/American Trojan horse... Like so many of Stalin's febrile fears, there was substance here: the Ottoman Sultans had controlled the Black Sea through their control of Crimea. Catherine the Great and Prince Potemkin annexed the Crimea in 1783 for the same reason, just as the Anglo-French armies landed there in 1853 to undermine Russia. Khrushchev controversially donated Crimea to Ukraine in 1954, a decision that almost caused a civil war in the 1990s between Ukrainians and those who wished to be ruled by Russia" (p573).

"Stalin ordered Abakumov to gather evidence that Mikhoels and the Jewish Committee were 'active nationalists orientated by the Americans to do anti-Soviet work' ... Stalin ordered Malenkov and Abakumov to put together the Jewish Case ... Since its centrepiece was the plan for the Jewish Crimea, on 13 January 1949 Malenkov summoned Lozovsky, ex-overlord of the Jewish Committee, for interrogation. This was already a matter of life and death for Lozovsky" (pp 574 and 601).

"On 8 May 1952, the 'trial of the Jewish poets' starring Solomon Lozovsky and the Yiddish poet Perets Markish opened. {Mikhoels had already been murdered in 1948, in a 'car accident' staged by the Soviet secret police—MOR} ... Stalin had already specified that virtually all the defendants were to be shot. Lozovsky had been tortured, but his pride in his Bolshevik and—more surprisingly—Jewish pedigrees was unbroken. His speech shines out of this primordial darkness as the most remarkable and moving oration of dignity and courage in all of Stalin's trials. He also shredded Rumin's imbecilic Jewish-Crimean conspiracy... Lozovsky was so convincing that the judge, Lieut-Gen Chesptov stopped the trial, a unique happening ... Chesptov, complained of its flimsiness to Malenkov. Malenkov ordered the trial to proceed. On 18 July, Chesptov sentenced 13 defendants to death ... But Chesptov did not carry out the executions ... Stalin rejected official

appeals. Lozovsky and the Jewish poets were shot on 12 August 1952. One of the survivors of Stalin's time, Maxim Litvinov (who had returned to serve as a Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister 1941-46), managed to die in his bed on 31 December 1951" (p636).

In the May 1940 issue of *The Communist International* Lozovsky, as Deputy to Foreign Minister Molotov, had penned an article on his boss under the heading of *A Bolshevik Statesman*. Lozovsky firmly held Britain's post-World War One policy to blame for sowing the seeds of World War Two:

"Our Party repeatedly emphasised that the authors of the Versailles Treaty had created all the conditions for a new imperialist war. This has been pointed out many times in the writings and speeches of Lenin and the speeches of Stalin. This warning was repeated by Comrade Molotov who at the Sixteenth Party Congress in 1930 declared: 'The attempt of the victor countries to saddle the working people of Germany with reparations beyond their power to pay cannot end well.' ... The present situation created by the second imperialist war demands special vigilance from the Soviet state, it demands a farsighted and firm maintenance of the interests and independent policy of the Soviet state. The plans of the British and French imperialists to make the USSR a supplier of cannon fodder, to set the USSR and Germany at strife, have ended in a fiasco. When the braves of the Second International, who are bolstering up the imperialist war with an 'ideological basis' for the deception of the masses, vociferously demanded that the Soviet Union take up arms to defend the money-bags of the City in London and the Bourse, Comrade Molotov made the following biting retort in his speech on the ratification of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact: 'These people positively demand that the USSR get herself involved in war against Germany on the side of Great Britain. Have not these rabid warmongers taken leave of their senses? Is it really difficult for these gentlemen to understand the purpose of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, on the strength of which the USSR is not obliged to involve itself in war either on the side of Great Britain against Germany or on the side of Germany against Great Britain? Is it really difficult to understand that the USSR is pursuing and will continue to pursue its own independent policy, based on the interests of the peoples of the USSR and only on those interests?' Even now this elementary truth has not been understood by the gentlemen who call themselves Socialists and democrats and on these flimsy grounds demand that the peoples of the USSR should shed their blood for alien interests. No, gentlemen, pull your own

chestnuts out of the fire, there is no cannon-fodder for you in the USSR and never will be—that is the answer of the Soviet people voiced by their leaders."

What would lead such a committed Stalinist politician as Lozovsky to his execution in 1952? The transcript of his secret trial was first published in Moscow in 1994 under the title of *An Unjust Trial—Stalin's Last Execution*. An English translation, under the title of *Stalin's Secret Pogrom—the Post-War Inquisition Of The Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee* was first published in the USA in 2001. An abridged edition, with Introductions by Editors Joshua Rubinstein and Vladimir Naumov, was published by Yale University Press in 2005, in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. In his Introduction, which had been previously published in the *New Republic* on 25th August 1997, Rubinstein wrote:

"Yiddish culture has not entirely disappeared, but it was sentenced to death twice, and each time the sentence was carried out. On the eve of World War II, millions of Yiddish speakers inhabited Jewish communities from Holland through Germany and Poland into the heart of the Soviet Union. Hitler did his best to annihilate every Jew his armies controlled. Individual Jews survived his onslaught, but their communities and unique culture were destroyed. Ironically, the country that saved millions of Jews and not so incidentally played the decisive role in stopping Hitler was the Soviet Union. And the Soviet Union had its own solution to the Jewish problem. Stalin, like Lenin, expected that Soviet Jews would gradually disappear as the regime offered the carrot of modernisation with the stick of forced assimilation. But by the end of his life Stalin could no longer constrain his murderous anti-Semitism and began a systematic assault on the leaders of Yiddish culture who were the primary vehicle for Jewish identity in the country. This campaign culminated on August 12, 1952 with multiple executions in the basement of Moscow's Lubyanka prison. *Jewish communities across America have increasingly marked this event on August 12 of each year as the 'Night of the Murdered Poets'*. Convicted at a secret trial in the summer, all the defendants, except for the biologist Lina Shtern, were executed on a single night—twenty-four writers and poets (so it was believed), all men (so it was said) cut down by Stalin's executioners in the basement of the notorious Lubyanka prison. But because their trial was held in secret and the regime refused to confirm what actually happened for many years, myriad rumors obscured the nature of the case and the identity and number of the defendants..."

"The trial did not involve twenty-five defendants. There were, in fact, fifteen

defendants, all falsely charged with a range of capital offences, from treason and espionage to bourgeois nationalism. While five prominent literary figures were among those indicted—the Yiddish poets Peretz Markish, David Hofshstein, and Itzik Fefer; the writer Leib Kvitko, who was known throughout the country for his children's verse; and the distinguished novelist David Bergelson—the remaining ten defendants were not writers at all but connected in various ways to the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee (JAC)—a group that the regime had created during World War Two to encourage Western Jewish support for the alliance with the Soviet Union ... *But only the (five) martyred Yiddish writers are mentioned at August 12 commemorations. The other (nine) defendants who lost their lives, as well as the sole survivor, Lina Shtern, are rarely, if ever, remembered ... perhaps became their careers as loyal Soviet citizens do not fit comfortably into an easy category for Westerners to honour.*" (My emphases—MOR)

"Stalin's decision to turn against the JAC reflected both his growing paranoia and several foreign policy difficulties that made the country's Jews vulnerable. With the onset of the Cold War and the establishment of Israel in 1948, Stalin linked the threat of war with the United States to his belief that Soviet Jews had other loyalties. Although they had demonstrated their reliability in the struggle against Hitler, in a conflict with America (where too many Soviet Jews were presumed to have relatives) Stalin believed they would betray him. Israel too had disappointed him; it was turning into an ally of the United States rather than a member of the socialist bloc..."

"The principal defendant was not a Yiddish writer, but a former member of the Central Committee. Born in 1878, *Solomon Lozovsky* joined the Marxist underground in 1901. He was a prominent enough revolutionary to know Lenin and Stalin well and after the October Revolution played a major role in the Profintern, the international communist-controlled trade-union movement, and in the Communist International. (His daughter also assumed significant responsibilities, serving as secretary and confidante to Lenin's widow Nadezhda Krupskaya from 1919 to 1939.) Lozovsky survived Stalin's purges of the 1930s and was even elevated in 1939 when Vyacheslav Molotov, who had replaced Maxim Litvinov as Soviet foreign minister, appointed Lozovsky one of three deputy foreign ministers..."

"With two exceptions—Itzik Fefer and Lina Shtern—all the defendants were brutally interrogated; some were beaten and tortured, placed in grim isolation cells, or subjected to endless nocturnal interrogations (the infamous 'conveyor belt'), then compelled to sign confessions... Only one defendant, Itzik Fefer, immediately cooperated with the investi-

gation, detailing a host of baseless accusations against the JAC that would frame the indictment in 1952. As a result of his betrayal, more than one hundred people were arrested. Fefer, it turns out, had been an informer for the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD) since at least 1943... The regime, it is now believed, (originally) intended to conduct an open 'show trial' reminiscent of the infamous proceedings against leading Bolsheviks in the 1930s... The transcript (of what ended up as a secret trial) often makes for painful reading. During the trial most of the defendants could not avoid debasing themselves. Fefer, the principal accuser, began his testimony by incriminating several co-defendants, claiming that he had recognized 'nationalistic views' in the work of Bergelson, Hofshstein, and Kvitko as early as 1920 when he first met them in Kiev..."

"The principal accusation revolved around the 'Crimea question'. Jews had once established small agricultural colonies in the northern Crimea in the 1920s. Two decades later, faced with severe dislocations brought on by the war, the Holocaust, and the difficulty of returning Jewish survivors to the Ukraine, Mikhoels and others proposed making the Crimea a Soviet Jewish Republic. At least initially, the regime treated the proposal seriously, but it soon dismissed the whole idea. Lazar Kaganovich, the only Jew in Stalin's Politburo, told Mikhoels and his colleagues that 'only artists and poets' could think up something like this. But then after the arrest of Fefer in December 1948, the regime began to embroider a complex quilt of lies and fabrications: that during their visit to New York in 1943, Fefer and Mikhoels offered to establish a Jewish republic in the Crimea so that Zionists and American imperialists could use it as a 'bridgehead,' part of a long-term strategy to dismember the Soviet Union."

But none of this could be presented in a public "show trial", primarily due to the heroic Bolshevik resistance of Solomon Lozovsky, which will be detailed in Part Two.

(to be continued)

Manus O'Riordan

Tell us about upcoming events

The Athol Books site now features a Notice Board to which readers are invited to feature forthcoming events. Go to:

<http://www.atholbooks.org/notice.php>

The Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee:

Some Context

Some readers may not be familiar with the affairs of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee (JAC).

The JAC was set up by the Soviet Union in 1941, chiefly for the purpose of influencing American opinion in World War 2.

The War was the outcome of British policy since the defeat of Germany in 1918 and the breaking up of the Austro-Hungarian State into a series of brittle 'nation-states', along with its veto on a secure French settlement against Germany, followed by British encouragement of a revival and reassertion of German strength under the Nazi regime in breach of the conditions of the Versailles Treaty (for which it had the main responsibility). In 1939, having facilitated the growth of Nazi power for six years, Britain decided to balk at the comparatively minor issue of the transfer of the German City of Danzig, over which Polish sovereignty was merely notional, to the adjacent region of the German State, East Prussia. It encouraged Poland to refuse to negotiate a settlement of its border dispute with Germany on the moderate terms proposed by Hitler by offering Poland a Treaty of a kind it had never made with any other State and getting France to do likewise. Germany, finding its own treaty with Poland (made in 1934) effectively repudiated, and finding itself within a powerful military encirclement, but seeing that Britain was making no actual preparations to make war jointly with their Polish Allies, struck at Poland in September 1939. As Hitler expected, but as the Poles did not, Britain did not wage war against Germany in support of Poland, nor did France, which had fallen altogether under British influence.

Stalin, seeing how the wind was blowing in the Summer of 1939, made a Non-Aggression Treaty with Hitler, within which secret clauses related to a collapse of the Polish State. It was agreed that a region of Eastern Poland—which had been taken from the Soviet Union in the Russian/Polish War of 1920, should revert to Russia.

Britain declared war on Germany a few days after the German attack on Poland (and the French followed suit), but set about waging that at its leisure as a World War, leaving the Poles to be defeated

without any assistance from its Treaty Allies.

During the next eight months Britain tried to get into conflict with the Soviet Union as an ally of Finland in the Soviet/Finnish War, and then began to violate Norwegian neutrality with a view to blocking Swedish export of iron ore to Germany—but it was pipped at the post by Germany in the occupation of Norway. All of this time the British and French declarations of war on Germany lay on the table, and the British and French Armies were in France poised to spring. While Britain was retreating from its failed Norwegian operation, Germany responded to the declaration of war by Britain and France and won a startling victory on French soil in a few weeks.

France, having brought the German Army deep into France with its frivolous declaration of war—frivolous because it had not waged war under the terms of its Treaty with Poland when it declared war—made a provisional settlement with Germany in June 1940, pending a final settlement when Britain made peace.

Britain, as usual fighting its wars on other people's territory, with the Channel and the most powerful Navy in the world lying between it and the battlefield, and with a third of its defeated Army allowed home from Dunkirk by Hitler, refused to make a settlement. It denounced France, which was occupied chiefly as a result of British policy, for settling—claiming that it was riddled with Fifth Columnists. It maintained its declaration of war without a hope of winning, and it set about spreading the war. It could itself only deliver pin-pricks on the margins, but these were sufficient to maintain a war atmosphere in Europe.

Churchill, as soon as he became Prime Minister, launched a massive propaganda operation in the United States, with the purpose of persuading American opinion that the USA was next on Hitler's supposed list of intended victims. This was his major positive effort at war-making. But the US did not prove to be as gullible as he had hoped. Roosevelt's policy was to encourage Britain to remain at war, and make a profit from helping it.

The more realistic hope was a revival of the Nazi/Bolshevik antagonism, which had been set aside by the Pact of August 1939. This hope was realised in June

1941 with the German attack on Russia.

During that Autumn of 1941 Roosevelt was manoeuvring his way towards war with Japan. About 90 years earlier Japan had been a peaceful State for centuries, absorbed in its own affairs. Then American warships arrived and insisted that it must open itself to the world and take part in world affairs. Seeing that it could not hold out against American power, Japan studied the world being created by America and Britain and began to participate in it with such effect that, by the early 20th century, influential American opinion began to see it as inevitable that the US would fight Japan for dominance in the Pacific. Roosevelt decided that the moment for war had come in 1941. He gave an ultimatum to Japan which, if complied with, would have undermined the new capitalist economy of Japan. Britain seconded the US ultimatum. When Japan responded to the ultimatum by striking at the American 'homeland' hundreds of miles from the American coast (Pearl Harbour in Honolulu), it also struck at the British Empire in Asia (of which it had been a protector in the 1st World War). Britain thereby ceased to be a Great Power and became a secondary Power. And, whatever had been Britain's purpose in the war it launched in September 1939, it ceased to apply in the second half of 1941. Its Asian Empire ceased to be functional under Japanese assault. And, when Hitler seconded Japan's war on the USA, Britain finally gained the US as an ally, but one which overshadowed it and was intent on taking economic advantage of its helplessness.

The Bolshevik ally was the one that counted in the medium term in the war with Germany—and, without effectiveness in that medium term, there would have been no long term. The Democratic ally, though giving priority to the war with Germany, was far away. It had to transport a large Army across the ocean. And Britain, its base against Germany, was still not eager to get to grips with Germany. In Churchill's view, Bolshevism remained the basic enemy, though an ally for the moment. And while that basic enemy was seriously engaged in war with what might be called the intermediary enemy, and was still holding its own, he did not want precipitate intervention. The thing to do was wait and see what happened in the deadly war between the Soviets and the Nazis, while making preparations to intervene.

That is not how the US makes war. It goes all out to win, making use of whatever

serves the purpose of the moment. In its proxy war with the Soviet Union in Afghanistan during the 1980s, it energised and trained the force that is now the object of its War On Terror. And in 1942-4 it engaged in all-out collaboration with Bolshevism, leaving the future to take care of itself.

That is the context of the JAC. There was an influential Jewish element in the US, and Jewish involvement in the Bolshevik regime was so extensive that many people who were far from stupid—Churchill, for example—were inclined to see Bolshevism as being essentially a Jewish affair.

Anyhow, Bolshevism set up the JAC to maximise Jewish enthusiasm for the War in the US, and to intensify American pressure on Britain for a *Second Front Now* when Churchill was putting it off from year to year.

Stalin's Jewish campaign in the US put Churchill's campaign in the shade. It was so energetic and persuasive, and led to such entanglements, that McCarthyism and the suppression of the JAC can be seen as necessary consequences of it when the Cold War set in.

Many social elements in Russia which had been curbed for twenty years were unleashed in 1941, to take part in the Great Patriotic War. Jewry was one of these, but it was different in kind from the others. The Orthodox Church was Russian in nature, while Jewry was international.

Jews within the Bolshevik system had always been amongst its most effective publicists towards the West, but they were so as Bolsheviks and not as Jews. It was as Bolsheviks that they were 'special people' and not as Jews, though it seems that some of them did not lose their sense of being special people as Jews as well. It was as Bolsheviks that most of them remained on course during the two years of the Pact with Hitler, and produced persuasive propaganda against Churchill's strategy of Spreading The War when as Jews they would have wanted to spread it. But was it as Bolsheviks or Jews that some of them, in defence of Soviet neutrality, had produced such powerful propaganda against France as riddled with Fifth Columnists?

The Jews were always greatly over-represented (proportionate to population) in the hierarchy of Bolshevism, but it was the opponents of Bolshevism who drew attention to this. It was only with the setting up of the JAC that Soviet Jewry presented itself as a component of the

Japanese Holocaust Forgotten?

The following email was sent to the Pat Kenny Show on the Japanese disaster on 16th March, but ignored

Pat, the speech of the Emperor to the people of Japan is historic. The first time ever the Emperor spoke on radio to the Japanese people was following the obliteration of two cities—Hiroshima and Nagasaki—in 1945. That was one of the worst single massacres of innocent civilians in the Second World War. A third of a million died immediately, with hundreds of thousands more dying of horrendous radiation cancers over subsequent years. This memory remains a traumatic one for Japanese people, and I am amazed how a veil of silence concerning this trauma seems to have descended on the western media, RTE included. Of all people, the Japanese deserve this nuclear crisis least, and our thoughts should be with them through their current nightmare.

Philip O'Connor

system. And it did this to great effect, shaping itself to American modes of operation in order to influence many different shades of American opinion.

The JAC was also an American avenue of entry into the Soviet Union.

The Soviet/American *rapprochement* was very different from Soviet/British relations during the War. Britain had a well-developed resistance to Bolshevism in the form of Labourism (it would be too strong to call it Social Democracy), and it operated a discreet barrier of Anti-Semitism, which it never lowered.

The JAC continued for a couple of years after the War. It was suppressed in 1948. In 1947 Russia engaged in an extraordinary collaboration with the USA, one which has ongoing consequences for the world. It got its satellite states in Eastern Europe to vote in the UN General Assembly for the setting up of a Jewish State in Palestine against the wishes of most of the people in Palestine, and against the opposition of all the Governments in the Middle East. The US did likewise with its client states in South America. That is how the two-thirds majority in the General Assembly was got. (The matter was referred to the General Assembly because Britain would not let the Security Council deal with it.) And Russia, through Czechoslovakia, armed the Jewish State for its 1948 conquests.

We have never come across a persuasive account of why it made sense in terms of Soviet interest to collaborate with the US in causing the UN to order the imposition of a Jewish State in Palestine, with the clear understanding that massive Jewish colonisation would follow.

The formal establishment of the Jewish State in 1948 was accompanied by a campaign which drove out a large part of

the native population from the region allocated for the Jewish State. The non-Jewish population of that region was close to equality with the Jewish population, and if it had remained the establishment of the Jewish State as Jewish in the full sense would have been very problematical. It has since become clear that the campaign for what is now usually called ethnic cleansing was carefully prepared in advance by the Jewish nationalist bodies, and it is hardly realistic to suppose that Soviet Intelligence did not know this at the time.

In 1948 also the Jewish State quickly expanded beyond the territory allocated to it by the UN and the driving out of the native population was practised in these conquered areas, as well as in the area allocated by the UN for a Jewish State.

The suppression of the JAC began at this time. Whether there was a causative connection between the mode of action of the Jewish State and the JAC is a sensitive question that we have never seen discussed. And likewise with the question of whether the JAC during its six years of comparatively free activity developed a Zionist orientation, and possibly influenced Soviet policy. But it would be remarkable if this had not happened to some extent

Although it seems unlikely that the Jewish State could have been established without Soviet support, the Soviet Union, within a few years, began to be described as a Anti-Semitic State, and it was said that the 'Doctors' Plot' was intended to be a first step towards the Final Solution begun by Hitler. And the book on it, published in 2003 after the Soviet archives had been opened, goes further and says it was a clearing of the way for a Third World War. The evidence presented is flimsy.

One difficulty in getting to grips with the realities of the affair is the great change in the meaning of anti-Semitism that happened after Britain in 1917 launched the project of forming a Jewish State in Palestine for the purpose of harnessing the international influence of Jewry to its war effort. Before 1917 those who denied that Judaism was merely a religion, and asserted that it had national or racial implications, were Anti-Semites. After 1917, and particularly after 1947, those who asserted that Judaism was merely a religion were Anti-Semites.

Ernest Bevin, founder of the British Transport and General Workers' Union in the period between the Wars, set himself, in Union affairs, against what he understood to be Anti-Semitism. He treated Judaism as a religion like other religions and stamped on religious sectarianism. In 1945 he became Foreign Secretary, and applying the old meaning of Anti-Semitism, he refused to consider erecting a new State on merely religious foundations in Palestine. He was denounced as Anti-Semitic for denying that Judaism was more than a religion.

He appointed his Socialist political colleague, Richard Crossman, to a Commission to make recommendations on the Palestine question. After joining the Commission Crossman became a Zionist. He met the Zionist leader, Weizmann, who asked him if he was Anti-Semitic. He said he was. Weizmann's view was that all Gentiles had in them the bacillus of Anti-Semitism, which they could never shake off, and that the best they could do was admit it.

Crossman became an advocate for the formation of the Jewish State. His criticism of British policy since 1917 was that Britain, as the great Imperial Power, had not undertaken a final ethnic cleansing of Palestine, so that it would be a land without people for the Jewish State to be built in with clean hands.

When Stalin, having made the Jewish State possible, began to be described as an Anti-Semite, there was nothing paradoxical about that from a strict Zionist viewpoint. He was not a Jew, therefore he had Anti-Semitism in his system.

Another meaning of Anti-Semitism is the assimilation of groups of Jews into the culture of the nation or state in which they exist. In that respect the Soviet Union was indisputably Anti-Semitic while having Jews amongst the most active elements of its regime. Marxism was Anti-Semitic. And Zionism published a collection of Marx's Anti-Semitic writings. From the Zionist viewpoint Marx was just another

Anti-Semitic Jew, and the Jews involved in the Bolshevik project of comprehensively re-ordering the conditions of human life were Anti-Semitic Jews, if Jews at all.

The JAC in its activity in America had contact with Weizmann. It was its business to collaborate with him, not to dispute his world outlook with him. The charge made against it later was that it had succumbed to Zionist influence. There is nothing improbable in that. Zionism had long ceased to be a form of nostalgia and became a very vigorous power structure, a kind of mirror-image of Bolshevism, capable of making dispassionate calculation and acting on it. Crossman found his Lenin in Weizmann and said so.

Today in the US there are people, who are far from stupid, who wonder whether US Middle Eastern policy is conceived in terms of American interest coldly considered, or the US is hustled by Jewish influence into a policy that is not to its advantage. If it can be thought that in an open capitalist democracy, operating by representative government, such a small minority as the Jewish lobby could influence State policy, why can it not be thought that something similar happened in the small central apparatus of the Bolshevik State in which there was a strong Jewish presence?

The Bolshevik State was, from the start, frankly a dictatorship dedicated to re-ordering society throughout the world. It was directive, not representative. When Lenin decided that the phase of capitalism might be skipped, it was understood that representative government would tend to produce capitalism. The strategy of continuously nipping capitalism in the bud—as the British State in 19th century Ireland nipped nationalism in the bud—was followed. In doing this the State acted in accordance with law where that was effective and acted arbitrarily where not. To describe a State assassination as 'murder' is hardly meaningful in terms of this system—and indeed in terms of other systems, even those with routine aims. The term 'murder' usually refers to events in civil society, rather than acts of state.

The aims of the Jewish State are hardly more routine than the aims of the Bolshevik, and it acts as freely in these matters as the Bolshevik State did. When it kills people, whether at home or abroad, as it has done very often, it does not regard these killings as murder, and they are not usually reported in the Western media as murders.

We cannot say what the purpose of the Doctors' Plot and the JAC trial was. We can only describe the situation in which

they occurred. Whatever the purpose was, it was aborted by the death of Stalin, and some of the basic assumptions of the Bolshevik project were aborted soon after.

It is said that these events were preliminaries to a great Purge, like those of 1937-8. These purges, we recall, were seen by some observers as debilitating the Bolshevik State and wrecking the Army. Only three years after the military purge, the Soviet Army was the first Army—indeed the only one—to hold up against Nazi assault. And six years later the Bolshevik State was in control of half of Europe. Expert Western comment on Bolshevik affairs was on the whole very wide of the mark.

A transcript of the 1942 trial of members of the JAC, on a charge of Jewish nationalist collaboration with the USA, was published in Russia in the mid-1990s. A translation of it (or most of it) was published by Yale University in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. This was in accordance with the Zionist view that the Soviet Union—which, we understand, opened its borders to Jews, after the Nazis entered Poland, and was the only State to do so—and which made possible the actual establishment and expansion of the Jewish State in 1948—was an Anti-Semitic State which had as its purpose, or one of its purposes, to take up the work of extermination of Jewry begun to Hitler.

The long Introduction to the translation of the Trial transcript is entirely Zionist in outlook. It asserts, but does not demonstrate, that the Bolshevik State, which Jews played such a prominent part in developing, was Anti-Semitic. Bolshevik condemnations of Anti-Semitism are treated as feints. It takes no real notice of Jewish participation in the State, because it does not see those Jews as real Jews. And it applies the concept of Anti-Semitism so flexibly that it ceases to have definite meaning.

Gilmore's Recipe For Inaction On Palestine

Minister for Foreign Affairs, Labour's Eamon Gilmore:

"hopes to recognise a Palestinian state during his term in office... however, it would be "premature" to do so now "in advance of actual control of the territory in question, a condition to which we in Ireland attach great importance"..."

Mr. Gilmore seems to have forgotten that the Irish Republic was declared before its future Government controlled its territory. Or has he?

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

NUCLEAR POWER

The Japanese earthquake and tsunami on 11th March 2011 were a reminder that we humans cannot control the forces of nature and that nuclear power generation is inherently unstable as a process and is not yet suitable for use in populated areas, if at all anywhere in the world. It is not safe and it is not necessary. There is abundant power available from the sun, the sea and the wind which we are learning to harness. There are enormous reserves of coal still underground throughout the world. So we do not need nuclear power generation until the process is a lot safer and until a genuine solution is discovered for the safe disposal of spent nuclear fuel.

DEMOCRACY

In economics, there is a concept called the 'Perfect Market' which occurs ideally when buyers and sellers each have access to all possible information on the product or service being traded. In the area of politics and governance too there should be a concept of a "perfect market" in information in the interests of enabling democracy to work. It is not possible for electors and elected to operate in a democratic manner if information is false or incomplete. The misrepresentation of facts, the supply of false or misleading information, and the suppression of information which citizens are entitled to know and which they need to know to make a rational voting decision, should all be prohibited by law. The enactment of such laws is necessary for us to progress towards the ideal of perfect democracy. It is not sufficient that citizens should become cynical, as most citizens have in recent years. It is necessary that public representatives, chief executives, journalists and advertisers all be made responsible before the law for intentionally misleading the people on material facts. The penalties should be substantial for convicted offenders—such as removal from public office, monetary fines of perhaps five times annual salary, etc, to emphasize the seriousness of offences against democracy which should be classified by law as crimes.

Recent examples in Ireland which could be prosecuted if we had such laws would be the Fine Gael Party's acceptance of €50,000 from a corporate donor, the conduct of Shell and the Wildlife Service and the Gardai and Courts in connection with the Corrib pipe, the Dublin Docklands property dealings, and the various matters referred to in recent Tribunals of Enquiry, which virtually guarantees immunity from

prosecution by virtue of it being all over the news and papers thereby making a safe prosecution impossible. Some people even believe that was the intention of them being set up the first day, but who ends up paying for it all—we the taxpayers. There was a very recent reference in France 24 about Ireland and the newsreader said about our seeming acquiescence that "*we haven't the street tradition of protest like they have in Greece or France*". And let me add that was not said with admiration—rather with pity!

LIBYA AND USUK

If there were effective laws against the perpetrators of crimes against democracy, the recent few weeks of outburst of anti-Libya propaganda in the 'western media' would not have been possible. The propaganda is quite outrageous. For several weeks before USUK got a UN resolution for a "no-fly zone", Muammar Gaddafi had been catching foreign mercenaries and expelling them. There were four Dutch highly trained operatives and he let them go. The *Irish Daily Mail*, once the "*western jet fighters*" were in over Libya, stated that the British SAS had several eight-man teams, who were doing what the SAS do best.

So this was an invasion plain and simple. Gaddafi stated publicly that "*we don't want to kill these people we want them to leave our country*". It seemed the "*rebels*" in Benghazi were being supplied with arms and armour from Egypt. There is no doubt that the SAS infiltrated the so called "*rebels*" and media agitators. We know only too well in Ireland how brutally the UK puts down any agitators—whether they are real or imagined—but this time they were on the side of the "*rebels*". Just suppose those "*rebels*" were against British rule—would the latter be so supportive?

The situation in Libya is that the Government of Gaddafi is internationally recognised, or at least it was until USUK suddenly did a *volte face* and decreed that now for reasons unknown it was not. The US Secretary of State, Hilary Clinton stated that bombs and rockets must be used against Libya for "*humanitarian*" reasons. OK that might not be the exact language she used but that is what a "*no-flight-zone*" meant to her and her likes. France under Sarkozy rushed to do the dirty and inhumane work. Germany's Foreign Minister said *No* and that was that. The French greed can only be for oil and the other goodies under Libyan soil. And of course there is the greed for arms manufacturers of which France is now one of the biggest. President Obama has over 70% ratings to take out Gaddafi but seems intent in having others take the lead as he can't be seen to be attacking all Muslim countries. His eye has always been on the main player in the region—Iran—blamed by Israel for being the author of all evil in

the region. What a terrible pickle it all is—and the continued suffering by the Arabs will eventually lead to a blow-back and then we will really have 'western' suffering.

WHAT ABOUT THE IRISH BANKS?

Can anyone imagine that the Irish Banks awarded themselves €66 million in bonuses recently while we are busily pouring billions of euros into them? It is front page news for a day and then along comes the next story and we just forget. But what about our Government? A few set pieces in the Dail and that amounts to that. But can anyone imagine for real that the Banks still cannot furnish us with how much their loans are worth? And yet Price Waterhouse Coopers (Bank of Ireland's auditors) and KMPG (AIB's auditors) are between them paid per year approximately €20 million of what is effectively taxpayer's money to report on the correctness of the Bank Balance Sheets. Obviously, the Balance Sheets have not been correct for years. The Balance Sheets have not been showing a "*true and fair*" view of bank assets and nor have the Profit and Loss Accounts been showing the true position. There is no doubt but that shareholders have a right to substantial damages from the Auditors and from the former Directors. Another question is: why does the Chartered Accountants Institute allow these accountants to continue to sign audit reports? It doesn't stack up! Will the new Government take steps to discipline the auditors and former Directors to prevent them doing this again to the taxpayers (and that is all of us)?

THE IRISH ARMY

The Army lads are at it again. First they all had hearing problems and had to be compensated by the State (us again) because they were near big guns which rather affected their ability to hear. We are very lucky that we are a neutral country because it doesn't bear thinking what might become of them if they actually saw a bit of action on the ground. This time, the powers that be decided to go completely by the book and, before they were sent to any foreign countries, they were given medicine shots that would cover them if they were picked on by any marauding mosquitoes. Alack and alas our boys were resourceful enough to come up with another tack altogether. They now claim that they have suffered an adverse reaction from the Malaria jab. So the new Government has had to put by €3 million to handle the claims that the soldiers are putting in. But, if a drug that is widely used could have such a reaction, surely it is with the drug company that the claims should be lodged with and not our State? We need much more information about this unfortunate event as ordinary people who holiday in foreign climes also use this drug and so far without complaint. I

have spoken with some friends in the medical field and they insist that they have had no such bad feedback and this job has long been tested and trialled.

CORK CITY COUNCIL

Close to a dozen businesses in Cork city have been threatened with legal action because of not having graffiti removed from their premises according to the *Evening Echo*, 1st February 2011. This is absolutely appalling. As Cork has been decimated by the economic downturn, the few businesses that are still operating in the city are dwindling by the day. Now it is nothing to see how many buildings are being boarded up. Businesses are being fleeced by the Corporation. Parking is so bad that it is killing the little that we have still going. Businesses have had to resort to putting up signs: "*The management have a right to refuse admittance*", "*Deposits are taken on all goods*" and there is simply a fear mentality taking over. And now businesses that have been targeted by graffiti vandals have received letters from the Council "*threatening to issue proceedings under the Litter Pollution Acts if action is not taken to remove the graffiti*". So the poor traders are hit whichever way they look. There are gangs of youths going round the city with cans spraying their "*sign*" and the poor victims have to pay. This is so unjust and simply cannot be allowed to happen. There is some lovely stone work around the city but it is beginning to go green and that is from people urinating on it and this happens in broad daylight. What is the point of paying our taxes if we can't be allowed to live in civilised standards? Really is this how low we have fallen?

Michael Stack ©

Review: play-script—Richard Bean
publisher: Oberon Modern Plays.

Saying What He's Meant To See?

THE BIG FELLAH

This was toured by Out of Joint "*a national and international touring theatre company*" (from the Programme, which included the play-script). Richard Bean has 19 other scripts to his name, *England People Very Nice*, (National Theatre), insulted nearly every minority that passed through London's East End. The Irish were fond of theft and incest.

Bean (a "*trained psychologist*") in London's *Evening Standard* (Tues. 7.9.10) insists he only says "*what I see*". What he's seen, in regard to this, was jaundiced headlines. *The Troubles—a Chronology* prefaces the Programme. It starts with 1170, then 1541, 1690, 1798 and 1801. That's a lot of history ignored. 1916: "*The Easter Rising defeated*". "*1921-23 Irish civil war. Michael Collins (the Big Fella) killed. Northern Ireland created.*"

Northern Ireland was not a consequence of Collins' death. That may not be his implication, but Bean writes, "*Some incidents only warrant inclusion because they are relevant to the play*". The UVF ("*formed in Belfast*" in 1966) doesn't appear in the play. (The UVF (Ulster Volunteer Force) formed in 1912, was a 100,000-strong army, not a hole in corner operation like 1966.)

The Chronology consists of bits and pieces about the IRA. Joe Doherty appears twice (in 1982, escaping from prison and going to New York). In 1981 he was "arrested as part of a hit squad that kills SAS officer". His unit ambushed an SAS patrol. There was no

element of superiority over the SAS unit.

This play is tangentially, about Doherty's case. The Doherty-figure is 'Ruairi O'Drisceoil' (pronounced 'Rory O'Driscoll' by the cast). Rory Keenan, a Dubliner, ignores "*the strong Cork accent*" indicated in the text. The character is a 300-year-old stage Irishman. It goes through a series of changes in the course of the action. None of the characters 'develop'. Except possibly, Costello (Finbar Lynch). That may be the performer's doing rather than the script.

Costello (pronounced in the Italian fashion) is the '*big fellah*'. The Chronology (1969) reads, in part, "*George Harrison begins running Mafia guns to the IRA from his base in New York*". Harrison, (not the Beatle) arrived in New York in the late 1920s and started supplying the IRA then. He aligned with the Provisional Army Council set up in 1969. The London and Dublin Governments have, in effect, dealt with this Army Council (Good Friday and all that). Why is it being presented here as a 'gang' dealing with the Mafia? (Costello mentions "*two sources of guns... the Italians... and the shops*").

Costello's squad eventually join the 'Real IRA'. If the script had any logic it would have been the Continuity IRA. But Bean could not then have included the Omagh Bombing. The lead-up to Omagh (there is no analysis of the matter—and no reference to British spooks having knowledge of the event—even having incited it) is over-carefully plotted.

The squad consists (over nearly 30 years) of the same small number of people. Costello, Ó Drisceoil, Tom Billy Coyle (an NYPD cop—who is racist, misogynist, homophobic (you get the picture) and has not developed one iota by the end of the play, he is made almost believable by Youssef Kerkour). Michael Doyle (David Ricardo-Pearce), a firefighter, joins up in Scene 1. His apartment being used to store the money collected on the St. Pat's Day after Bloody Sunday. No reason is given for this or for his decision to join the IRA (presumably it's an emotional spasm), his Protestant background is made much of.

Bean possibly thought this would have brought the house down, laughing at Doyle's stupidity. But was told some facts of Irish history. There is an exchange between Costello and Ó Drisceoil about Wolfe Tone, "*the Father of Irish Nationalism*". Tone is usually referred to as the father of Irish Republicanism, a radically different matter (for Republicans) from Nationalism. The Doyle character, a cipher, does not develop, apart from acquiring (in Act 3) grey hair.

There are two female characters. Karelma, appears in Scene 1, and pops up in the rest of the action. She is a spook, who takes Ruairi in hand. She meets him in Art Galleries. He has an ambition to be an architect. He passes on information about IRA activities in Ireland. Suspension of disbelief is all very well, but we are required to accept that a unit in New York knows precisely where the material it is sending to Ireland will be used. Ó Drisceoil asks at one point why his (paid-for) information is not used Karelma says, "*the Irish got lot of clout*". No reference is made to Reagan's energetic pursuit of Joe Doherty on the UK's behalf.

By the end of the action Ó Drisceoil is a successful architect. Doyle, after six attempts, has become a Lieutenant in the Fire Department. Costello congratulates him on his persistence. It's difficult to know why this character is made so substantial. He owns up, in a 1999 St. Pat's Day speech, to having been an FBI informer since 1987. He was revolted by the Enniskillen Bombing. Coyle refers to it as "*a fuck up*". Why then, was Costello willing to send detonators to kill people when "*They go shopping*", in Omagh? Coyle and Doyle kill Costello without waiting for orders. Crude types like them could not possibly entertain the notion 'double agent'.

The other woman is Elizabeth Ryan (Claire Rafferty): the Chronology links Ryan to "*Cristin ni Elais avoids being assassinated by her own PIRA colleagues...*" (1981). Was this person, a senior member of Sinn Féin, directly connected to the IRA? It is implied here and in the script that the ni Elias / Ryan figure was expelled from the IRA because of a relationship (where? it's implicitly not in the North) with a British officer. She was setting him up for killing. Belfast did not do the "*hit*". She accuses the Belfast people who are taking over the movement, of being misogynists. This means Gerry Adams and company. (Is Bairbre de Brún aware of this?)

Coyle and Costello take her away "to Mexico" (a euphemism for killing), Doyle, despite talking about marriage to her minutes

prior to this, does virtually nothing to stop it. She mentions a psychotic, Frank McArdle. Ruairi says he is a "*South Armagh alcoholic*", who "*was in the Kesh with him*". Where did McArdle access alcohol in Long Kesh? He attends Alcoholics Anonymous in Lurgan. Lurgan is in north Armagh, far from having "*cow farmers*" in, or near it, was a manufacturing town. He is not a believable character even before he comes on stage.

He does so (Act 3, Scene 1) the script notes the date 1987 (these dates were flashed up on a screen to the left of the stage). The directions say he looks "*scary*". As played by Fred Ridgeway (directed Max Stafford-Clark) he looks like a man who has suddenly lost his false teeth. His conversation consists of "*aye*", the f-word, and the odd c-word. He is in pursuit of a mole who snitched about the Eksund, a boat full of Libyan military hardware. Among other things he utilises a "*battery-operated drill*". Drills were a UDA (Ulster Defence Association) speciality. Trying to torture someone with a battery drill would probably be very frustrating for the torturer. They can barely drill through plywood. Human flesh is tender but using a drill on the fleshier parts of the body would, surely, kill average person.

McArdle retreats to his 'cow-farm', in post-industrial Lurgan, after having gone through a series of humiliations that are not particularly believable. There is no comeback from Belfast. As in the rest of the script there is no sense that the IRA, in the US, or NY, consists of any but themselves.

McArdle was handled serio-comically. His conversational gambit with Ruairi was to say he shot Shergar. Ruairi had suggested "*kidnapping*" a race horse. He being a jockey. He talks about being a "*wee*" man—Rory Keenan is about 5' 10". The Chronology states categorically that the "*PIRA*" (Ruairi at one point uses the term "*stickie*", but it is not explained) "*abducted*" and "*kidnapped*" the horse.

This script was probably started some time ago, as a denunciation of everything the IRA stood for—violence, bombing, brutality. All of the things the UK and its armed forces do so much better than gifted amateurs like the Provis. The course of events stymied total denunciation. Someone had to be a sort-of hero. Bean decided it was Gerry Adams. He is denounced several times in the script. In the Chronology he is said (in 1982) to "*publicly*" distance "*himself from the IRA*". In 1990 he is "*working to separate Sinn Féin and the IRA*". This is gibberish, Adams went to great pains to inform the IRA Council and Convention, and the rank and file about his tactics. The IRA, as has been pointed out in this journal on a number of occasions, has always been 'political'. Sinn Féin, for decades was a publicity outlet for the actual political wing of the movement. It was the moving into the Sinn Féin of IRA personnel that made it a vigorous political force.

Some elders in the theatre claimed loudly that the play was 'brilliant'. The twentysomethings I was sitting among were quite subdued. The script is shambolic. Bean can't make up his mind about the IRA, or his characters. The latter are ignorant and shallow, but remain members of their squad over thirty years. There is an implication that the IRA is Mafia-like. But not that they are enriching themselves. They justify even their most brutal acts on the grounds that they are soldiers fighting a just war. This is not contradicted. The scene involving McArdle could be said to justify their self-assessment. (McArdle wouldn't last a month in an actual underground army.)

The above elders may have been referring to the fact that Out of Joint made something of a silk purse out of something of a sow's ear. Bean was smart to set this play in New York. The UK's armed forces need not be mentioned, nor the various Loyalist groups. The 1966 mobilisation of the UVF is noted, but not its activities up to (and after) 1994. The Chronology doesn't mention the cease-fires. Derry's Bloody Sunday is noted, with a grudging reference to the Saville Inquiry findings. Apart from 1988: "*Three PIRA operatives killed in Gibraltar*" (an Act of God?), there is no mention of what the Army (Navy and Air Force) did in Ireland. There's certainly no mention of Clones and Dublin. The (unnamed) SAS Captain Westmacott shot by Joe Doherty's unit is described by Ó Drisceoil, as "*a young lad*".

Seán McGouran

CORK continued

McCarthy's other heroes were Professor Tom Garvin, the late Professor Peter Hart, and Jack Lynch, the former Taoiseach. Dr. John-Paul told us that he is 30 years of age and has a German partner.

SECTARIANISM

Dr. McCarthy was followed by Professor John A. Murphy:

"The contemporaneous regard with which the lord mayors of Cork, Tomás MacCurtain, who was murdered, and Terence MacSwiney, who died on hunger strike—both in 1920—were held in their native city can be gauged from the acknowledgement given them by their political opponents, a debate on their legacy has heard.

"Prof. John A. Murphy said MacCurtain and MacSwiney attempted to improve the lot of Corkonians during their short tenures as lord mayor. Their good faith was recognised by their Unionist opponents on Cork Corporation.

"When MacCurtain died, the expressions of sympathy came not least from the Unionist representatives on the Corporation and it was Unionists on the Corporation who seconded the motion for the election of Terence Mac Swiney..."

"That proves that what they were doing for the city in that short period, when they set out to explore the social problems of poverty and poor housing, was accepted in good faith by people who didn't have any political sympathy for them.

"While both men were cast in a heroic mould, he added, it would be wrong to think of MacSwiney's hunger strike as being undertaken out of some kind of pacifist idealism as it was simply part of a wider strategy, including armed struggle." (*Irish Times*, 15.3.2011).

John A. Murphy said that: "*They were Lords Mayor of a city they loved deeply. They lived and died for the city as well as the country*" (*E. Echo*, Cork, 14.3.2011).

In his opening remarks, Professor Murphy quoted fellow colleague at University College Cork, Dr. Andy Bielenberg, whose study into the impact of the War of Independence on the Protestant population was a much more sober and accurate assessment than some of the wild figures thrown around by Dr. McCarthy and the author Gerard Murphy. Murphy added that "*Theology today has no impact in the Republic*".

"Ireland owes more than it will probably ever realise to the Christian Brothers... I am an individual who owes practically everything to the Christian Brothers" (Eamon de Valera, on the centenary of the death of Edmund Rice, 1944).

MY MA'S FROM BANTEER

The third speaker was Dr. Ruth Dudley Edwards, author and commentator:

She told the audience her mother was an O'Sullivan from Banteer in North Cork before launching into a spleen about Gerry Adams; the La Mon bombing; Jean McConville, saying "*What right has a minority to hijack a people, a state or a nation?*"

She said that, while MacSwiney and MacCurtain were men of "*high ideals and courage*", she believed their legacy was a bad one as a result of the direction their lives took.

She questioned what mandate both men and others in the Irish Volunteers had to stage the 1916 Easter Rising and then engage in the War of Independence—two conflicts which she described as Ireland's first and second civil wars of the 20th century. She also wondered about the mandate of those who engaged in the Civil War and the Northern conflict.

"Many involved in all those conflicts had been inspired by both MacCurtain and MacSwiney but had disgraced their memories with their brutality..." (*Irish Times*, 15.3.2011).

MORAL INTEGRITY

The final speaker was the former editor of *The Irish Press*, Tim Pat Coogan:

"Coogan said MacSwiney by his death on hunger strike brought 'a moral integrity' to the struggle for Irish freedom but he believed that the legacy of both MacCurtain and MacSwiney had been squandered in a modern Ireland blighted by corruption..." (*Irish Times*, 15.3.2011).

"Tim Pat Coogan brought the debate into the present day and the current economic climate. He said: 'The 100 or so people who have led us into this current crisis should face a court of law and prison'..." (*Eve. Echo*, Cork, 14.3.2011).

AUDIENCE RESPONSE

MacCurtain's granddaughter Fionnuala MacCurtain said she believed strongly that, but for the Irish Volunteers and men like MacCurtain and MacSwiney, "*we would not be sitting here today with the possibility of a free and just Ireland*" (*IT*, 15.3.2011).

The 500-member audience participated in a limited series of questions and comments. Amongst these were:

Peader Beecher, veteran Cork Republican who criticised the biased formation of the panel and particularly the long anti-Republican stance of Professor John A. Murphy.

Dr. John Borgonovo of UCC corrected Dr. McCarthy on certain remarks he made regarding Gerard Murphy's book *The Year Of The Disappearances* and highlighted

the lack of historical accuracy in that publication and Murphy's over-reliance on local folklore and second or third-hand accounts of events.

Seamus Lantry highlighted the strong statistical evidence that the withdrawal of the occupation forces also involved a substantial *entourage* of loyalist followers who would not accept a Republican administration. Statistically, the majority of these were non-Catholics.

But the most telling criticism of the evening came from Mr. Jim Fitzgerald, Chairman of the Knockraha History & Heritage Society in East Cork. He explained his involvement with Gerard Murphy and described in detail how Murphy had made a travesty of the events he purported to describe. (He wrote to a number of newspapers about this but his piece was suppressed. It appears elsewhere in this magazine).

"Governments may think and say what they like, but force cannot be eliminated and it is the only real and unanswerable power. We are told that the pen is mightier than the sword, but I know which of these two weapons I would choose."

(Lieutenant-General Sir Adrian Carton de Wiart, an old Oxford boy & British war hero).

SINN FEIN

The newly elected Cork Sinn Fein TD issued a statement:

"*Politicisation of MacCurtain-MacSwiney debate 'inappropriate' claims TD*

"Jonathan O'Brien TD has described the politicisation of Friday night's debate on the legacy of Tomás MacCurtain and Terence MacSwiney, during which members of the panel launched attacks on republicanism both past and present, as completely inappropriate.

"Deputy O'Brien said, 'Friday night's debate at City Hall was billed as a serious reflection on the legacy of two of this city's most honoured sons, Tomás MacCurtain and Terence MacSwiney. Instead it turned into a highly politicised attack on republicanism both past and present'..." (14 March 2011).

It is impossible to imagine whenever any debate on the deaths of MacSwiney and MacCurtain would not have been political. They were huge political events when they happened and have inevitably remained so ever since. Depoliticising them would be like depoliticising the War of Independence itself, i.e., making them and the war meaningless events; this was a most odd contribution to the debate from a Sinn Fein TD.



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 29 No. 4

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

Report

MacCurtain/McSwiney Legacy

A Revisionist Slap In The Face For Cork

"WE NEED THIS 1890s-1916 generation like we need a hole in the head given our current difficulties . . . this generation have nothing to teach us in terms of our current predicament."

Dr. John Paul McCarthy of Oxford University was speaking at a Commemorative Debate held in the Cork City Hall on Friday, 11th March 2011 to celebrate the Bicentenary of the Christian Brothers College, the North Monastery, Cork 1811-2011. The theme of the Debate: "*MacCurtain & MacSwiney—a legacy squandered or fulfilled?*"

The Debate was held on the anniversary of de Valera's defeat in 1926, at an Extraordinary Sinn Fein Ard Fheis, after which he resigned as President of Sinn Fein and set up the Fianna Fail party. The debate was chaired by Mr. Pat Cox, former Progressive Democrat founder, an ex-TD and former Independent MEP for Munster.

Ms Fionnuala MacCurtain and Professor Cathal MacSwiney-Brugha made brief presentations on behalf of the families.

The panellists were Tim Pat Coogan; Ruth Dudley Edwards; Professor John A. Murphy and Dr. John Paul McCarthy (Cork & Oxford).

"Throughout the debate, which gripped the audience for more than two hours, the panel both agreed and disagreed with the motion" (*Eve, Echo*, Cork, 14.3.2011).

"Former Mon student John Paul McCarthy and Dr. Ruth Dudley-Edwards received the coldest reception when they said that MacCurtain and MacSwiney did not have a mandate from the people and that sectarianism was use..." (*ibid.*).

But there was only two actors in this drama: Murphy, an old revisionist, and McCarthy a "young fogey"! The old master couldn't contain his ebullient pupil!

"HEAVY GUNS"

The opening speaker was Dr. McCarthy:

"Already feeling more than a little

manipulated by the newsreel footage of both mayoral funerals that preceded the public debate, I wasn't in any mood to be outflanked in my hometown.

"While Chairman Pat Cox expertly ejected the drunks who wandered in from the quays, I did my best to wheel the heaviest historical guns into place and to fire them directly..." (J.P. McCarthy, *Sunday Independent*, 20.3.2011).

Dr. McCarthy launched into a revisionist tirade from the word go; he left the Cork city audience in no doubt as to where he stood "*a legends squandered or fulfilled*", the ex-North Monastery boy who has made 'good' at Oxford had no doubt that it was a legacy squandered.

"Historian, Dr John Paul McCarthy, likened MacCurtain and MacSwiney and others of the 1890-1916 generation to Lenin's theory of the vanguard, where a small unrepresentative elite dictates the pace of change through the momentum of violence."

But surely Leninist vanguardists don't put themselves up for election under the rules laid down by the enemy—that's what happened in Cork, Limerick, Derry and

elsewhere and they are not known for dying on hunger strike.

"He criticised this generation for its limited capacity to think in the abstract and said their approach to politics and public administration cast a long, dark shadow over the Irish State until the 1950s, when it essentially collapsed under the weight of its own contradictions.

"We need this 1890s-1916 generation like we need a hole in the head given our current difficulties... this generation have nothing to teach us in terms of our current predicament..." (*Irish Times*, 15.3.11).

McCarthy wrote in the *Sunday Independent*:

"I told the crowd about P. S. O' Hegarty's essential book, *The Victory of Sinn Fein*.

"Here, O'Hegarty recalled a bitter confrontation with Cork City's No 1 Brigade in 1920, having been apprised of some looming plan that he considered "fiendish and indefensible" and which he tried to sabotage by appealing to the invertebrate principle of Dail supremacy" (20.3.2011).

"Those opposing me were impervious to the petitions of O'Hegarty, de Valera, Hubert Butler, O'Connor, O'Faolain and Bishop Cohalan of Cork who said in 1923 that "Protestants have suffered severely during the period of civil war in the south"... " (*ibid.*).

At the debate, McCarthy referred to Maurice Moynihan, former Private Secretary to Eamon de Valera and Editor of the book, *Speeches And Statements of Eamon de Valera*, saying that Dev regretting words in criticism of the RIC, of Dev's "*sorrow and shame*".

Dr. McCarthy was laudatory in his praise of Gerard Murphy's 2010 publication *The Year Of The Disappearances, Political Killings in Cork 1921-1922*, adding that "*his book was even better than my own U.C.C. thesis*".

He called on the audience to beg, borrow or steal Hubert Butler's *Escape From The Ant Hill*. And complained of how poor Butler was treated by Archbishop John Charles McQuaid.

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

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

1 Sutton Villas, Lower Dargle Road
Bray, Co. Wicklow or

PO Box 339, Belfast BT12 4GQ or

PO Box 6589, London, N7 6SG, or

Labour Comment,

C/O Shandon St. P.O., Cork City.
TEL: 021-4676029

Subscription by Post:

12 issues: £20, UK;
€ 30, Ireland; € 35, Europe.

Electronic Subscription:

€ 15 / £12 for 12 issues
(or € 1.30 / £1.10 per issue)

You can also order from:

<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>