

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

August 2011

Vol.26, No.8 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.25 No.8 ISSN 954-5891

Summer Manoeuvres

PRESIDENCY

The function of the Presidency in the state is to represent the past in the life of society. It is an institution without either legislative or executive powers. Creating the future is the business of the Dáil. But the future is a modification of the past—except when some catastrophic general upheaval brings about a kind of Year Zero in which the past has no relevance. And the Dáil at present seems to be adrift in the present with little sense of the past, and therefore little sense of a viable future line of development. A Presidency which made a point of representing the past would therefore play a particularly useful part as ballast that would keep the public mind on an even keel.

The big event in the life of the next Presidency will be the centenary of the 1916 Insurrection. A Fine Gael Minister has expressed the hope that it will not be a militaristic commemoration. The state has in recent years been wallowing in the celebration of British militarism. The British war of destruction on Germany and Turkey has been presented as *Our War*. But the war that was actually our war must not be celebrated because it was a war against Britain. And yet it is only by entering the realms of fantasy that one can think that an independent Irish state would have come into being and been acknowledged by Britain if it had not been established by the use of force that Britain was unable to crush. Britain was not going to give up anything to mere votes.

Presidential nominations are not closed as we go to print. Of the possible candidates, three stand out as being distinctive in some way: David Norris, Michael D. Higgins and Robert Ballagh. Two are Protestants, one is homosexual, and all three are strongly interested in the Arts. Norris is a colonial Protestant of the Ascendancy kind and Ballagh is what used to be called a Dissenter in Ascendancy times. While well-meaning, Higgins is inclined towards globalist ideology—for example he described as genocide the Myanmar/Burmese refusal to give the United States the free run of the country to deal with the consequences of the typhoon a couple of years ago. But he has one substantial national achievement to his name—the creation of TG Ceathair. That is a big plus in his favour.

continued on page 2

EU Issues—

fiscal union?

The *Irish Times* editorialised on the Euro crisis on 16th June:

"The tectonic plates of international finance began to shift four years ago this summer. The world has since been living with repeated tremors, the consequences of the earthquake of Lehman Brothers' collapse in 2008 and near-constant fear of further, possibly even more damaging upheaval. Poorly designed structures built atop fault lines of finance have been affected most severely. None is bigger or more at risk than the euro."

This is the grandiose style of hyped-up analogy that is usually an excuse for thinking. And it goes on:

"As Europe's debt crisis deepens, with tremors running through the Italian and Iberian peninsulas, unscrambling the egg of currency union is not an option. The notes and coins in pockets, from Helsinki to Palermo, Bratislava to Tralee, can't be replaced overnight with legacy currencies."

A solution is then suggested, or rather just slipped in:

"...completing the euro project by creating a fiscal union appears to be the only

continued on page 6

UN Membership For Palestine

In September, Palestinians intend to apply for UN membership for a Palestinian State in the 1967 borders, that is, in Gaza and the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, the Palestinian territories that Israel has occupied by force since 1967.

It is expected that the US will veto the membership application in the Security Council and the application will fail. However, Palestinians are confident that they will succeed in enhancing their status

at the UN in the Autumn by being recognised as a "non-member state". This requires a simple majority in the UN General Assembly and cannot be blocked by the US.

As far back as 1974, the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) acquired observer rights at the UN. At present, Palestinians have a permanent mission at the UN with observer rights, but as a liberation movement, not as a state. Being recognised as a "non-member state" will not materially alter these rights.

Nor will it alter one whit Israel's control

of their territory. However, it will permit the State of Palestine to apply for membership of a variety of international bodies, including the International Criminal Court (ICC) with the possibility of serious consequences for Israel. Remember, for example, that under the Rome Statute of the ICC, colonising occupied territory is a war crime.

PALESTINIAN STATE DECLARED IN 1988

In November 1988, the PLO declared the establishment of a Palestinian state in the 1967 borders. With this declaration,

continued on page 8

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| Summer Manoeuvres. Editorial | 1 |
| EU Issues. Jack Lane | 1 |
| UN Membership For Palestine. David Morrison | 1 |
| Readers' Letters: Worse To Come? Eamon Dyas; Gerard Murphy, " <i>Ethnic Cleansing</i> " And A " <i>Disappeared</i> " Jew. Manus O'Riordan | 3,21 |
| Stranger Than Fiction. Conor Lynch | 5 |
| Gilmore Supports Palestine State. Report | 9 |
| Poems. Wilson John Haire. The Madness Of Imperium; The Day The Dream Died | 9,28 |
| Sinn Fein Still 'Owns' West Belfast. Seán McGouran | 10 |
| Editorial Digest (Respecting Traditions; The Twelfth; Loyalists; Missing Flag; Orange Order; Feud?' Royal Black Preceptory; Belfast Lord Mayor; Moyle; The Coward Kenny; McGill Summer School; Low-Paid Hit) | 11 |
| The Truce Of 1921. Nick Folley (Report of Pádraig Óg Ó Ruairc talk) | 13 |
| Shorts from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (Labour Court & JLCs; Enda Kenny; Protecting The Bond Holders; The War On Drugs; Comparative Statistics) | 15 |
| Murdoch And Gallipoli. Pat Walsh | 16 |
| Totalitarianism And Garret The Good. Desmond Fennell | 19 |
| Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (Child Abuse, State And Church; Orwell And Johann Hari) | 24 |
| Biteback: The War And The Emergency, Philip O'Connor; Israel Unresolved, David Morrison; John-Paul And The Brits, Seán McGouran | 26 |
| Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Cloyne Report And The Catholic Church; USUK; Somalia) | 27 |

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

[WikiLeaks And Labour](#)

(back page)

A communication has been received from Jeff Dudgeon. It will appear next month.

Ballagh seems to be the one who could, without embarrassment, represent the past of the state amidst the flux of the present.

Norris, to judge by things he has said over the years, sees the formation of the state as a great mistake. That is more relevant to the election than his remarks about the prevalence of pederasty amongst the founders of democracy in ancient Greece. It would certainly be useful if he got a nomination, provided that he stood as a candidate of the Reform Society publicly advocating a return to what remains of the Empire, openly supported by the British Ambassador—who appears to be operating quite openly in Irish politics now.

Norris has been going around the country meeting the people for the first time ever. He has had to wait on culchies out there amidst the bogs. It would be interesting to know if, on his first venture out of the West British enclave in Dublin, he has got to like the people, or whether they have made him feel an alien more than ever.

Gay Mitchell managed to get the Fine

Gael nomination for the Presidency after fighting off a strong challenge from Pat Cox—who was admitted to the party to pursue his declared aim of winning its backing for his candidature. Bizarrely—in view of what he did to wreck the Commission—Cox is regarded as an expert on Europe. Getting the Fine Gael nomination is of consequence, because the party hopes to win the Presidency for the first time ever.

It is a measure of the demoralisation of Fianna Fail that it is not fielding a candidate. The Party has chosen the winning Presidential candidate ever since the Office was established. Éamon Ó Cuív has been mentioned as a contender even though he has not put himself forward. It would have been surprising if he had done so, given that he is the Party's best chance of re-connecting with its roots, should he become leader. Though not standing, the *Irish Times* treated him as a contender in a poll it conducted and found that he had least support amongst the long list of candidates. Surely the explanation for that is that he was not standing, rather than a lack of popularity? The Fianna Fail leadership election a few months ago

showed that Ó Cuív has solid support all around the country.

That *Irish Times* poll showed David Norris to be the front runner, though not having achieved the required nominations despite the strong support of the Sir Anthony O'Reilly press. The talk then was that it would be a blow to democracy if Norris failed to win sufficient nominations to get onto the ballot paper.

Norris, while being a Zionist, was an advocate of Palestinian rights and critical of 'settler' encroachments on the West Bank. He was the sort of candidate who could expect to get Second Preferences from many quarters—more so than Gay Mitchell, an old-style Fine Gael politician with no particular broad appeal. It was at this point that Israel intervened, making public an indiscreet letter Norris had written to the Israeli Supreme Court. This character reference was on behalf of his former partner, an Israeli Jewish dissident who had a relationship with an under-age Palestinian boy aged 15. (It might be said that an Arab who has had to cope with the State of Israel is certain to be much more mature than a Western child of that age. The age of consent in Israel is 16. 'Statutory' in that context usually means consensual. Nevertheless, statutory rape did take place.) With this revelation, Norris's support fell away, even though he had not made a secret of his views on these matters.

The elimination of Norris as a serious contender for the nomination has done a favour to Fine Gael. Israel has an obvious interest in helping Fine Gael, especially as there is an active Zionist group in the Coalition—the first ever in an Irish Government.

Public discussion of Norris's indiscretion has brought forward the suggestion that public representatives should be required to register their interventions in the affairs of other States. Surely it would be as much, or more, to the point for the reverse to take place? The Wikileaks revelations have confirmed that, not only senior Irish politicians and Ministers were reporting to, and receiving advice from, the American Ambassador, but also top civil servants (see *Labour Comment*, back page). Archive research has revealed that the British Ambassador is also the long-term confidante and adviser of the Irish Establishment. If there is to be a register of official foreign contacts, it would be to the point to have such encounters in the public domain.

Meanwhile, the system that DeV put in place—which required candidates for the Presidency to achieve solid support in society in order to obtain a nomination—has proved its worth. The President is elected directly by popular vote, by proportional representation, but candidates are nominated by members of the Oireachtas and local Councils.

Regarding the centenary, it is of some importance to know what 1916 was. It was an act of war, undertaken by a Government against a foreign enemy. That is, it was an act of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. The IRB was the Government of the Republic. Of course it was the self-proclaimed Government of the self-proclaimed Republic. What else could it have been? Britain ruled Ireland by right of conquest and made it clear that it did not regard Ireland as having any democratic right to secede from the conquest. It policed Ireland intensively, nipping independent developments in the bud, making the Independence movement of necessity a conspiracy whose first piece of practical business was military.

The Rising was an act of a Government, and its leaders held positions in that Government—which is more than can be said for the desultory rebellion in Libya which has just been recognised as the legitimate democratic Government by France, the USA and Britain. And the IRB fought a week-long battle in Dublin while the new 'legitimate democratic' Government of Libya has yet to set foot in Tripoli.

Open democratic development in Ireland was made possible as a direct consequence of the 1916 Insurrection and an indirect consequence of 'Our War' on Germany and Turkey. Britain did not find it easy to get back into the routine of wholesale oppression in Ireland after winning its Great War under the slogan of "democracy and the rights of small nations" and with many of its Irish recruits coming back from the trenches and taking seriously the slogan that had recruited them. In 1918 an elected Government replaced the conspiratorial Government. But Britain was no more respectful of the democracy than of the conspiracy, so there had to be another war. It is curious therefore that a Minister of the state which would not exist without these military events should object to a military dimension to the commemoration. And that it should be a Fine Gael Minister.

UNDEMOCRATIC MILITARISM

In 1921-2 Britain, having failed to whittle away the Republic by low-intensity police and military operations, threatened to launch a thorough war of conquest of the kind it had carried through against the Boer Republics twenty years earlier, unless the Republic was set aside and a Government under the Crown put in its place.

A group led by Michael Collins agreed to set up a new Government under British authority and to ward off the re-conquest

Worse To Come?

Interesting interview with Terry Smith—a barrow-boy type financial businessman who is Chief Executive of Tullett Prebon, the broking firm—on BBC Radio 4 this morning, 29th July. He discussed the recent Eurozone 'solution' and says that it only "kicks the problem down the road". More interestingly he went on to discuss the situation for the British economy and says that everyone in Britain is living in a fantasy land if they think that they are safe from the levels of required austerity that has not really been felt yet. Everyone is going to be significantly poorer in future and people have no idea what is in store for them. The public sector has to shrink dramatically and even under the present Government the public debt has been growing month on month since it came into power. The public sector needs to be radically reduced far beyond current plans. A large percentage of the mortgage-paying public is only paying interest-only repayments leaving them worse off and making no real inroads into the economy's private debt. On a private note, he said that he himself invests in equities in large companies which supply people's everyday needs (which I presume means utility companies and oil and gas), gold, and currencies in safe countries like Norway which has huge financial reserves and is well run.

He's obviously been schooled in the monetarist college and seems to be coming straight out of the Tea-party philosophy but it'll be interesting to see just how that particular philosophy begins to take on a British persona in the months to come. The monetarist school has dominated economics in the USUK for so long that there can't be a working economist out there who knows anything else. As they struggle to seek answers, the most obvious one is the current Tea-party perspective which has the benefit of talking in language which monetarists understand, as opposed to the language of Keynes.

Another factor which invariably influences the perspective of these people is the army of Business School graduates dominating large companies. In Britain the number of new Business Schools and Colleges/Universities offering degrees in things like Business Studies and Business Management has exploded since Thatcher and the foundation that their courses rest upon is the monetarist mantra. These people dominate business and the economy in Britain and set the terms under which discussion takes place. As they cannot deny that the financial crisis was caused by free-market activities, and as they cannot comprehend categories of thought outside their received wisdom, they will be pushed to the extreme limits of the monetarist philosophy to seek an explanation and solution. This is what seems to be happening in the US—an extreme monetarist position coupled with a political populism that more or less squeezes out the pragmatic options that enabled the monetarists to operate in the real world up to now.

Eamon Dyas

and preserve a base from which to fight another day. This divided the body politic. Collins began to form a new Army, supplied by Britain. He tried to maintain a *modus vivendi* with the Old IRA that had fought Britain for the Republic in 1919-21, and he used it for subversive military operations in Northern Ireland—which is to say, for making war on Britain in the North, because Northern Ireland was never anything but a segment of the British state. But Britain's object was to break up the Republican movement that had defied it for three years. Collins found himself increasingly beholden to Whitehall, and increasingly ordered about by it. In July 1922, while he was actively collaborating with the Old IRA in the North, he was suddenly ordered to make war on it on the flimsiest of excuses, or else Britain would begin the reconquest. That is what we call the Civil War.

The Free State was established in this way. Its establishment was a militaristic event.

The Republic declared in January 1919 was based on a democratic election mandate. The Free State was founded on military action.

An election had been held a month before the Free State was founded in war. It is sometimes suggested that this election authorised the war that founded the Free State. But whatever it was that was elected in June 1922 had not met when the war was launched in July. If that Dáil had been allowed to meet before the event, it would not have authorised making war on the republicans. The Government which waged that war was not the Government that won the election: it could not have been, as the Dáil did not meet to vote it into Office. It was the 'Government of Southern Ireland', an institution operating under British authority, which started the war.

Elections in a system of representative government are not self-interpreting events.

Britain had interfered directly in the election campaign. Collins and De Valera agreed a programme to put to the electorate. That did not suit the British purpose in imposing the Treaty. So Collins was ordered summarily to Whitehall and the Election Pact was vetoed. He returned on the eve of the election and ended the Pact—sort of—so that what was to be voted on was far from clear. And then, before the elected representatives could meet, he was given the ultimatum to make war on the Republicans—or else.

DEMOCRACY

The Free State won the war with British arms. De Valera delivered his resounding address to the defeated Republicans—the Legion of the Rearguard—and Republican resurgence began. The Free State Party, calling itself Cumann na nGaedheal, rapidly lost its bearings—possibly because of the loss of Collins in an absurd escapade—but possibly not. Collins showed himself increasingly bewildered by the turn of events.

As the Republican (Anti-Treaty) sentiment of the country asserted itself ever more strongly during the 1920s, the Free State stuck ever more stubbornly by the Treaty, for which it had been manipulated into fighting a war in which it had done some dreadful things. Its loss of popular support at the outset made it dependent on the authoritative support of the Catholic Hierarchy, leading to the abnormal relationship of Church and State. (Abnormal, that is, for a Catholic country—the separation of Church and State having been one of the great innovations of Roman Catholic Europe. In Protestantism Church and State were one.)

Then the survivals of Redmondism gravitated towards the Treatyite Government and it was in no position to drive them away. And of course the Unionists joined in, since the Treaty State was intended to be a British state.

Cumann na nGaedheal governed in strictly Treatyite spirit from 1922 to 1932. In 1924 it suppressed the Republicans within its own ranks who regarded the Treatyite State as a "stepping-stone" to independence. In 1925 it half-recognised Northern Ireland as whatever it was, tacitly acknowledging that the Boundary Commission, which had played a part in gaining support for the Treaty, had been a swindle.

The utter military defeat of the Anti-Treatyites in 1923 marked the beginning of an Anti-Treaty resurgence, which got stronger at every election. The Government then used the Treaty Oath to keep Anti-Treatyites out of the Dáil, raising the

possibility of the minority party governing with the majority party locked out. That prospect was warded off when the Speaker admitted Fianna Fail Deputies without taking any Oath at all. That was in 1927, when the two parties were equal.

The Free State Party survived a Vote of Confidence with the help of the *Irish Times* Editor, who kept John Jinks, an Independent who supported Fianna Fail, away from the Dáil for the critical vote. Cumann na nGaedheal then governed for the next four-and-a-half years with a stringent 'law-and-order' policy directed against the Communist Party and the IRA, which it declared were the reality behind Fianna Fail.

Fianna Fail won the 1932 Election and formed a Government with Labour support. It called another Election in 1933 and won it outright. Cumann na nGaedheal then merged with a small Redmondite party, supported by soft Unionists, to form a Fascist party called Fine Gael, to fight Communism and defend the Treaty. It formed the Blueshirts as a fighting organisation to deal with the subversive Parliamentary system, as the Brownshirts were doing in Germany just then. Then in 1936, when General Franco struck against the Spanish Republic (in what was a war rather than a *coup*), it formed the Irish Christian Front to rally active support for him.

While these things were going on, Britain launched the Economic War against Irish trade when Fianna Fail stopped the transfer of the 1903 land purchase repayments to Whitehall. The main export market for agricultural produce collapsed, and Ireland had as yet a weak industrial sector. But Fianna Fail kept winning elections, and it resisted pressure from the influential Christian Front to recognise Franco's rebellion as the legitimate Spanish Government—recognising it only when it became the *de facto* Government in 1939.

The conflict over the Treaty arrangement, which dominated politics in the 1920s, became a conflict between Parliamentary democracy and Fascism in the 1930s. The intelligentsia of the society was Fine Gael with a Redmondite tinge. The Protestant/Unionist social residue was not a factor in electoral politics, but it was by far the wealthiest social segment, and it ensured that the *Irish Times* continued to be published, despite its minuscule readership, as a potential political influence biding its time. It was not militantly Fascist as Fine Gael was, but it was supportive of Fascism.

Fianna Fail curbed Fascism in Ireland

in the 1930s, and then the Fascist order in Europe was broken by the war of the British Empire on Germany, which in its initial phase was very much a war on Germany rather than on Fascism.

After the Fascist era ended, Fine Gael's origins as a Fascist movement became an embarrassment to it. But, with the intelligentsia being predominantly Fine Gael, this was easily dealt with. It was written out of history—just as the Official Republican war in the North a generation later was written out of history by the present allies of Fine Gael. It was argued by the Politics Professor at University College Dublin that Fine Gael could not *really* have been Fascist because it did not succeed in establishing a Fascist regime, and the real Fascism was the camouflaged Fascism of Fianna Fail. That is how we deal with our history.

CHURCH AND STATE

Fianna Fail sustained the Parliamentary system throughout the Fascist era and Fine Gael had to submit to it after 1945. And in order to return to office Fine Gael had to do a deal with Clann na Poblachta. That is one of the merits of the Parliamentary system—or one of its defects—it generates opportunist alliances which subvert principles.

The Treaty Party did two notable things on its return to Office in 1948: it blew away the last tenuous connection with the Treaty by formally withdrawing from the British Commonwealth and Empire, which Fianna Fail had made a dead letter but left in place; and it proclaimed the subordination of the State to the Catholic Church in medical matters.

The relationship of Church and State for two centuries—which will, presumably, continue to exist—was determined 200 years ago in the great Veto Controversy amongst Catholics. Henry Grattan, in the Westminster Parliament, proposed a Catholic Emancipation Bill—a Bill to admit Catholics to the Legislature. It included the proviso that the Government should exercise a right of veto on the selection of Bishops—a list of nominees should be submitted to it and it might strike out any it thought might exert undue political influence. The Irish Hierarchy had agreed this with Grattan, and the Vatican saw it as just a normal arrangement between Church and State. Indeed there were states where the Government chose who was to be Bishop. But a great campaign against the Veto erupted in the Dublin middle class, set off by Walter Cox's influential *Irish Magazine*. It raged for many years with the older clergy and

the Jacobite laity supporting the Veto, and the new progressives of the middle class (led by O'Connell after initial hesitation) opposing vehemently. The Anti-Vetoists won. Twenty years after the dispute began Peel brought in an unconditional Emancipation Bill. Catholics entered Parliament and the Church remained free of entanglements with the Government.

The Government also attempted to introduce State payment of the priests. That too was defeated.

There were places where the Church, Protestant or Catholic, was an instrument of State authority. Ireland was not one of them. The oppressive Church, from which the *Irish Times* is now celebrating our liberation, never had a shred of State authority attached to it. We had no Catholic Ecclesiastical Court, though we once had a Protestant one.

That oppressive Church had no State support. Its only support was the people it oppressed. And that oppression consists almost entirely of false memory imagined after the event. It is not what was experienced. It is what some people began to feel in retrospect that they should have experienced. But if any substantial number of people had experienced the status of the Church as oppressive and rejected it that would have been an end of it, because its status depended entirely on them. The only power of the Church was the power of the public opinion that supported it.

"Enda Kenny, with steely eloquence, has ended decades of government obeisance to Rome", says *Irish Times* columnist Miriam Lord. And she asks:

"Was this really a Taoiseach saying this on the floor of Dáil Eireann? In a country where taoiseach John A Costello once declared: 'I, as a Catholic, obey my church authorities and will continue to do so in spite of *The Irish Times* or anything else...' When Noel Browne, having resigned from Costello's cabinet... after the rejection of his Mother and Child Scheme publicly said 'I, as a Catholic, accept unequivocally and unreservedly the views of the hierarchy on this matter'. And the late Brendan Corish... once famously said 'I am, of course, a Catholic first, an Irishman second'..." (30.7.11).

Could she find no statement from a Fianna Fail leader saying that kind of thing?

The power that Enda Kenny has condemned is not that of the microscopic foreign state in Rome which intervened unwarrantably in our affairs. It is the inheritance of the founders and leaders of his own party: John A. Costello, and

William Cosgrave before him.

Cosgrave founded the post-Republic State with British arms and priests as Commissars.

The London *Times* comments:

"The Church has dominated Irish life since independence in 1922. In a republic where 92.6% of the population identified itself as Catholic at Partition, the Church could make or break governments. In a poor, rural and pious country it ran most schools, hospitals, orphanages and other social services. No politician dared to challenge its authority. The Church inspired fear more than love..." (July 26).

Which Government did the Church make or break? It certainly helped to make the Treatyite regime of the 1920s. But then the party of the excommunicated took over, gave refuge to the unorthodox, and Miriam Lord cannot find a juicy Fianna Fail quotation to go along with Fine Gael and Labour.

In the early 1920s Cosgrave, making war on the Republican substance of the Independence movement, gave an array of public institutions over to the Church to run, and that could not easily be undone ten years later.

Judge Patwell, in Munster, was reported in the *Corkman* a couple of months ago as throwing out a case brought against a priest thirty years after the alleged event. The plaintiff pleaded that the case could not have been brought earlier, because of the terrible power of the Church. Without going into the question of whether the Church ever had such power, Patwell did not let the case go to trial because the Church certainly did not have much power at all for the last ten or fifteen years. It was protested against this that the awesome power of the Church left a disabling psychological condition in the individual which long outlasted its actual influence, and that the individual was only released from its spell when the Church was in public disgrace and contempt was being heaped on it from all sides.

There are obligations on citizenship. Citizenship cannot exist if those obligations are not met. Individuals in a democracy cannot be compelled to act the part of citizens. If they failed to do so in parts of the country, the adaptation of the law to the failure by making itself patriarchal, pastoral institution is certainly not the way to encourage people to live up to the obligations of citizenship. That belongs to a different kind of civilisation. And it seems to us that it is this failure that is at the heart of the abuse scandals.

Stranger Than Fiction

FOREIGN AMBASSADORS

The *Papal Nuncio* (Vatican Ambassador) to Ireland is Guiseppe Leanza. The Chairman of the Fine Gael Parliamentary Party, Charlie Flanagan, has called for Leanza's immediate expulsion from the country following the report into child abuse in the Diocese of Cloyne. Flanagan accuses the Nuncio of colluding with Irish citizens to break Irish law by organising cover-ups of abuse scandals, which would be enough to make him an unfit person to be an Ambassador—indeed had he not had diplomatic immunity it would be enough to have him thrown in jail.

But Leanza did much more than that. He *organised* and promoted the breaking of the law. He, and not one of the local Catholic clergy, was the prime mover in the whole affair. It is an indictment of the Taoiseach Enda Kenny and the Foreign Minister Eamon Gilmore that it was neither of them who proposed the major (or indeed any other) step against Leanza. They left it to *Charlie Flanagan*. Doubtless our 'leaders' will now watch the polls and look at the tea leaves before doing anything.

But expel the Ambassador? Unlikely. Ireland has developed the habit of cowering before foreign diplomats over the last forty years. It began with the then British Ambassador, Sir Andrew Gilchrist (1967-70). He began a more or less open campaign to undermine the Irish State. First through his strengthening of British control of the *Irish Times* and then his blatant intimidation of the Lynch Government, with close assistance from his Fine Gael lackey, *Liam Cosgrave*—resulting, among other things in the arrest of his opponents in the Irish Government, Neil Blaney and Charles Haughey, and the subsequent notorious Arms Trials. Since his intimidation was entirely successful, and Lynch bowed to his every whim, there was hardly likely to be any comeback against him!

The Origin Of Irish Catholic-Nationalism, Selections From Walter Cox's *Irish Magazine*: 1807-1815. Introduced and Edited by *Brendan Clifford*. 136pp. Illus. Index. 1992. €12, £9.

The Veto Controversy by *Brendan Clifford*. An account of the fierce dispute among Irish Catholics, between 1808 and 1829, as to whether the appointment of Irish Bishops by the Pope should be subject to a degree of Government influence, as was generally the case elsewhere. Includes **Thomas Moore's Letter To The Roman Catholics Of Dublin (1810)** and extracts from polemical writers on either side: J.B. Clinch, Dr. Dromgoole, Bp. Milner, Denys Scully, Rev. Charles O'Connor etc. 203pp. 1985. €20, £15.

Fianna Fáil, The Irish Press And The Decline Of The Free State, by *Brendan Clifford*. Index. 172pp. 2007. €12, £9.

On December 1st 1972 the British Army bombed Dublin. *Jack Lynch* was still Taoiseach and did nothing. Indeed such was the cover-up, that this particular bombing is barely remembered—especially with the horror that was to come. Supervising Britain's activities in Dublin at the time was Ambassador John Peck. He wasn't even disturbed. Another bomb was set off in Dublin on 20th January 1973—again on Peck's watch. Lynch did nothing.

On 17th May 1974 came the 'big one'. A mixed bag of regular British Army and Ulster Defence Regiment, flying under the UVF flag of convenience, set off bombs in Dublin and Monaghan killing 34 people. This was to pre-empt a Fine Gael rebellion organised by Garrett Fitzgerald against proposed further draconian legislation. It succeeded. Involved this time, especially in getting the bombers safely back North were British agents in the Gardai in Monaghan and Dublin—including the then head of the Special Branch, Supt. Garvey.

Though the bombing was convenient for the Taoiseach, Liam Cosgrave, he may or may not have been in on the initial conspiracy. He was certainly involved in the cover up.

The response from the Irish (West British) ruling elite was terrible. At first Cosgrave refused to have the tricolour flown at half-mast in Dublin and Monaghan, but eventually relented. Speeches effectively excusing the bombings were made by Cosgrave; Justice Minister Paddy Cooney; Attorney General Declan Costello; Conor Cruise O'Brien; Labour Party Minister Jim Tully; and Opposition Leader Jack Lynch. The only politician of note to roundly condemn the bombings and send his condolences was Unionist Leader *Brian Faulkner* in the North. All this took place on the watch of Ambassador Sir Arthur Galsworthy (1973-6).

More recently we had the incident of people carrying out criminal acts, including murder, on behalf of the Israeli Government, using stolen Irish (and other) passports. Nothing was done against the *Israeli Ambassador*, Zion Evrony. The only contact between the Irish and the Israelis on the matter took place in Brussels—not in Dublin or Tel Aviv. At least the British and the Australians expelled some diplomats. So Leanza is probably safe enough—unless the Vatican pulls him out

THE CHURCH CRISIS

One of the knee jerk reactions to the Cloyne Report is Justice Minister Alan Shatter's proposal that priests have to report any suspicion of child abuse obtained in the confessional. That would really mean the end of confession as a sacrament—even if the rule applied only to child abuse, which of course it wouldn't. One of the greatest scandals in the recent war in the North was the discovery that the British had been putting bugs in in confession boxes in West Belfast. Not that IRA men would be *confessing* their

actions—they would not have regarded their activities as sins—but the confession box can also be somewhere some people may choose as a safe place to talk about things.

There is much confusion among non-Catholics as to what confession is. The Justice Minister can be forgiven for not understanding the matter—he is Jewish. Protestants don't understand it, nor do many nominal Catholics. There is a belief that when someone does something bad—commits a sin—he goes to confession, tells the priest, gets absolution and is told to say some prayers. That is the end of the matter. A line is drawn. This is not the case.

God grants absolution and the priest is a conduit. In the confession box the priest has to make judgements. Is the penitent making a clean breast of things? Above all, is he determined never to repeat his actions or indeed, more often, his thoughts, for thoughts are an awful lot more common than actions? If the priest is not satisfied he will not grant absolution. But the matter does not end there. The penitent, in the nature of things a convinced Catholic, otherwise he wouldn't be there, must now live up to his promises. The priest is out of it.

Absolution remains conditional. If the penitent does not continue with his determination to improve, there is no absolution. This is probably a greater 'cure' than all the therapy groups put together. It is different to the Lutheran position where there has to be a determination to live a good life according to Lutheran principles. Some at least of the Lutheran Churches have communion and confession. Communion differs from the Catholic sacrament in being in both kinds, bread and wine. The Lutheran doctrine on salvation is "*justification by faith alone*". All true believers are saved. It couldn't be more different to the Calvinist position where your saving is pre-determined, for guess who!, and you can do more or less as you like—hence the good conscience in running slaves, massacring peoples, etc. Good works don't enter into it for Lutherans or Calvinists

Confession is not the prevention of child abuse, as we have seen. Confession itself has been abused—sometimes to avoid giving scandal—more often to protect the senior figures and the institutions of the Church. Confession is not a perfect solution, but it is one of the best about. Prevention is surely better than punishment. Meanwhile, there is nothing to stop the arrest of people who abuse both children and the sacrament of confession. We will not hold our breath waiting for the first Bishop to be hauled through the gates of Mountjoy.

The Catholic Church is, to say the least, in disarray. It needn't be so. But Bishops Clifford of Cashel and Martin of Dublin seem to be the only ones keeping their heads. Defending the Church in no way means defending the awful rogues within it. But it does mean coming clean about these rogues, however many there are, while doing the best possible for an institution that serves so many people. The tendency, however, is to throw out the baby with the bathwater. This tendency is nowhere better represented

than by the head of the Church in Ireland, that quivering wreck of indecision and denial, Cardinal Brady.

So far the scandals have been confined to the South. Now Deputy First Minister, and practising Catholic, *Martin Mc Guinness*, is leading demands for the Church to be examined in the North as well—and in spite of opposition from some Church leaders. Mc Guinness will get his way, as usual. In the South many Catholics have simply wandered off into nothingness or smart aleckry.

This is not the case in the North where the Church is very relevant indeed. This could mean more rigorous investigations and well as a spirited defence of what is good in the Church. Perhaps by the time of the Eucharistic Congress in a year's time, Ulster could be leading a movement against the lethargy, the permissiveness and the smugness that have pervaded the Church in many parts of the world since Vatican 2.

Conor Lynch

EU Issues

continued

real alternative to preventing it joining failed monetary unions in the dustbin of history."

Fiscal union is one of those solutions that are now appearing on EUophile wish lists. Political union, a United States of Europe, a Federal Europe: these are other favourites. And of course if it was a matter of wishing solutions all our problems would be solved, immediately. The *Irish Times* editorial makes no effort to spell out anything about how such a momentous proposal might be put into practice.

It would mean a Minister of Finance for Europe. What EU institution would he/she be appointed by? The Commission, the Council, the Parliament? Such a thing is not allowed for by any of these institutions. Even the omniscient Lisbon Treaty in its foresight does not cater for one, and where would non-Euro members stand, e.g., the UK. So it is not possible within the existing framework. But then the present framework is getting more redundant by the day.

The only alternative would be an inter-governmental Minister for Finance. Inter-governmental rules OK nowadays! And on such a basis, as it is all to do with sovereign Governments taking decisions, it is inevitably a matter of deciding which country he/she will come from. There are an increasing number of countries that need not bother applying for the job. There is surely only one with the right CV and the necessary clout to ensure proper setting and collection of taxes—Germany.

This is the most sensitive area of all for any Government—the setting and collection of taxes for its electorate. People consent to be taxed at present because they

have faith in their State and consider that it is deserving of their taxes. The collecting and paying of taxes is basic evidence of a considered political commitment and of the confidence that exists in the institutions of the State. People will not want to pay taxes for something that does not exist, never mind not having confidence and commitment to it.

People will not pay for a pig in a poke. But that is what is being suggested that they do. Doing it for 'Europe' will not suffice because that has become a piece of rhetoric in the absence of a definable political structure that has created mass and enthusiastic commitment for its political aims and objectives. The sentiment must be created before anything else works. But Europeans are being asked to accept that the object of the political project is the proper collecting of taxes. That is putting the cart before the horse, but the EUophiles can conceive of no other political purpose for their project, apart from the rhetoric and that cuts no ice when it comes to the nitty gritty of paying your taxes.

Find The Lady!

The EU is becoming a paradise for lawyers and a graveyard for commonsense. The Lisbon Treaty has to be revisited because 'bailouts' break the Treaty and a permanent financial rescue mechanism is needed. The current 'bail-out' can be held to be legal in terms of EU law by claiming it's coping with a natural catastrophe and is exceptional. But that will not do in the long-term, as the problems it is dealing with are going to be permanent. As Germany is the major paymaster, and its Courts will most likely not allow the country to fund the permanent bailout—being illegal—there is a problem.

So change the Treaty, make it legal and close that avenue. But such a drastic change is surely a change that necessitates a referendum in Ireland and maybe elsewhere. No, comes the reply, as the change is not going to involve the EU—it will be the individual Governments making inter-Governmental agreements among themselves. On this argument, with the EU machinery not being called into play, there is no need for Treaty amendment. On this view, the EU does not exist as far as this bailout is concerned.

It's like the three card trick—'find the lady'—now you see her now you don't.

Two legal eagles explained this recently:

"Legal experts say Lisbon can change without a referendum.

Former attorney general Paul Gallagher and senior UCD law lecturer Gavin Barrett.

The Government is not obliged to hold a referendum on changes to the Lisbon Treaty paving the way for a new bailout mechanism in 2013, two legal experts have said.

"Former attorney general Paul Gallagher... and senior UCD law lecturer Gavin Barrett, told a joint meeting of the Bar Council and the European Union-funded Institute of International and European Affairs that the amendment to the Lisbon Treaty does not require a national vote. The complex changes, due to be passed in the Dail next year, aim to remove an existing clause banning bailouts" (Irish Independent 30 June, 2011).

Arguing legalistically, the experts insisted it was all perfectly OK to the satisfaction of the meeting they were addressing. There seemed to be no concern whatever about the political absurdity of what they were saying and where it left the EU and 'Europe' as a meaningful entity. The EU is bypassed from playing any part in securing the Euro, the most important issue in the EU. The Euro, therefore, is not dependent, or indeed related to the EU in any way! Not many people know that!

Yes, everything was rosy in this 'Europe', and Paul Gallagher almost went into ecstasy about how Europe since 1945 had become nothing less than the *"high-point of world civilisation, since Homo Sapiens appeared on earth over 200,000 years ago"*. It was hard to credit a grown man, indeed an erudite man, lapsing into such a rhapsody to try to keep his spirits up and those of his listeners. He did protest too much.

A clear conclusion is that Anthony Coughlan should not bother his head about this development. The Crotty Judgement requiring constitutional change to be put to referendum and all that is beside the point. We have moved on, away from the EU, and these speakers seemed to see no problem at all with this. It's legally OK and what else matters? Anthony Coughlan has won his point. The EU is being bypassed by its Member States when the chips are down. The Union has faded. Now it's a collection of States or a Union or whatever you're having yourself. Anthony can rest easy. The EU is discrediting itself faster and better than he could ever have dreamed of.

Back to the future?

British Eurosceptics are enjoying the current problems of the Euro, as is to be expected. They are very sorry for the state of Greece (smirk, smirk) but they can say 'we told you so'. Some of them have longer memories than the EUophiles, as they

knew, and remember, a world before the EU and the Euro. It's a great pity that the latter do not have such memories as it would help get matters into perspective about how the current state of the EU has come about.

One of these dyed-in-the wool sceptics is Andrew Alexander of the *Daily Mail* and he recently commented: *"One should not laugh over financial crises. All the same, the confusion about Greece and the euro will cause some chuckles, even from the most solemn of bankers"* (6 July, 2011).

He goes on to suggest a way forward:

"Some EU governments fear the break-up of the euro would threaten the union itself. And then where would we be, ask the faint hearts. The word is EFTA. Say it slowly: it is a pleasant word. It takes us back to the time when Britain established this free trade zone including Switzerland, Portugal and a few European peripherals for the purpose of removing tariffs and restrictions. Its aims were not political like the EU. The European Free Trade Association still exists. It was cut back in size when we decided to apply for membership of the Common Market, as it was then called. Why not a movement to explain the benefits of EFTA, as they were once on offer?"

This is just poking fun at the EU and of course we would not expect a full history of EFTA from him. But I doubt if any of our EUophiles could or would give any history of it either, or see any point in doing so. Apart from anything else they would be betraying their age if they showed they knew too much about it. That's a pity because there is a very a salutary lesson for the European project in the history of EFTA.

Far from being *"not political"* it was the very opposite. It was set up to counter and prevent the EEC from developing. It gathered all possible non-members and future members into a free trade arrangement to counter the protectionist EEC and sought to stop it in its tracks. However Ireland did not join, though encouraged to do so. It then knew all the pros and cons of free trade which it certainly does not know now. Then, it had not lost its critical faculties—though it had no objection whatever to joining European organisations. It had had a belly full of free trade historically and knew what this new body was up to. Those were the days!

The protectionist EEC thrived and the free trade EFTA declined. Then Britain decided it had backed a loser and joined the EEC. But it did not abandon EFTA in spirit. Rather, it set about making the EEC an EFTA and it has succeeded! That's

called political determination and sticking to your instincts. Harold Macmillan used an analogy to encourage British membership of the EEC to the effect that Britain would be to Europe what Greece was to ancient Rome—the brain to direct the brawn. For Macmillan it was no doubt what we would call a bit of *plamás* to make the British feel good about entry. He could hardly have imagined how successful they would have been. The EU now defers to Britain on all crucial matters but the favour is not returned—and why should it?

Remembering EFTA shows how the EU today has betrayed its heritage and now, in fundamentals, has become almost indistinguishable from what was specifically set up to destroy it.

Jack Lane

UN Membership For Palestine

continued

Palestinians accepted the objective of a state on just 22% of Mandate Palestine, with Israel continuing to exist in the other 78%. Since then, the way has been open for a "two-state solution". But, it has not been achieved because Israel has refused to withdraw from the territory meant for the Palestinian state.

In response to this declaration in 1988, close to a hundred states in the world recognised a Palestinian state and granted it full diplomatic relations. This number has increased to around 120 in recent months as a consequence of a worldwide campaign for recognition.

Other states, including Ireland, while not going as far as recognition, established some form of diplomatic relations with it. In January 2011, Ireland upgraded Palestinian representation in Dublin to that of a Mission.

Palestinians are now seeking the ultimate form of international recognition for their state, that is, UN membership. Writing in the *New York Times* on 17th May 2011, PLO Chairman, Mahmoud Abbas, made the following appeal:

"We call on all friendly, peace-loving nations to join us in realizing our national aspirations by recognizing the State of Palestine on the 1967 border and by supporting its admission to the United Nations."

HOW TO APPLY FOR UN MEMBERSHIP

UN membership is granted by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The procedure is as follows:-

First, the state submits an application to the Secretary-General in a letter formally accepting a member's obligations under the UN Charter.

Second, the Security Council considers the application. Any recommendation for admission must receive the affirmative votes of 9 of the 15 members of the Council, provided that none of its five veto-wielding permanent members—China, France, Russia, UK and the US—have voted against the application.

Third, if the Council recommends admission, the recommendation is presented to the General Assembly for consideration. Two-thirds of the members present and voting must vote for admission for the application to succeed.

THE EXPECTED SCENARIO

The following scenario is expected to unfold at the UN in the Autumn:-

- (1) Palestinians will formally apply for UN membership for a state in the 1967 borders.
- (2) The application will be considered by the Security Council, which will probably establish a committee to do so. This process may take weeks.
- (3) Meanwhile, Palestinians will propose a resolution in the General Assembly asking members to support the recognition of a Palestinian state in the 1967 borders. The purpose of this is to demonstrate the strength of international feeling on the issue and put pressure on Security Council members to vote for UN membership for Palestine.
- (4) If 9 or more members of the Security Council vote to recommend to the General Assembly that Palestine be granted UN membership, then the US will have to cast its veto in order to block it. It is not expected that France or the UK will veto it. China and Russia are expected to vote for it.
- (5) Assuming the Security Council doesn't recommend UN membership for Palestine, Palestinians intend to apply to be a "non-member state" recognised by the UN. This requires a simple majority in the General Assembly, which will be easily achieved.

RIGHTS OF A "NON-MEMBER STATE"?

In the words of the UN website, "non-member states" have "a standing invitation to participate as observer in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly" and "to maintain a permanent observer mission at [UN] Headquarters".

A considerable number of states that have since become full members of the UN were first "non-member states". These include West Germany (1952-1973), South Korea (1949-1991) and Switzerland

(1946-2002). Today, there is only one "non-member state"—The Holy See.

Currently, Palestinians have a permanent mission with observer rights at the UN, but as a liberation movement. Becoming a "non-member state" recognised by the UN means that Palestinians will continue to have observer status but now as a state, with a territory—Gaza and the West Bank, including East Jerusalem—recognised by the UN.

"OCCUPIED" OR "DISPUTED" TERRITORY

In resolution after resolution, the UN Security Council and General Assembly have declared the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, to be "occupied" territory, within the meaning of the Fourth Geneva Convention. So has the International Court of Justice when in July 2004 it ruled Israel's construction of a wall in the West Bank to be "contrary to international law".

This is important since Article 49(6) of the Convention bans the colonisation of occupied territory, saying that the occupying power "shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies".

However, Israel has never accepted that the West Bank is "occupied" territory, from which it might be expected to withdraw completely some day. Instead, it claims that it is "disputed" territory to which it has as much right as Palestinians. Hence, the Fourth Geneva Convention doesn't apply and therefore colonisation is OK. Hence also, its refusal to accept the 1967 border—the Green Line—as the baseline for negotiations with Palestinians about a final border between Israel and an eventual Palestinian state.

UN recognition of a Palestinian state, albeit a "non-member state", in the 1967 borders would be a powerful statement from the world that Gaza and all of the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, is the territory of a Palestinian state and not "disputed" territory, as Israel would have it. It follows that the transfer of any part of that territory to Israel can only come about if Palestinians consent. The Green Line has to be the baseline in any negotiations with Israel about territory.

Of course, Israel will continue to occupy the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, but now it will be the territory of a UN recognised state, if Palestinian plans are realised.

MEMBERSHIP OF INTERNATIONAL BODIES

Being a "non-member state" will allow Palestine to apply for membership of a wide variety of international bodies, including the International Court of Justice

(ICJ) and the International Criminal Court (ICC). If Palestine becomes a party to the ICC, then it would have jurisdiction over the occupied territories and Israeli actions in these territories would be subject for the first time to international legal scrutiny.

The ICC will have jurisdiction over the occupied territories, albeit for offences committed after Palestine becomes a party to it. Remember, for example, that Article 8.2(b)(viii) of the Rome Statute of the ICC defines

"the transfer, directly or indirectly, by the Occupying Power of parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies"

as a war crime. Israelis active in the settlement building programme could in future be found guilty of war crimes.

(In January 2009, after Israel's military assault on Gaza, when over 1,400 Palestinians were killed, the Palestinian Authority attempted to get the ICC to accept jurisdiction over the occupied territories. It made a formal declaration to the ICC, under Article 12(3) of the Rome Statute, stating that "*the Government of Palestine hereby recognizes the jurisdiction of the Court for the purposes of identifying, prosecuting and judging the authors and accomplices of acts committed in the territory of Palestine*". The ICC has yet to determine whether or not it is permissible under the Rome Statute to accept jurisdiction. The decision hinges on whether Palestine is a state, within the meaning of Article 12(3).)

ISRAEL'S RESPONSE

Israel's response to the Palestinian initiative has been contradictory. On the one

Gilmore Supports Palestine State

The Minister for Foreign Affairs, Eamonn Gilmore, made the following statement in the Dail:

"The continuing Israeli military occupation of the Palestinian territories is at the heart of the unresolved Arab-Israeli conflict. The issues which have been critical for Israel for most of its history—the existence of the state of Israel and its right to live in peace and security—have for many years been accepted in principle by most Arab and Palestinian opinion. It is the continuing occupation, and the creation and growth of illegal settlements on the occupied lands, which are now the major obstacles to peace.

"I consider it an urgent priority objective, both for Ireland and the EU, to help achieve the end of the occupation and the establishment of a sovereign Palestinian state, living in peace alongside Israel. This has been the consistent view of Irish Governments since 1980. It is long overdue, and it remains my view that there should be a state of Palestine, and very soon."

<http://debates.oireachtas.ie/dail/2011/07/13/00011.asp>

hand, it says that a UN vote would be meaningless, while on the other hand it has mounted an extensive diplomatic campaign to persuade States not to support the initiative. With most States, it has accepted that abstention is the best that can be hoped for.

It is difficult for Israel to argue that the UN should have no part to play in the creation of a Palestinian state, since the UN General Assembly was crucial to the creation of the Israeli state. The Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel says as much:

"On the 29th November, 1947, the United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution [181] calling for the establishment of a Jewish State in Eretz-Israel; the General Assembly required the inhabitants of Eretz-Israel to take such steps as were necessary on their part for the implementation of that resolution. This recognition by the United Nations of the right of the Jewish people to establish their State is irrevocable."

It can be guaranteed that an element of the Palestinian case at the UN this Autumn will be that Resolution 181 also provided for the establishment of an Arab state in 44% of mandate Palestine and that all Palestinians are asking for now is the recognition of a state on 22%. It is difficult for Israel (and the US) to combat that argument.

It may be a coincidence that the Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister, Danny Ayalon, has just released a YouTube video that dismisses the 1947 partition settlement as having "*no current legal standing*" and relies entirely on the *Balfour Declaration*, and its incorporation into the British mandate by the League of Nations, as the source of Israel's legitimacy in Palestine.

AMBASSADOR ZAKH SPEAKS

In a letter to the *Irish Times* on 14th July 2011, Ruth Zakh, the Israeli Deputy Ambassador, accused Palestinians of "*violating its agreements with Israel and the entire framework for Mideast peace by seeking premature recognition of a Palestinian state in the UN*". She claimed that such a step would breach the interim agreement from 1995, aka the Oslo II Agreement, Article XXXI (7) of which states:

"Neither side shall initiate or take any step that will change the status of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip pending the outcome of the permanent status negotiations."

This is a bit rich coming from a representative of a state that has, in the interim, nearly doubled the number of Jewish settlers on the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, added considerably to the settlement infrastructure and built a massive wall, 700 km long. This settlement construction is, of course, in violation of the Road Map, which Israel signed up to in 2003 and agreed to "*freeze all settle-*

ment activity (including natural growth of settlements)".

US ISOLATED AGAIN?

A meeting of the Quartet (US, EU, Russia and the UN) on 12th July 2011, which was supposed to agree a framework for renewed negotiations, produced nothing. According to *Ha'aretz*, the framework proposed by the US was one where territorial discussions would begin from the 1967 borders and include mutually agreed territorial exchanges, and that Israel would get recognition as the "*national home of the Jewish people*". There was no mention of freezing settlement building. It is difficult to believe that the US administration thought that this would be acceptable to Palestinians. In any event, the EU and Russia refused to put their names to it and no statement was forthcoming from the Quartet.

This is indicative of a developing rift between the US and the EU over Israel/Palestine. Back in February, the US was on its own in opposing a resolution in the Security Council calling upon Israel to cease all settlement activities in the Palestinian territory. All EU states voted for the resolution.

It's unlikely that the US will be isolated to the same extent in the Autumn on UN membership for Palestine. Will there be a common EU position on this? Probably, not. However, apart from Germany, very few EU states have publicly opposed the Palestinian UN initiative. Most have reserved their position and the likelihood is that a majority of EU states, including Ireland, will support it.

David Morrison

24 July 2011

THE MADNESS OF IMPERIUM

Depleted uranium-tipped shells,
missiles, bunker-busting bombs,
punches through armour like butter, fells
air defences with aplomb,
fit for purpose,
at the moment.

(excluding habeas corpus)

The moment served, the price of procurement,
uranium dust to breathe,
indestructible, old as the earth itself,
it lives 4.4 billion years,
the lungs, through the bloodstream it weaves,
to sink into the water table.

Universal outrage meets the veto,
UK, US, France, against Babel.

The beloved weapon of NATO.
Too many Iraqi new-born deformed,
after the winds blew to delirium
and the earth glowed as a firefly swarm.

They strive to create a Herculaneum.
Now Libya plays host
to the screech of heavy metal
that turns humanity into ghosts,
animals, insects, the delicate flower petal.

Wilson John Haire

13th April, 2011

Sinn Féin Still 'Owns' West Belfast

There was a by-election for the West Belfast (Westminster) seat on Thursday, 9th June 2011. It was due to the fact that Gerry Adams was standing for a seat in 'another jurisdiction'. Much was made of his having to apply for various 'offices of profit under the Crown'. Apparently these were brought out of some dusty closet just to embarrass Adams. (You wonder what the denizens of Downing Street and Westminster think happened at RUC 'Interrogation Centres' if they think this sort of Gilbertian nonsense is going to discommode Sinn Féin.)

Paul Maskey stood for the Westminster seat. He already sits in Stormont—nobody accused him of 'double jobbing' as he is extremely unlikely to go to Westminster. Except, possibly, as the Tyrone-Australian comedian Jimeoin put it, "*to take a shite and use the photocopier*". There was a tiny hope expressed that Sinn Féin might slip in the election, given Adams's personal standing. The turnout was very low (37.5%) but SF's share was still 70.6%. Gerry Adams's share was 71.1% in 2010. Alex Attwood, SDLP, came a bad second, and the others weren't really in it. Nevertheless, Gerry Carroll of the SWP (alias, People Before Profit) who got a healthy 1,751 votes. Worked on that could get him into the City Council.

Mr. Carroll probably shaves. The Alliance candidate, Aaron McIntyre, judging from his election material, probably doesn't yet. He is a second year archaeology student. His flyer reads "*Alliance has continued to grow, increasing significantly our representation at council, Assembly and Executive level...*" But Alliance is not really a force in the land. It amounts to the couth Unionist Party. The flyer boasts of Naomi Long's taking of the East Belfast seat, but that was something of a fluke. Attwood's publicity showed a (rather expensive) chair, with slogan, "*West Belfast needs a strong leader... ..not an empty seat*". It didn't convince too many people.

Neither the Democratic nor the Ulster, Unionists seem to have spent too much money on the election. Just as well, they got humiliated, coming behind Gerry Carroll. Aaron McIntyre was at the bottom of the poll, though he turned up in the constituency and remarked (to *Andersonstown News*) how polite people were.

In the rather confusing elections in May

to the Assembly and to Local Government (most parties, thriftily used the same material for both), the SDLP in west Belfast used the "Strong Leadership" slogan. It is possible that Alex Attwood sees himself as a credible leader of the Party. There may not be much to lead relatively shortly. His brother Tim stood for Belfast City Council but didn't succeed. The SDLP played up attacks on some canvassers. It was hooliganism or more 'extreme' Republicans, not the Shinners.

Éirigí stood in West Belfast and did not do very well. It was a respectable vote but they are not going to unseat Sinn Féin for a while (SF cultivates the seat: it does not take it for granted, publishing two journals for the area. The SDLP claims *Andersonstown News* is 'a Sinn Féin paper', but it gives everybody who can produce a quotation their chance. Alex Attwood quoted *Andersonstown News* in his by-election flyer.

The 'Left' did not do well in the May elections. The Workers' Party (the "*of Ireland*") somewhat downplayed in the North) put up four candidates. They all got very small votes. The numbers aren't diminishing—but they aren't growing either. The PUP (Progressive Unionist Party) got one (Belfast) Councillor, the veteran Hughie Smyth. Brian Ervine (David's brother), a schoolteacher and rather good writer, stood for the Assembly, in East Belfast, as did Dawn Purvis (now an Independent), who has had a Bliarite 'make over'. She left the PUP, and, like Brian Ervine, failed to get a Stormont seat. She supported Naomi Long in Belfast, East in the UK General Election. (Something worth remembering next time Alliance waxes indignant about Loyalist skulduggery. Mr Ford, the Party leader was "*appalled*" at recent UVF misbehaviour in Ballyclare.)

The Socialist Party ('Militant' as was) put up four Assembly candidates, they had endorsements on their flyers. Mostly from the Republic's SP, and a local worker. One was from "Cllr Dave Nellist, ex-Labour MP Coventry". They should have thought twice about that. Not because Dave Nellist is not a decent public representative, but because it underlines the fact that, within the UK, the SP / Militant hasn't done very well since being purged from the Labour Party. Brian Phelan stood in West Belfast, as "*An Independent*

Socialist alternative". His flyer was "*Printed and published*" by Election agent, John McAnulty of Socialist Democracy (the former Peoples' Democracy).

The Greens got their MLA re-elected, and three Councillors. Their flyers urged economic development, better education and a reduction in class sizes, protecting the NHS, and other good things. It wasn't much different from the handouts of the obviously 'left' parties, quite why they can't sink their differences is difficult to understand. Sinn Féin has made it implicitly clear that Irish unification needs the consent of a credible majority in Northern Ireland. And they are the only party that is likely to bring about a united Ireland.

The 1917 Russian Revolution can hardly be the object of any but historical controversy these days. The multitude of Republican, and Socialist groups are allowing the legacy of Ireland's 1916 to be relentlessly rubbished and are doing nothing about it. They can't really plead poverty or ignorance. They have headquarters, regular publications, and substantial international ramifications, from which they can access money and plant to publish material. The Workers' Party had two regular publications, the CPI (Communist Party of Ireland) still does. Where is their defence of Ireland's political legacy?

Traditional Unionist Voice also got three Councillors. Jim Allister, the leader, became an MLA for North Antrim (the seats are multi-member based on the Westminster constituencies). TUV did not do as well in the local / Assembly Elections as it clearly hoped. It is anti-SF. Sinn Féin wants to abolish the "11+". TUV supports it, and grammar schools, but does not give any real reason why. It describes Northern Ireland's education system as 'Ruined'. TUV is worried about the Irish language and road signs. "*Christian Have Rights Too*" the party is worried about funding "*lesbian, gay and bisexual campaigns*", they "undermine free expression of core Christian values", they don't explain how. TUV wants to "Raze the Maze" (they are good at catchy slogans). They want "*ugly prison buildings*" destroyed and not made into a "*Shrine*". They oppose 'wasting' money on, for example, the GAA. (In his 2010 UK General Election material Allister boasted of accessing money for 'the Orange sector').

This is all nostalgic nonsense, pining for the days when 'Stormont' was 'Stormont' and the Taigs stayed in their ghastly hovels (© Terence O'Neill).

One candidate was so exasperated that she left for a real political party. UKIP (the UK Independence Party) now has a Councillor in Northern Ireland.

Other comedy candidates included the BNP (British National Party). Its flyer had the face of a female Aryan we've dissolved into the Union Jack. It solicits our vote "Because we'll **stop immigration**" (the term 'bog-wog' has never crossed any English fascists' lips—honest) and it insists "**No mosques!**". However, the building of mosques in the Wee Black North is not a pressing problem. (A pity really, most custom-built mosques in GB are genuinely elegant and enhance their surroundings.) The BNP wants to take the UK out of 'Europe'. This is a nostalgic "*fog in the Channel; Europe cut off*" trope. Not many voted for the BNP, probably on the grounds that we have enough eejits of our own.

Raymond McCord (whose son was murdered by the UVF) stood as a genuine Independent on a ticket not dissimilar to the Left groups and the Greens. He campaigns against drug-pushing (a Loyalist paramilitary monopoly), and for more help to prevent youth suicide. He did not get elected.

The Ulster, and the Democratic, Unionists had bit of a 'sham fight'. The UUP pretended that it could do something different from the DUP. It knows quite well that, if it got a majority and tried to do to SF what it did to the SDLP, SF would regard such a matter as a relatively minor impediment. It is whispered that Martin McGuinness likes the clubby Stormont atmosphere, and might pine for it. But Sinn Féin is a democratic party and Martin would have to do what he was told.

The UUP Leader, Tom Elliott, added to the nation's gaiety by denouncing Sinn Féiners at the count as "*scum*" for waving the "*flag of a foreign county*", which they hadn't been doing—at that point. The DUP said that sort of language wasn't appropriate any more. (It's been subcontracted-out to TUV.) The DUP's handout (an A4 fold-over) has the big headline, "*Only One Unionist Party Can Win*", but few were under the impression that the UUP would make an impact. The DUP picked a nit (SF's education policies), but pointed out the party was doing the best it can in a situation where Unionists no longer have the whip hand. It worked, they got a very large endorsement from the electorate.

Seán McGouran

Editorial Digest

Respecting traditions. Almost every Monday in the *Irish News*, columnist Roy Garland urges readers to "*respect each others' traditions*" without ever spelling out what these traditions are.

The Republican tradition is the struggle to set up an independent state, 32-County or even 26-County—depending on circumstances. In the 26 Counties this was largely achieved following the Fianna Fail election victory in 1932 and took the form of being able to implement an independent foreign policy. This began with Ireland insisting on League of Nations sanctions against recalcitrant members such as Italy and its attack on Abyssinia. A genuine neutrality in the Spanish Civil War (unlike the fake neutrality of Britain) and its refusal to recognise the Franco rebellion despite a lot of internal pressure. Having secured the Treaty Ports back from Britain in 1938, Ireland was able to make good its neutral position in World War Two. After the War it supported Indian independence—something the Indians are still grateful for.

On entering the UN, it tried, when such seemed possible, to make that institution work, and sent several battalions to the Congo. Then the US assassinated Congolese President Lumumba and almost certainly had UN Secretary, Dag Hammarskjöld, killed. It wasn't quite the end of the UN but certainly the beginning of the end. Later Irish soldiers protected the people of South Lebanon from Israeli Aggression (at a high cost in dead and wounded)—something which helped make this writer very welcome in that part of the world at the time of the (failed) Israeli aggression in 2006.

Incidentally, the Irish have always been to the forefront in supporting Palestinian rights in the region. Later Charles Haughey, as President of the EU, defied Britain, and facilitated German unification—a fact acknowledged by Chancellor Helmut Kohl. That, at least in part, is one tradition.

This Irish tradition is not respected by Garland. Garland is part of a group, the Orange-led Reform Movement, whose sole purpose is to destroy any shred of Irish independence and bring the Southern State back under the control of the British. They make no secret of this. Part of Garland's "moderate" stance on the Orange Order and what's left of the Unionist Party is to stop them disgracing themselves in the eyes of the world, the better to gain influence in the South.

This was very much the theme of a speech by the new head of the Orange Order, Edward Stevenson, to Southern Orangemen in Donegal recently. Stevenson is now part of the Garland party, or conspiracy! Garland doesn't respect the

Republican tradition. He hates it. He is determined to destroy it.

The Orange tradition is another matter. The Orange Order was formed in the 1790s as a militia serving the aristocratic Irish Parliament in Dublin. Its purpose was to terrorise reformist opposition to that Parliament. Effectively Presbyterian opposition—Catholics, at least in the North, hardly appeared on the radar at that point. A good day's work was considered to be rounding up some Dissenting clergymen and hanging them.

Initially the Orangemen opposed the Act of Union as they regarded the English, and Pitt in particular, to be altogether too liberal for their taste. Then they decided to be pro-Unionist as the best way of keeping down the rising power of the "*papists*". They have since seen it as their main aim in life to make the "*croppies lie down*". That's the Orange tradition. Respect that?!

The Twelfth. This year a few more recent 'traditions' came back into play—most notably the tradition of throwing things at the police in Ardoyne and Broadway in Belfast.

Police behaviour was remarkable. The Orange parade past Ardoyne in the morning passed, as it usually does, without incident. Trouble normally occurs with the return parade, a totally provocative affair, in the evening. But this year there was no trouble and the Orangemen went on their merry way. That is the point at which the police should have climbed into the landrovers and gone home. They didn't. They hung around and hassled people and rioting broke out. Even then it was all over by 2 am.

Each year there is a confrontation on Broadway, probably organised by Republican Sinn Féin. It is almost like two sides turning up for a football match. What would happen, as is perfectly possible, if the potential rioters turned off the Falls Road and there were no policemen on Broadway? Oh dear! A few pints and an early night. But, of course, the police were there right enough.

The Loyalist activities were what caught the eye most this year. The UVF and the UDA organised as series of attacks on Catholics. (Imagine the holy fuss there would be if there was even a hint that the IRA was organising trouble—as opposed to trying to dampen it down!) Hundreds of Loyalists attacked the Short Strand in East Belfast for no reason anyone has been able to explain. There was certainly no provocation from this vulnerable Catholic enclave. It may be said that the people of the Short Strand put up a strong defence.

Loyalist groups also organised attacks on police in Ballyclare, Carrickfergus, Rathcoole, Coleraine, Derry, Portadown, and many other places. Ballyclare, a predominantly Protestant town, was the most peculiar. Loyalists, as is their wont, put up some flags, two quite near a Catholic

church—though the priest didn't seem bothered. The police took them all down. The Loyalists put up more. And so it went on until the rioting started. Then the police apologised for pulling down the flags in the first place much to the annoyance of the editorial writer on the *Irish News*, and of Justice Minister, Alliance leader David Ford, who thought pulling down flags was a great idea). What were the police thinking about?

A loyalist mob attacked members of the largely Catholic Crumlin Star soccer club as they returned from a day out at the races in Dundalk—a day out to avoid the Ardoyne troubles. They were not wearing any football regalia to identify themselves—but were identified anyway. The mob were armed with knives, bottles and golf clubs. Several supporters received serious wounds. One had three broken bones and another was stabbed. And people wonder why there is trouble in Ardoyne each year!

Missing flag. A couple of days before the twelfth a man hid himself overnight in Belfast City Hall, stole the Butcher's Apron that normally flies over the building and broke the flag pole so that it couldn't be replaced. (Another flag was later erected on a side pole.) UUP Alderman, Jim Rodgers, declared himself "*disgusted*". "*It's deplorable and sickening*", he said. No, it's not. Jim. It's very funny, and you need to take some sense of humour medicine! Now the Unionists are going mad because there is a rumour that the Alliance Party may support a Sinn Fein/SDLP motion to either add the Tricolour to the mix or have no national flag there at all.

The Orange Order is still refusing to have talks about anything with anyone—especially the Parades Commission or Sinn Fein. Martin McGuinness has said that if they won't talk to him as Sinn Fein, will they talk to him as Deputy First Minister alongside the First Minister, Peter Robinson? No Way. And anyway Peter Robinson has never been an Orangeman. Still, the Orangemen managed to get the Drumcree march over with this year without any trouble.

Loyalist Feud? More rioting took place in Portadown on 17th July. Again this involved exclusively Loyalists. A pattern is now beginning to emerge and it seems to involve a turf war between the UVF and the UDA. So far they have not directly attacked each other. But each side is determined to show its supporters and other Loyalists that it is 'the main man'. In the Sunday papers that paragon of peace, Johnny Adair, launched a fierce attack on the UVF and in particular its public execution of Red Hand Commando, Bobby Moffat, on the Shankill Road last May—an event which caused the resignation of the UVF's political leader, Dawn Purvis—its only MLA at the time..

Royal Black Preceptory. A matter which puzzled this writer for many years was the difference between the Orange Order and

the Royal Black Institution. Enlightenment there came none. Until, that is, I made the acquaintance of a former RUC man—now something of an amateur historian. Two features of the Black, he pointed out, were that they did not drink alcohol and, more importantly, they were all Freemasons. He was aware of the intimate connection between the Freemasons and the United Irishmen.

In the course of discussion we decided that the Black was set up in opposition to the terrorists of the Orange Order. On their own website the Black say they were formed in 1797, two years after the Orange Order. They then claim that they have "*scant*" records until the 1850s, which is very convenient—though it does seem that they were Dissenting Protestants, the same as the United Irish. The 1850s also saw the Great Revival in the North when the Protestant lines began to merge by way of splintering rather than actual merger.

Niall O'Donoghail, Sinn Féin's Short Strand Councillor, has been elected Belfast's youngest ever Lord Mayor at the age of 25, after the Unionist stitch-up on voting was overturned—see last month's Digest. His Deputy is the DUP's Ruth Patterson. She refused to even look at him at the time and has failed to have anything to do with him ever since. Some 'traditions' just go on and on.

Moyle District Council has decided to twin itself with Gaza. Moyle is centred on the town of Ballycastle in North-East Antrim and includes Bushmills, Glenariffe, Cushendun, Cushendall, Ballintoy, Armoy and Waterfoot. The make up of the Council is: Independent 4; Sinn Fein 3; UUP 3; SDLP 2; DUP 2; TUV 1.

The Coward Kenny. Taoiseach, Enda Kenny, refused to attend the Connacht Senior Football Final between Mayo and Roscommon on 17th July. It is not something that Kenny, a former Mayo player, ever misses if he can at all help it. Kenny skipped this one as there was to be a protest not only over the closure of facilities at Roscommon hospital, but also over Kenny's blatant lying about the matter. Even Eamon Gilmore, standing in for Kenny in Leinster House made a crack about the Connacht final.

During the general election campaign, Kenny stated that the hospital was safe if Fine Gael got into power. He went further and urged people to organise themselves to defend the hospital. Later he claimed that he had done none of this. But tapes of his words were produced and he has waffled about the matter ever since. For those interested, Mayo beat Roscommon by 13 points to 11.

The McGill Annual Summer School was opened in Glenties, Co. Donegal, on 24th July, by the Viceroy—sorry, **British Ambassador, Julian King**. In his remarks he made fuss about the recent visit to Ireland by the Queen of England, and how good that was for Anglo-Irish relations. Presumably that depends on whether you

are Anglo or Irish. Since becoming Ambassador in September 2009 King has hardly stopped attending and speaking at events around the country. He even turned up at counts in the recent General Election. He seems even more determined to involve himself in the internal politics than his predecessor, *David Reddaway*. Reddaway publicly associated himself with the Orange Reform Movement which wants Ireland at least back in the Commonwealth. Before coming to Ireland his specialities were "defence" and security—particularly regarding the EU and its various Member States.

The keynote address, the John Hume Lecture, was given by **Enda Kenny**. He addressed the Viceroy, Richard Bruton, the head of AIB, economist Colm McCarthy, James Reilly, Brigid Laffan, and other undesirables; as well as a few decent people from the unions, Sinn Fein and others. His main theme was that he himself was a rather wonderful person with fearsome negotiating skills. There is no evidence that anything the Kenny did or said anything that eased Ireland's debt. The situation in Greece and the possible, or probable, problems for other countries, were what made the Euro countries act in a united fashion. As well as that the US, and probably Britain, are putting pressure on the Euro.

Kenny also played up his intemperate outburst against the **Vatican**. No mention either of the Irish State's responsibilities or those of its predecessor governor of Ireland—Britain. Kenny is the longest serving member of Leinster House. There were plenty of chances to have a go at the Catholic Church down the years. But that would not have been opportune!

This is an odd use of a Summer School named after McGill. **Patrick McGill**, a native of Glenties, who worked as a labourer building railways in Glasgow—a common destination for emigrants from Donegal. He wrote about the experiences of Irish labourers in Scotland. Especially his collection of poems *Gleanings From A Nabby's Scrapbook*, and the novels *Children Of The Dead End*, and *The Rat Pit*. One wonders what this Socialist would have made of many of those participating in the Summer School, now in its 30th year. Hopefully we can give a more detailed account of the Summer School in the next issue of the *Irish Political Review*.

The Southern Government is playing games with its Enterprise Minister, Richard Bruton's, plans to pay for the debts run up in banking and building by hitting the lowest paid. One minute his leader, Enda Kenny, supports him, the next he says it's all just a proposal by Bruton (who tried to have Kenny dismissed as Fine Gael leader last year). In the end Bruton will probably get his way (he is supported by the real financial rulers, in Europe). Opposition from the Labour Party coalition partner is probably all froth.

Conor Lynch

The Truce of 1921

Friday the 8th of July was the 90th anniversary of the Truce of 1921 which preceded the final round of talks that led to the signing of the Anglo-Irish Treaty later that year. While most people know that the Truce came into effect on Monday 11th July at noon, it had actually been agreed several days before. The time lag was to ensure that the various combatants all over the country received the news in time before hostilities actually ceased.

It was a major milestone in our history, particularly the War of Independence. With so much interest in this period still evident, one may wonder why the only event held to mark this anniversary was a talk given by Pádraig Óg Ó Ruairc, author of *Blood On The Banner* and other titles, on behalf of the Irish Volunteers Commemorative Organisation.

Pádraig opened the talk by noting that a number of commentators in recent years have claimed that the IRA, aware of the impending Truce, did everything it could to 'increase the body count' as it were, in the final days of the Tan War, quoting Kevin Myers, Peter Hart and Gerrard Murphy among others by way of example. Such seems to imply an IRA as more of a bloodthirsty gang than a politically or ideologically driven Army of the new Irish state created out of the result of the 1918 General Election and subsequent 1st Dail. Pádraig argued that the facts do not bear this view out.

To begin with, Truce negotiations in some form or another had been conducted since as far back as September 1920. The sum effect of these early Truce talks only served to convince the British Military Command that the 'Shinners' and IRA must be on their last legs, in short as a sign of weakness or desperation. The British believed they would have the rebellion crushed in a matter of months or less. However, events were to prove they had made the mistake of underestimating their enemy.

Firstly, in a single day Michael Collins' squad assassinated the *crème-de-la-crème* of the British spies in what was to be known as Bloody Sunday, while at Kilmichael Tom Barry's Flying Column demonstrated to the British that the IRA had real military capability (prior to that the Tan War had been viewed as a series of assassinations). Furthermore, the Auxiliaries killed at Kilmichael were officer

class whose deaths would have created more waves back in the UK than mere rank and file soldiers. To add to these events, the Liverpool IRA carried out large-scale arson on factories, warehouses and docks bringing the war to the UK mainland and convincing an alarmed British opinion that the war might spread to the UK and they could no longer afford to ignore it.

Further talks occurred in December which again came to nothing as Lloyd George kept shifting position and in essence wanted to wind the war down quietly with no official notice, which was unacceptable to the Irish delegation. For much the same reason, talks in January 1921 also failed. The British had made a number of demands—such as that the IRA hand over their weapons, there be no amnesty for major leaders like Dan Breen, Tom Barry and Michael Collins, Ireland would not be allowed to have an Army or Navy and, while Ireland would have financial independence, it was expected to use it to contribute to Britain's debts from World War One. Obviously the Irish delegation found these conditions unacceptable.

So various Truce talks had been underway for almost a year before the July Truce was eventually agreed on. The situation for the IRA across the country was very varied in the period leading up to the Truce. A number of hoped-for imports of IRA arms failed, for example, the 400-plus Thompson submachine guns that were impounded in New York and the break up of the Glasgow Branch of the IRA, which had been smuggling weapons to Ireland, by the British authorities. The Dublin IRA had suffered a serious setback in May 1921 when it lost over 80 men and a large number of arms on an ill-advised attack on the Customs House. For the remainder of the period up to the Truce, it struggled to mount ambushes or carry out its other activities and numerous operations were cancelled. In Cork and Mayo the IRA were relatively strong and well-armed by comparison. Equally for the British, the Irish war was a minor one compared to the other wars in which it was simultaneously involved around the globe—fighting for White Russia against the Bolsheviks, fighting the Turks in Asia Minor and so on. Its military was already stretched and a decisive military victory in Ireland, which was already costing some £20 million a

year could only be achieved by doubling the number of troops to around 180,000 in the opinion of British military strategists. Apart from the strain this would put on Britain's resources, British public opinion was very much against this kind of intervention here. The previously hawkish British military were beginning to realize they would need to conduct some form of negotiation with 'the Shinners'.

It was in this maelstrom of political and military activity that the Truce was finally set for 11th July 1921. With the country in such a state of turmoil, it was not surprising that news of the Truce, actually agreed on Friday 8th July, did not reach some combatant parties for hours or even days. Pádraig gave examples of units of Black & Tans in Galway not learning of the Truce until that Sunday, while Tom Barry found out about it by reading the newspaper on Saturday 9th. The enactment of the Truce was set for the 11th July precisely because it was feared that news would not reach all parties in time, perhaps resulting in numerous unwitting breaches of its terms. Adding confusion were two conflicting orders—one issued by Richard Mulcahy requesting the IRA to wind down operations as the Truce approached while another issued by the 1st Eastern Division asked the IRA to step up its attacks. It may be this latter order that has given some historians and commentators the view that the IRA attempted to 'increase the body count' in the final days before the Truce came into effect.

Firstly this order would have to be taken in context with that by Mulcahy ordering a winding down of operations. Secondly, Pádraig demonstrated that the facts on the ground do not bear out the 'bloodthirsty IRA' view. He began by noting the number of RIC men killed by the IRA over the Truce weekend (5) was actually less than that killed the previous weekend (7) and suggested thus that in the normal course of events these RIC men would have been ambushed and killed anyway—in other words, their deaths did not buck the overall pattern for the time and the impending Truce did not contribute to them.

Pádraig noted that many IRA operations over the course of the weekend were either aborted or cancelled. The Dublin IRA had planned several attacks and ambushes despite their depleted condition, the one at Crumlin was to involve both mines and some of the few Thompson submachine guns that had found their way to Ireland. These were cancelled by order of Eamon deValera, perhaps mindful of the fact the Truce was imminent. The Barna Ambush,

had it gone ahead, would have been one of the largest operations of the war, where Cork and Limerick IRA brigades joined forces to ambush a large British patrol. It was to have involved the use of some 18 mines (Crossbarry had only used three) and 120 men. In the event a small patrol just prior to the Truce was allowed to pass unhindered. When the large patrol did arrive, the IRA did not attack it as the Truce had just come into effect. IRA attacks on RIC Barracks across the country mostly consisted of sniping (rather than bombing or burning, which would have been required to force the occupants to evacuate), or attacks on empty barracks. This seems to indicate an IRA 'letting off steam' rather than any serious attempt to kill as many people as possible, as the attacks would have been carried out differently had that been the case.

British forces were not inactive over the weekend and killed a number of people; for example in Cork, Denis Spriggs shot by the Staffordshire Regiment at Kilgobnet and John Foley shot in Coachford. The Buffs Regiment booby-trapped a trenched road and when IRA commander Frank Fahey had his men retrench it, the mine exploded, killing several of them. But the bulk of the deaths over the Truce weekend occurred as a result of loyalist rioting in Belfast, which started after the IRA there shot RIC constable Conlon. A total of 19 people were killed in the riots, a number of the deaths sectarian.

So—apart from the Belfast rioting—the death toll for the Truce weekend was not out of place with what had been occurring up to the time. Had there been a real attempt by the IRA to 'up the ante' before the Truce came into effect, we would expect to see many more deaths than actually occurred.

The other main issue commentators such as Myers, Murphy & Hart rely on to paint a picture of an increased ferocity in the IRA over the Truce weekend is the shooting of spies and informers. It has also been suggested these spies were all, or nearly all Protestant, suggesting the IRA was sectarian. Pádraig noted that Maria Viliarius refers to "*11 spies*" shot over the Truce weekend, whereas in fact the Collins' Papers, from which this figure comes, show that this was the number of spies shot for *the two weeks of July* up to the Truce, with five of these eleven shot over the weekend of the Truce. While it does seem a larger number, once again Pádraig examined the evidence and accounts as given by Murphy and Hart and found not all was as they present it. He looked at five cases—

David Cummins (Protestant), Eric Steadman (no known religion), Maj. G.B. O'Connor (Protestant and ex-British soldier), John Poynton (Catholic) and John Begley (Catholic). Some were found shot with the label "*Spies and Informers—Beware*" attached to their bodies, a practice I was surprised to learn, that had not originated with the IRA but with the British Army as far back at least as World War One.

Looking into the details of their cases, we learned that Steadman had already been captured and tried as a spy but escaped and returned to the area from where he was captured. Likewise, John Poynton had been warned to leave the area by the IRA, as he was known to socialize with the RIC (which was understood to imply passing tidbits of information to them) and had been seen regularly leaving his house under curfew to join RIC patrols (which both suggested he had special protection in order to flout the curfew and was perhaps acting as a 'spotter' for the RIC). He threw caution to the wind, ignored the exile order and was shot in consequence. John Begley, a Catholic, was a known associate of William Shiels (also Catholic) and was presumed to be supporting him in his activities. Shiels had infiltrated the Mallow and Kanturk IRA with disastrous consequences for both. Begley was tracked up Patrick St by Sean O'Connell and members of Cork's G-Coy IRA before being abducted shortly before the Truce came into effect. He was shot the day after, breaching its terms. Pádraig noted that Hart suggested that the final example, Maj. G.B. O'Connor was shot simply because he fitted the description of 'an Outsider'—a criteria Hart ascribes to IRA motives for shooting people. In Hart's order of things, being 'an Outsider' means something like simply being different to what the IRA regarded as 'normal', though Hart does not define what the IRA regarded as 'normal', simply we come to it by a process of elimination—it was not whatever the IRA's victims were! Pádraig noted that Hart fails to give any evidence for this 'Outsider' status other than his opinion, and the fact that O'Connor was a Justice of the Peace. Hart also fails to explain why, out of 26 JPs in Cork, only two were shot while several others were captured and released. In his memoirs, IRA member Connie Neenan suggested the operation to kill Maj. G.B. O'Connor was planned well in advance and therefore was not mere opportunism based on an impending Truce.

Overall, as many spies were released unharmed as killed over the weekend of

the Truce—hardly the actions of an IRA bent on killing as many people as possible.

Following the talk Pádraig took some questions from members of the audience. One concerned the burning of 'the Big Houses', with one speaker suggesting that, in at least three cases he knew of (though no specifics were forthcoming), the occupants had no known connection with the British regime: "*they weren't involved in anything*", as he put it. Pádraig obviously could not answer this question fully without at least knowing which houses were in question, but suggested that, as well as burning the houses of collaborators, some houses may have been burned because the IRA felt they were about to be turned into RIC / Black & Tan outposts which would then be used to command the surrounding area. I know from reading Tom Barry's *Guerilla Days* that this was precisely Barry's stated motivation for going back to burn Burgatia House. Originally the owner had been accused by the IRA of being an informer but, after an aborted attack by the British on the IRA forces within the house, Barry returned later that night to burn the house otherwise it would have been fortified against them, having been attacked once.

Another speaker who gave neither his own name nor that of his grandfather, had it "*on authority*" from the same anonymous grandfather that Frank Busted did not shoot Mrs. Lindsey and that someone else had, though he declined to say who. Pádraig, not knowing the identity of any of the participants in this anecdote, was of course in no position to comment on the veracity or otherwise of these claims, though I have no doubt they came as a surprise to the descendant of Frank Busted who *was* in the audience, a few seats away from the speaker in question!

One interesting point was raised from this discussion however, which was why the Dripsey IRA had not shot Fr. Shinnick, who was probably as culpable as Mrs. Lindsey in betraying the ambush to the British authorities. Pádraig replied that, as far as he was aware, the IRA had a general policy of trying not to shoot clergy of both denominations (RC or COI) or women, though Mrs. Lindsey was an obvious exception. The two clergymen, who may have fallen foul of them were Rev. Lord (Bandon) and Dean Findley. Rev. Lord was not killed and Rev. Findley was struck with a blunt object—his death may have been accidental. Both were Protestant. My own opinion here is that many of the IRA were also devout Catholics—again,

To page 15, column 1

Shorts

from
the Long Fellow

LABOUR COURT AND JLCs

The decision of the High Court to declare the Employment Regulation Orders issued by the Labour Court and Joint Labour Committees (JLC) unconstitutional has grave implications for the future of industrial relations in this country. This legal decision should be seen in the political context of Minister Bruton trying to 'reform' the JLC structure.

At the last General Election Fianna Fáil was prepared to throw the IMF a concession in the name of Labour market flexibility. It reduced the minimum wage which affected about 50,000 employees many of them transient or part timers such as students. Fine Gael, on the other hand, was prepared to defend the minimum wage. It now appears that this was a piece of cynical opportunism. Fine Gael's defence of the minimum wage was a cover to tamper with the substance of the country's industrial relations structure, the Joint Labour Committees, which affect 240,000 employees.

The minimum wage legislation was introduced by Mary Harney about 10 years ago. The rate is ultimately in the gift of the Minister. What can be given can be taken away. There is no social structure underpinning the rate. The Labour Court and JLC system, on the other hand, is a structure that has been developed over more than half a century. At the time it was introduced

the Communist Party activist John Swift described it as a revolutionary social change. Wages for the low paid had been taken out of the realm of the market.

The basis for the High Court decision appears to be that legislation has not adequately defined the powers of the Labour Court and JLCs. This defect can be remedied by legislation. But early indications suggest that the Labour Party is not prepared to defend this social structure. Pat Rabbitte has said that the Labour Party will not support any reforms that reduce the wages of low-paid workers. But the structure itself is the only means by which the long-term interests of the low-paid can be protected. The dismantlement of this structure would be the final nail in the coffin of Social Partnership.

It will be interesting to see if Fianna Fáil defends our industrial relations infrastructure. The JLCs are the proud legacy of a de Valera Government of the 1940s and implemented by Sean Lemass as Minister for Industry and Commerce. If Fianna Fáil cannot vigorously defend this heritage, it might as well follow the advice of *Irish Independent* columnist David Quinn and become Ireland's Tory Party.

ENDA KENNY

There is no doubt that the recent agreement to reduce interest rates by about 2 percentage points and extend the terms of the loan on the 22.5 billion EFSF component of the IMF/EU bailout is welcome. However, it is difficult to know where Kenny obtains the figure of an 800 million per annum Euro saving. It appears that he is assuming that the deal will also apply to the 22.5 billion EFSM component (which includes the UK loan). Needless to see the anti Fianna Fail bias of the media prevented it from being critical of Kenny's claims.

The deal has been at the price of Ireland committing to "*constructively engage*" with tax harmonisation.

The Long Fellow is beginning to wonder at the negotiating skills of Enda Kenny. He seems to be more interested in appearing to be tough than advancing the interests of the country. At the last General Election campaign he had a very public meeting with Angela Merkel in order to establish his credentials as a statesman. At the meeting he raised the issue of the 12.5% Corporation Tax in order to confirm the incoming Government's opposition to change. Well done Enda!

But the problem with raising the issue is that the people you are raising it with have to respond. The Germans, who have seen financial sector jobs transferred to the Irish Financial Services Centre in Dublin, are hardly going to express their wholehearted support for Kenny's intransigent line. Germany and France were forced for domestic reasons to take a position on this issue since the matter was raised.

As the debt crisis deepened it became clear that the policy of punitive interest rates for Ireland and Greece was counter-productive. At a European Council meeting last March the EU conceded a reduction in the interest rate for Greece of 1 per cent, but how could German and France concede a reduction in the interest rate for Ireland without losing face? A form of words had to be devised to get German and France off the hook which Enda had placed them on. Accordingly, Ireland was asked to "*constructively engage with tax harmonisation*" in the EU (see Daniel McConnell article in the *Sunday Independent*, 10.7.11). In short, the Irish Government was being asked to make an intangible concession ("*constructively engage*") in order to obtain a tangible benefit (a reduction in the interest rate). Unbelievably, Enda still thought he was fighting the General Election and refused the offer.

So, while it is now welcome that we have obtained a 2 percentage point reduction at the price of "*constructively engaging*" with tax harmonisation, the question arises as to why we didn't obtain a 1 percentage point reduction for the previous 5 months.

PROTECTING THE BOND HOLDERS

The European Central Bank as an institution probably deserves to be criticised. It is unique in the world in not being accountable to a Government. However, its policy of protecting senior bond holders is not necessarily flawed. In order for the economic system to function individuals and institutions must believe that their money is safe in the bank. Senior Bond holders have the same legal status as deposit holders and therefore deposit holders cannot be insulated from a bond holder default.

In the United States bond holders and deposit holders (with amounts over the insured level) are not protected against the collapse of a bank. However, the United States does not have a savings culture. It is in a position to borrow from the rest of the world (whether this is sustainable in the long run is a separate issue). The EU on the other hand has not the international financial clout of the US. Therefore capital must be raised by domestic savings. Burning senior bondholders runs the risk of undermining the capacity of European banks to raise finance. This is not in the interests of the European economy.

THE WAR ON DRUGS

The recently released United Nations 2010 report on drugs has been used by some commentators (e.g. James Downey, *Irish Independent*, 13.6.11) to support the policy of legalisation of drugs. The argument appears to be that, since the war on drugs has failed, Governments should raise the white flag and accept that there is nothing that can prevent recreational drug abuse.

Truce Report

concluded

we find Tom Barry referring to this in relation to the crisis Bishop Coughlan's Excommunication Edict of 1920 threw his own Flying Column. For such men, killing a clergyman would have probably been an insurmountable taboo, tantamount to an attack on Christ Himself. Others, such as Frank Busted, were of no strong religious persuasion, or avowed atheists. However, shooting clergy—especially Catholic clergy may also have been avoided due to the very adverse publicity it would create. Support for the IRA might have fallen dramatically had they shot a number of priests in 1920s Ireland. The shooting of Canon Magner by the Black and Tans in Cork did nothing to improve their already low-standing in the community.

Nick Folley
July 2011

However, the UN report does not support the thesis of rampant and escalating drug abuse. The picture is unclear. Consumption of heroin has declined in Europe, although cocaine consumption has increased. In the United States there has been a decline in the consumption of cocaine. Indeed the escalating violence among Mexican drug gangs has been attributed to an intensification of competition as a result of a contraction of the US cocaine market. In the last decade there has been a dramatic increase in 'legal highs' or amphetamine and cannabis substitutes. However, since 2006 the problem seems to have stabilised reflecting the legal response to this new phenomenon. There has also been an increase in "poly" or multiple drug use.

The percentage of the world's population of between 15 to 64 years that have taken an illegal drug in the last year is less than 5% (cynics might conclude that the remaining 95% don't remember!). The percentage of "problem" drug users (regular or injecting) is about a half of 1%. These figures have remained remarkably stable over the last decade. While it is true that a tiny minority can cause havoc for the rest of the population, it must also be recognised that drug abuse is still confined to that tiny minority.

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS

The abuse of opioids (opiates and opiate substitutes such as methadone) is relatively high in the United States. In the 15 to 64 age group 5.9% of this population have taken such substances in the last year for recreational use. The incidence of opiate consumption (mainly heroin) is low (about 0.57%). The problem in the United States seems to be concentrated among prescription opioids. The figure for Ireland (i.e. the Republic) for opioid abuse is 0.72%. This is less than the UK. The UK figures are broken down into three regions: England and Wales (0.82%); Scotland (1.59%); and Northern Ireland (0.12%). Overall the UK figures are the highest in Western Europe (in contrast to the German figure of 0.22%). For Eastern Europe the figures for Russia, Ukraine and Estonia were 1.64, 1.16 and 1.52).

The United States also has quite high cocaine abuse by international standards (2.4% of 15 to 64 age group have tried it at least once in the last year). However, some of the Latin countries, which have a low consumption rate of heroin have high consumption rates for cocaine. The figures for Spain and Italy are 2.6% and 2.2%. For Ireland the figure is 1.7% which trails behind Northern Ireland (1.9%), England and Wales (2.5%) and Scotland (3.9%). The statistics indicate that Scotland has the highest rate of consumption of illegal drugs in the UK for all the main categories of illegal drugs.

While Ireland is behind the UK the

trend in Irish consumption, particularly cocaine, is upwards, while the UK shows a stable pattern.

The figures for Cannabis are: US (13.7%), Ireland (6.3%), Northern Ireland (7.2%), England & Wales (6.6%), Scotland (8.4%), Italy (14.6%), Spain (10.6%). Some countries, which hardly feature in other categories, have high consumption rates of cannabis such as France (8.6%) and the Czech Republic (15.2%).

For the United States the figure for Amphetamines is 1.5% compared to Ireland 0.4% Northern Ireland 0.8%, England & Wales 1.0% and Scotland 1.4%.

For Ecstasy the figures are 1.4% for the United States, Ireland 1.2%, Northern Ireland 1.5%, England and Wales 1.5% and Scotland 2.5%.

It is difficult to draw firm policy con-

clusions from the survey. The Anglo Saxon countries have a relatively high rate of drug consumption. Countries such as the Netherlands, which have a liberal approach to drugs such as cannabis (but not other drugs), have a low rate of consumption. On the other hand France and Germany, which are not noted for their tolerant approach to drugs, also have a low consumption rate. It is probably the case that historical and cultural factors are more important determinants of drug use than the various approaches to law enforcement.

However, no country has legalised the sale of heroin or cocaine. Drug abuse has been confined to a small minority. Perhaps this should not be taken for granted. It should not be assumed that legalising these substances will not make the problem worse.

Murdoch And Gallipoli

I was watching the British Parliament interrogation of Rupert Murdoch and Son when, under pressure, he made an unexpected reference to Gallipoli. Of course, this is not of much interest to the media hordes who let it pass without comment, but it may be of interest to our readers. Rupert Murdoch said that one of the things that inspired him as a young man was his father's determination to purchase a small newspaper in Australia in order to expose the disastrous conduct of the British at Gallipoli.

Murdoch's father, Keith Murdoch, was a young Australian newspaperman who was political correspondent for the *Sydney Sun*. His story is narrated in a book called *The First Casualty* (1975) by Phillip Knightley:

"What happened was this: Murdoch, at the age of twenty-nine, was sent in August 1915 to London, to act as representative there for a group of Australian newspapers. It was arranged that he should stop in Cairo, en route to London, and report on the postal arrangements for the Australian troops. While in Cairo, Murdoch, who was anxious to visit the battlefield, wrote for permission to do so to General Sir Ian Hamilton, who was in command of the mixed force that had landed at Gallipoli in April to attack Constantinople and knock Turkey out of the war. Hamilton was reluctant to allow Murdoch to go. Everything had gone wrong at the front, and the British and the Anzacs (Australian and New Zealand Army Corps) were hemmed into a few terrible areas of beach and hillside that were permanently under shell-fire. So Hamilton took the course of getting Murdoch to sign the war correspondent's declaration undertaking 'not to attempt to

correspond by any other route or by any other means than that officially sanctioned' and promising that for the duration of the war he would not 'impart to anyone military information of a confidential nature.... unless first submitted to the Chief Field Censor.'

"Murdoch arrived on September 2, made a brief visit to the Anzac bridgehead, declined Hamilton's offer to provide him with transport to go anywhere and see anything, and then returned to GHQ, on the island of Imbros, and sought accommodation at the press camp. The camp, in an olive grove just outside Hamilton's headquarters, housed an interesting collection of war correspondents, including G. Ward Price of the *Daily Mail*, Charles Bean, the official Australian war correspondent, and Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett of the *Daily Telegraph*, the most interesting and dominating personality of them all. Ashmead-Bartlett had covered the Russo-Japanese War and was an experienced and highly competent correspondent. He appeared to have an unlimited expense account and used a large portion of it to purchase liquor from the navy. One of the sights of Imbros was the regular line of Greek porters staggering up the hill to the press camp loaded with supplies for Ashmead-Bartlett. He hated the restraints GHQ imposed upon him, especially that imposed by the censor, Captain William Maxwell, and had been fighting a losing battle, since the first landings, to try to tell the British public what was happening. Maxwell, on instructions from Hamilton, would allow no criticism of the conduct of the operation, no indication of set-backs or delays, and no mention of casualty figures; finally, he refused to give permission for any of Ashmead-Bartlett's messages to be transmitted until Hamilton's own official cables had reached London. This meant

that, at a time when there was more interest in the fighting in France, Ashmead-Bartlett's Gallipoli dispatches, days late and heavily censored, often failed to appear in print."

"Over the months, Ashmead-Bartlett had grown sour, hostile, and pessimistic... He was in the middle of one of his more despondent moods when Keith Murdoch arrived and fell quickly under his influence. Ashmead-Bartlett poured out to Murdoch's sympathetic ear all the frustration he had accumulated over his difficulties in filing stories, spun a gloomy description of the way the campaign was being conducted, and convinced Murdoch that a major disaster would occur during the winter unless the British government and the British people could be told the truth. Murdoch must have realised that almost by accident he was in possession of information that would certainly rank as one of the great stories of the war. He agreed with Ashmead-Bartlett that the only way to get the story out would be to break the rules and get an uncensored dispatch back to Britain. Ashmead-Bartlett wrote [a letter to British Prime Minister Asquith], and Murdoch set out to take it to London."

"He got as far as Marseilles, but there was detained by a British officer with an escort and warned that he would be kept in custody until he handed over the letter. He had been betrayed to Hamilton by H. W. Nevinson, the correspondent for the *Guardian*... He had alerted the War Office, which arranged for Murdoch's arrest, and had then withdrawn Ashmead-Bartlett's accreditation and ordered him back to London. Murdoch went on to London and on September 23, 1915, sat down in a room in the office of the Australian High Commissioner and dictated everything he could remember of Ashmead-Bartlett's dispatch and what Ashmead-Bartlett had told him during their all-night conversation. His account was in the form of a letter addressed to the Australian Prime Minister, Andrew Fisher, but the presentation had strong journalistic overtones, with the data marshaled in a brisk and attractive way. It was an amazing document, a mixture of error, fact, exaggeration, prejudice, and the most sentimental patriotism, which made highly damaging charges against the British general staff and Hamilton, many of them untrue. But the basis of the charges—that the Gallipoli expedition was in danger of disaster—was correct, and Murdoch's action, questionable though it may have been, had resounding consequences."

"These were obviously Ashmead-Bartlett's sentiments Murdoch was expressing, since Murdoch's visit had been too brief for him to reach so dogmatic a conclusion. Murdoch would no doubt have felt it necessary to check his accusations much more thoroughly had he ever imagined he was writing more than a private letter to his Prime Minister, and so it must have placed him in a rather

awkward position when, three days later, Lloyd George, who opposed the Gallipoli campaign, read the letter and immediately urged that Murdoch send a copy of it to the British Prime Minister, Asquith. Murdoch could hardly have declined, but in a covering note he tried to tone down the virulence of his criticism."

"Asquith used the weapon Murdoch sent him in an inexcusable manner. Without waiting until Kitchener had studied it, without checking its more outrageous allegations, and without even asking Hamilton for his comments, he had it printed as a state paper and circulated to the members of the Dardanelles Committee, which was in charge of the campaign. While the committee was still studying it, Ashmead-Bartlett arrived in London, and he and Murdoch began lobbying against Hamilton, Ashmead-Bartlett substantiating the substance of Murdoch's letter with an article of his own in the Sunday edition of *The Times*. This made it clear that they had Northcliffe's backing, and when the Dardanelles Committee met, on October 14, Hamilton's active career was brought to an end and Kitchener was deputed to break the news to him. The evacuation of Gallipoli began on December 12, 1915. A Royal Commission that began sitting in August 1916 (Murdoch and Ashmead-Bartlett both gave evidence) found that the campaign had been a mistake" (p100-3).

Below are some extracts from the letter to the Prime Minister that Murdoch carried to London, before his detaining:

"September 8th 1915

Dear Mr. Asquith,

I hope you will excuse the liberty I am taking in writing to you but I have the chance of sending this letter through by hand and I consider it absolutely necessary that you should know the true state of affairs out here. Our last great effort to achieve some definite success against the Turks was the most ghastly and costly fiasco in our history since the Battle of Bannockburn... The failure of the 9th Corps was due not so much to the employment of new and untried troops as to bad staff work. The generals had but a vague idea of the nature of the ground in their front and no adequate steps were taken to keep the troops supplied with water... As the result of all this fighting our casualties since August 6th now total nearly fifty thousand killed wounded and missing."

"The army is in fact in a deplorable condition. Its morale as a fighting force has suffered greatly and the officers and men are thoroughly dispirited. The muddles and mismanagement beat anything that has ever occurred in our Military History. The fundamental evil at the present moment is the absolute lack of confidence in all ranks in the Headquarters staff. The confidence of the army will never be restored until a really strong man is placed at its head.... At the present time the army is incapable of a further

offensive. The splendid Colonial Corps has been almost wiped out. Once again the 29th Division has suffered enormous losses and the new formations have lost their bravest and best officers and men. Neither do I think even with enormous reinforcements, that any fresh offensive from our present positions has the smallest chance of success. Our only real justification for throwing away fresh lives and fresh treasure in this unfortunate enterprise is the prospect of the certain cooperation of Bulgaria. With her assistance we should undoubtedly pull through. But as I know nothing of the attitude of Bulgaria or Greece or Italy I am only writing to give you a true picture of the state of the army and the problems with which we are faced in the future if we are left to fight the Turks alone.... In fact the season will soon be too late for a fresh offensive if another is contemplated. We have therefore to prepare against the coming of the winter or to withdraw the army altogether. I am assuming it is considered desirable to avoid the latter contingency at all costs for political reasons owing to the confession of final failure it would entail and the moral effect it might have in India and Egypt... But I suppose we must stay here as long as there is the smallest prospect of the Balkan alliance being revived and throwing in its lot with us even if they do not make a move until next Spring".

"You may think I am too pessimistic but my views are shared by the large majority of the army. The confidence of the troops can only be restored by an immediate change in the supreme command... If possible have the Colonial troops taken off the Peninsula altogether because they are miserably depressed since the last failure and with their active minds, and positions they occupy in civil life, a dreary winter in the trenches will have a deplorable effect on what is left of this once magnificent body of men, the finest any Empire has ever produced. If we are obliged to keep this army locked up in Gallipoli this winter large reserves will be necessary to make good its losses in sickness. The cost of this campaign in the east must be out of all proportion to the results we are likely to obtain now, in time to have a decisive effect on the general theatre of war. Our great asset against the Germans was always considered to be our superior financial strength. In Gallipoli we are dissipating a large portion of our fortune and have not yet gained a single acre of ground of any strategical value. Unless we can pull through with the aid of the Balkan League in the near future this futile expenditure may ruin our prospects of bringing the war to a successful conclusion by gradually wearing down Germany's colossal military power.

"I have taken the liberty of writing very fully because I have no means of knowing how far the real truth of the situation is known in England and how much the Military Authorities disclose. I thought

therefore that perhaps the opinions of an independent observer might be of value to you at the present juncture. I am of course breaking the censorship regulations by sending this letter through but I have not the slightest hesitation in doing so as I feel it is absolutely essential for you to know the truth. I have been requested over and over again by officers of all ranks to go home and personally disclose the truth but it is difficult for me to leave until the beginning of October...

The Rt. Hon. H.H. Asquith
10 Downing Street."

There are two interesting aspects to Gallipoli referred to in this letter carried by Murdoch that are not mentioned by today's advocates of Remembrance. The first relates to the view that a British withdrawal (and defeat) should be avoided "*at all costs for political reasons owing to the confession of final failure it would entail and the moral effect it might have in India and Egypt*".

A good summary of some of England's objectives at Gallipoli is contained in the 1915 book *The Dardanelles: Their Story and Their Significance in the Great War, By The Author of 'The Real Kaiser'* (which contains a review or recommendation from *The Times* and *Times Literary Supplement* on its title page.) In *Chapter I, The Significance of the Dardanelles*, the unattributed author explains the importance of the Dardanelles/Gallipoli operation for the British Empire—which not only included the War against Germany and Turkey but also that of keeping the Moslem and lesser races in general in their place, below the white man:

"It would seem, therefore, that the forcing of the Dardanelles will drive between Germany and what is left of Turkey a wedge of far greater extent than is represented by the mere strip of territory that will fall into the possession of the Allies. The Turks will be cut off from their supplies of weapons, ammunition, and skilled advisers. There will be a rapid end of them as a fighting possibility, and a deadly menace to the whole of our Eastern Empire will be removed. For the plot to rouse the fanaticism of the 300,000,000 Mohammedans of the world into a religious war against Great Britain has still to be considered... the idea itself is an insidious poison, that has been diligently scattered by German emissaries in all the dark and uncivilized places of the earth. It has been sedulously fostered by such lies as Germany alone knows how to disseminate. It would be impossible to exaggerate the danger it still holds for civilization. Savage and half savage tribes in Africa and the East are watching the issue with true homicidal interest. All their latent savagery is stirred by the return of an era of unchecked violence and bloodshed. The Kaiser, who has already figured in their eyes as the protector of Mohammedanism, and has even

been represented to them as a renegade Christian, has led his armies into the lands of the Christian... The prestige of Great Britain, in which they have an inherited belief, the more implicit because it has never before been challenged, is now at stake. It suffices still to hold them in check, though every baser instinct in them is stirred by the daily record of carnage and savagery..."

"In these circumstances an attack is launched at the very heart of Turkey. The Holy War becomes for the Sultan a war of self-preservation. The seat of the Turkish Empire is threatened; it seems about to pass away from his possession into the hands of the all-conquering English. The heathen must still wait for the event, sullen and watchful. And this mighty issue, the prestige of the British flag in all the dark places of the world, is being decided in the Straits of the Dardanelles. While Constantinople stands, the few white men who are holding hundreds of thousands of coloured men in check, not in one place but in many, live in a deadly peril. Had Constantinople never been attacked, they might well have been carried away ere now in a flood of barbaric licence. When Constantinople falls, the floodgates will be securely fastened again, and the British prestige will stand higher than ever, both in Africa and in the dangerous Far East. In view of these considerations, it is easily possible to regard the attempt on the Dardanelles as the main point of the Allies' offensive..."

"The Allies, on their part, display that coherence of plan which has marked their conduct of the war since its very beginning... In confident unison they are enduring all, until the determining factor in the struggle has been revealed. May not that factor be declared when the Christian God is once more worshipped under the dome of St. Sophia?..." (p10-19).

It is perhaps not politic to say today that a primary motivation of the Gallipoli operation was to maintain the white Anglo-Saxon with 'the whip-hand' over the 'lesser breeds'—be they Moslems or 'coloureds'.

The other aspect that is largely and handily forgotten about Gallipoli relates to the 'Balkan Alliance'. The letter carried by Murdoch, extrapolating the mind of the British ruling class concerning an alternative to withdrawal and humiliating defeat, notes: "*I suppose we must stay here as long as there is the smallest prospect of the Balkan alliance being revived and throwing in its lot with us even if they do not make a move until next Spring*".

The same book, *The Dardanelles: Their Story and Their Significance in the Great War*, cited above, also refers to this aspect of the Gallipoli operation in relation to the Balkan Alliance and the British capture of Constantinople/Istanbul:

"The reasons which caused its founder to select the city as the new capital of the

Roman Empire apply with equal force to-day. Apart from its naval importance, as the key to the Straits, Constantinople occupies a position of the highest strategical significance, from the military point of view alone. Its possession would mean to any of the existing nations of South-east Europe a nucleus spot for the creation of an Empire that might well vie in might and influence with the great Empires that have already had their seat there. When Constantinople passes into the hands of the Allies the momentous choice can no longer be deferred by the Balkan States. It will indeed be strange if, when the magnitude of their interests has been considered by them, they cannot set aside the differences that have paralyzed them through the first months of the war. In the great settlement that is before Europe the question of paramount importance to them is the disposal of Constantinople. Only one way exists for any of them to claim a voice in the settlement of that question. Which of them will refuse to take that way when Constantinople shall have fallen into the hands of the Allied Powers?" (p12).

Perhaps the author did not realise that Sir Edward Grey had at that moment promised Istanbul to the Russians. Perhaps he never imagined the Foreign Secretary would overturn British policy of a century that "*the Russians shall not have Constantinople*." Or perhaps he was just a good judge of things and understood that promises were made to be broken, when circumstances change.

Of course, due to unexpected Turkish resistance, Britain got no further than the shores of Gallipoli in 1915 and could not take and hold Constantinople as bait for the prospects of a new Byzantium. It had to wait until 1918 to do that and use the Greeks as its catspaw after subverting their neutrality and organising a *coup* against the Greek King.

A few weeks ago, after reading the column of Eoghan Harris in the *Sunday Independent*, I wrote a letter to point out a gross historical distortion that Harris indulged in to sensationalise his pet argument:

"In his column of last Sunday (*Following IRA's bloody track from the Bandon Valley to south Armagh*) Eoghan Harris makes the statement that 'the exodus of 107,000 Irish Protestants in the period 1911 to 1926' was 'the largest movement of population in Europe before the Second World War.'

"One only has to look a couple of years past 1911 to see that this statement is incorrect. During the Balkan Wars of 1912-13, 410,000 Muslims and thousands of Jews were driven out of the Balkans by the Christian forces of Serbia, Montenegro, Greece and Bulgaria. More than a million Muslims were also killed in this vast ethnic cleansing and genocide. The alliance that accomplished this was partly

facilitated by an Anglo-Irishman, James Bouchier, old Etonian and correspondent of the Times of London.

"If Mr. Harris can be so ignorant of these events, or if he ignored them to simply press home his points, it throws into doubt the other, even less factual elements, of his article."

Needless to say the letter never saw the *Sunday Independent's* Letters' Page—so readers can keep the impression that Southern Irish Protestants were the greatest victims of ethnic cleansing in the early twentieth century!

Roger Casement, in his article *The Problem of the Near West*, written at the time of the Balkan Wars, saw the Balkan Christians as mere pawns in British Imperial power politics:

"The true virtue of the Balkan 'Christians' lies in the possibility of their being moulded into an anti-German factor of great weight in the European conflict, clearly impending, and in their offering a fresh obstacle, it is hoped, to German world policy... Hemmed in by Russia on the East and the new Southern Slav States on the South-east, with a vengeful France being incited on her Western frontier to fresh dreams of conquest, Germany sees England preparing still mightier armaments to hold and close the seaways of the world..." (*The Crime Against Europe*, p104, Athol Books edition).

The Balkan Alliance, facilitated by an Anglo-Irish gentleman, was the greatest ethnic cleanser of the early twentieth century and Britain saw its benefit in erecting a series of buffer States between Germany/Austro-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire. No matter that a large community that had lived in the area for longer than the Protestants in Ireland or the European in North America, was wiped off the map.

The Liberal Government, which shirked the conscription of its own people in its 'war for civilisation', looked to reassemble the Balkan Alliance, as Casement predicted, when it got bogged down at Gallipoli. But its main components, Greece and Bulgaria, refused to play ball. Greece was subsequently persuaded by armed intervention at Salonika, Royal Navy blockade and irredentist promises in Anatolia. But it all ended in tears. Bulgaria, which joined the Germans, was defeated.

To end on an interesting note, a few years ago the film *Gallipoli* (with Mel Gibson) was made in Australia. It is, to say the least, not very favourable to the British. It took three years for the filmmakers to secure funding for the film, and the Australian Government's film agency declined support for it. The film was eventually produced by R&R Films, a production company owned by Rupert Murdoch.

Pat Walsh

Naval Warfare, Part 13, has been held over to the September issue. Ed.

Totalitarianism and Garret the Good

In the *Irish Political Review* in July I said that the liberal West (left liberal in ethics, neo-liberal in economics) practises 'soft totalitarianism'. A reader has asked me: what then is totalitarianism if it can be both hard and soft? Let me interject that, oddly, there is no existing noun corresponding to 'monarchy', 'republic', etc. to describe a totalitarian state. So I have invented and used elsewhere '*a totalitarianium*'—it has a suitably all-enclosing sound!

The adjective 'totalitarian' was first used in the early 1920s by certain Italian writers and by Mussolini when they were describing the proposed Fascist State. In the background, historically, was the largely *laissez-faire* State of classical liberalism. In contrast to that, the Fascist State would embrace society totally and concern itself totally with the citizens' lives; that is to say, with every aspect of their lives.

I remember that in Taine's book on the French *ancien régime* he mentioned that at some point in eighteenth-century France the peasants in parts of France distant from Paris began to say "*the Government*" (meaning in Paris) "*should do something about*" this or that. In other words, rather than looking to their local *seigneur* to attend to things in their neighbourhood, they recognised the general responsibility of the French State to see to their welfare. Leave aside how much precisely they included in that notion of the Government's responsibility, and how much they excluded. Is it not a fact that today in Ireland, as in other European countries, people have by now come to calling on the Government to attend to a multitude of things; and in fact consider it responsible for almost everything?

Perhaps, then, the Italian Fascist idea of the 'total' state was in that respect not too far from what has actually come to be the case, in contemporary Western states generally. But Italian Fascism envisaged also that the Italian State would be guided by a secular doctrinal authority, namely, the Fascist Party. As things turned out, it was guided, at least in its laws, by an agreed partnership of the Fascist Party and the Italian Catholic Church; but that was an aberration not only from the Party's original intention but also from what would come to be the totalitarian norm.

In the Soviet Union in the 1920s there already existed a secular doctrinal authority, the Communist Party, directing the State comprehensively. A similar authority, the Nazi Party, would later exist in Germany, but military defeat after a

twelve-year existence prevented it from developing its all-inclusive, supremacist programme. In our own time in the West an Ameropean collection of states, headed by the US, is guided—tacitly and informally—by the American liberal Correctorate and subordinate liberal Correctorates, including that of the European Union located in Brussels.

So I think we can fairly say that a totalitarianium is 'a state, guided by a secular teaching body, which involves itself authoritatively in all aspects of the citizens' lives'. It is what has been satirically called in Britain "*the nanny State*", except that the guidance of such a State by a secular doctrinal authority has been omitted from that concept.

A 'hard' totalitarianium is one that operates partly through persuasion, partly through coercion, with harsh punishment, including execution, for dissent, and in some cases mass murder on ideological or other grounds. A 'soft' totalitarianium operates mainly through persuasion, a liberal-democratic system, and defamation or effective silencing of dissenters. Further differentiations might of course be made. The authoritative involvement 'in all aspects of the citizens' lives' can vary in degree from 'in all aspects more or less' to minute and detailed involvement in everything, including language spoken in public. In our liberal totalitarianium, technological advance has enabled such involvement to be more minute and detailed than in any of its predecessors.

Stalin's Russia, Mao's China, Communist East Germany and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty Four* combined to establish in the West a notion of totalitarianism that lasted even when it no longer corresponded to any major contemporary reality except China up to the 1970s. After Stalin's death in 1953, and particularly in the 1970s and 80s, the Soviet Union increasingly developed in the direction of a soft totalitarianium. In the years after Gorbachev dissolved it, he became the most hated politician in Russia as people remembered how life was before.

When I spent a month in Minsk in 1993, people told me how good (in their minds) the 1980s had been in that city. President Reagan's arms race had made Minsk a busy centre of armaments production, and increasing numbers of people were buying cars and more of them than ever were going on Trade-Union-sponsored Summer holidays on the Black Sea.

But the notion had got established in the West that a totalitarian system was by definition the opposite of Western liberal democracy. This notion persisted in the last decades of the twentieth century when the development in the West of liberal soft totalitarianism had made that no longer the case. In my *Irish Political Review* article in July I quoted from Alexis de Tocqueville's prophecy in 1840 of the ultimate future of American liberal democracy. I think his most striking insight came after he had outlined the minutely regulated, conformist, avidly consuming democratic society of the future, and then added:

"I have always thought that servitude of the regular, quiet and gentle kind that I have just described might be combined more easily than is commonly believed with some of the outward forms of freedom..."

*

A few months ago when *The Irish Times* and RTÉ were bestowing a secular canonisation on the late Garret FitzGerald, I remembered my only direct contact with him as a politician. It was an incident related to what I have said above about 'effective silencing of dissent in a liberal democracy'.

I had known Garret in school, in the Jesuit Belvedere College to be precise, where he was a few classes ahead of me and a school prefect. After that, he and I went different ways and I knew of him only as a politician, a journalist and an occasional writer of books. In the 1980s, when he was twice Taoiseach, he launched a "*constitutional crusade*" to 'liberalise' the constitution and laws in the name of 'pluralism'. That was code for ending the Catholic Church's determining influence on the laws about such matters as contraceptives and marriage and replacing it with determining left-liberal influence (what he called 'pluralism').

Himself a practising Catholic who engaged in theological studies, and strongly anti-Republican, he was useful as a 'transition liberal' for the hard-line liberals who would have their way fully from the 1990s onwards. I welcomed and contributed to his New Ireland Forum on the Northern question and regarded his Anglo-Irish Agreement as a useful step forward.

The incident that brought us into fleeting direct contact occurred in 1976-7, when FitzGerald was Minister for Foreign Affairs. At that time I was lecturing in the Politics Department of University College Galway and I had written a good deal about the North in the *Sunday Press*, *The Irish Times* and in pamphlets. The Irish American Cultural Institute had invited me to lecture to Irish-American groups in

25 locations in the USA on the subject: *The Northern Conflict: Irish Proposals for a Solution*. I would be talking mainly about Irish-British joint rule or condominium and Sinn Féin's four-province federal scheme, for which I was an active consultant and drafter.

Eoin McKiernan, head of the Institute, wrote to tell me that the Irish Consul-General in New York had written to him to say that the Irish Government did not approve of my proposed lecture tour, but that the Institute was not worried. After some time, McKiernan wrote to me again saying that the Irish Embassy in Washington had written to him in similar terms, and that the Institute (which incidentally received some funding from the Government) had decided it would be prudent to withdraw my invitation with much regret.

I was puzzled about why the Irish Government regarded me as a sort of threat to the State. So I wrote to Garret, recalling our shared schooldays, and asking why his Department's men in the USA had objected to my lecturing. I received an answer from him on Department notepaper which consisted of a few typed lines followed underneath by a couple of lines in his own hand. I forget what the typed part said—something formal and blah-blah-ish. In his own writing underneath Garret had written that I could not expect the Government to approve of me when, in a conversation with its Consul-General in Boston, I had described our democratically elected Government as "*your tyrannous Government*".

I remembered the conversation. It had occurred a year or two previously, in the course of a seminar on Northern Ireland at Amherst College, Massachusetts. Representatives of all sides in the North (even Andy Tyrie of the UDA) and in the Republic had attended. Our Consul-General in Boston, a lady whose whose surname escapes me, had come to a late-night drinking session of the seminar group. With rhetorical flourish I had no doubt in my conversation with her called her Government '*your tyrannous Government*'. It was the time of that Cosgrave Government during which, as anyone who lived under it will remember, the Republic came nearer than ever before or since to being a police-state.

I wrote back to Garret pointing out that the democratic Opposition, whether in the Irish or any other parliament, often used derogatory language to describe the Government in power—language sometimes even more derogatory than the word '*tyrannous*'. He did not reply.

But what struck me most were two things. First, the surprising pettiness of

the grounds on which my lecture tour had been banned—just in case I might say something derogatory about the Government of the day. Second, that, as we had often been told about those totalitarian Communist regimes in the East, there were 'spies everywhere', who would report to the authorities any casual disloyal remark made in a private conversation.

*

Finally, here is a useful formula I hit on recently. When an ideology—Catholicism, Communism, consumerist liberalism—is powerful in a country, it is powerful—shapes how people think and live—because its message and its rules are (1) endorsed by the rulers; (2) it is preached everywhere; and (3) many believe the preaching. Note: in that order of importance.

Desmond Fennell

Reply To Desmond Fennell's *Better See Clearly Than Not* (July Irish Political Review)

Seeing Clearly— some thoughts

Desmond Fennell has issued a interesting challenge to readers in asking for a debate on how we can arrive at a agreed view on the current state of Ireland and the western world and:

"Once arrived at a more or less true view of how things are, and have come to be as they are, in the West generally and in Ireland, we could then proceed with our monthly discussions about all sorts of matters in the light of that."

He argues that:

"The essential basis of a true view, it seems to me, is to recognise that the spread of the Marxist-Leninist system of values and rules (its do's, don'ts and do-as-you-likes) from Russia to the other countries of eastern Europe had a counterpart in the West. That counterpart was the spread from the 1960s onwards of the new American system of left-liberal values and rules to the countries of Western Europe, Ireland included, and to the lawmakers of the European Community in Brussels. Both Marxist-Leninism and left liberalism were argued theories of the good human life in society which rejected the values-and-rules system of the thousand-year-old European civilisation."

He goes on to say how this came about in the West:

"In the West the takeover was done differently. The American left liberals had emerged as an ideological force during the Roosevelt New Deal years. They were the secularist left wing of that classical liberalism which Daniel O'Con-

nell had adopted from the British Non-conformists and which remained the basic political ideology of Catholic Ireland to the 1980s. These new-style American liberals, who called themselves simply 'liberals', had signalled their rejection of Western civilisation in August 1945, when they joined in the official American justification of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In the 1960s and early '70s they were able to bring their programme to centre stage and to get legislative backing from the American State."

While it is true that O'Connell adopted classic British Liberalism/ Whiggism I can't see how it "*remained the basic political ideology of Catholic Ireland to the 1980s*". O'Connell's Liberalism did not survive him in Ireland because it was restricted to his base in English politics in his lifetime but the Repeal movement at home was not based on Classical Liberalism—far from it. The Young Irelanders, Fenians, Home Rulers, Sinn Fein, and all its offshoots, were less and less influenced by classic Liberalism. There was a fundamental antagonism and existential incompatibility between native Ireland and Classic—i.e., British—Liberalism and that was most dramatically illustrated by the fact that the Whigs/Liberals when they came to power in the mid-1840s orchestrated the extermination of millions as an intrinsic part of their philosophy. And that was only one illustration of their relationship with Ireland.

The Irish national movement, as a consequence, remained immune when not completely hostile to British—i.e., Classic—Liberalism. Its modern version did not take hold in Ireland as a result of post-war American influence. As far as I can see, any American influence in Ireland before and after WWII was compatible with native cultural attitudes and beliefs, complemented them and did not have an undermining role. There was not an inherent incompatibility, no more than there was with any European influences.

The takeover that Desmond describes had a different origin in Ireland and it took hold in the vacuum that emerged in the 70s when the national psyche was thrown into confusion by its unrealistic attitude to the Northern crisis. The Irish Government seriously misjudged a war that it was engaged with and as a result lost its nerve and its bearings. That's what the Arms Crisis was all about and that was the defining moment in modern Irish history. That was effectively the same as losing a war and nothing has more serious consequence for a nation. As nature abhors a vacuum the traditional British Liberal view re-emerged which says essentially that the natives are not up to managing their own affairs and never were. *The Irish Times* is the vocal and articulate expression of this and there is almost an inevitability that it should re-emerge to articulate the

case as that was always its position.

Desmond argues that the modern Liberals lost their moral bearings over Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That they "*had signalled their rejection of Western civilisation in August 1945, when they joined in the official American justification of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki*".

I don't think that Liberals, classic or otherwise had to wait until Hiroshima to reject Western civilisation—by which I assume Desmond means the morality that is claimed for that civilisation. Darwinian Evolution, along with its twin called Progress, had justified such horrors for centuries before Hiroshima. These concepts together constitute the essence of the Whig theory of history, which is applied to all life, human as well as natural, since the beginning of time and until its end. And the culmination of all world progress had its apex in Whitehall. That was the Classic Liberal view of things. Hiroshima and Nagasaki was a crime of passion in comparison to the exterminations that had been planned and carried out coldly and systematically across centuries, in colonies beginning with Ireland and North America. This was Progress and Evolution put into practice.

Desmond compares the two world views of Marxism-Leninism and modern left liberalism and, despite all the differences between them including a 40 year Cold War, I think it's worth considering what they had in common philosophically. And that was these very concepts of

Progress and Evolution. It was the absolute totalitarian confidence that both sides had in these concepts which made them irresistible to their constituencies. The fact that one is defunct politically has simply allowed those common beliefs a free hand in the world by the 'winner'. That is, apart from the Moslem world.

It was also these concepts of Darwinian Progress that necessitated two world wars against the Germans, as they were judged most equal to the Anglo Saxons in the human species stakes. And the fittest has to assert and prove itself the fittest. That's a law, *the law*, of Darwinism—there is a permanent struggle to prove who is the fittest to survive and the most vicious struggle must be among those who are most alike or most equal.

In the course of these wars the Anglo Saxons had to call on their offshoot, the Americans, to ensure victory. The latter naturally came to dominance as they were the real winners of both wars in this part of the West. They were completely ascendant after the second war and naturally they came to dominate culturally over those they had saved in the wars. That is the source of the Americanisation of the West and it did not originate out of America's internal demands, which appears to be Desmond's argument. They were essentially invited to take over by a Europe that had destroyed itself twice by falling victim to Britain's divide and rule, or balance of power strategy, which ended up by overreaching itself and overwhelming both the author and the objects of the strategy.

Jack Lane

Letter to Irish Political Review:

Gerard Murphy, "Ethnic Cleansing" And A "Disappeared" Jew

Gerard Murphy's replies to James Fitzgerald, as published in the June issue of *Irish Political Review* and the July/August issue of *History Ireland*, are virtually identical, but for one vitally important sentence present in the former but omitted from the latter:

"The only reference to ethnic cleansing in my book (*The Year of Disappearances: Political Killings in Cork 1921-1922*) is my belief that the departure of Protestants from parts of Cork city could not be regarded as ethnic cleansing if only because they were largely replaced by other Protestants."

He concludes (in both versions): "*It is important to distinguish between what I wrote and what he (Fitzgerald)—and, indeed, others—think I wrote*". But why is it only with somebody who disputes that there was "*ethnic cleansing*" that Gerard

Murphy is having such an argument, rather than with any of those "*others*" who have nurtured that particular myth and have presented his book—either negatively or positively—as self-consciously attempting to be part of that school's literature?

Éamon de Valera has long been sneered at—by academic historians and press columnists alike—for his "*I look into my own heart*" statement. But what are we to make of those same groupings who seek quick fixes by "*looking into their own Hart*"? The academic supervisor and sponsor of a now much discredited Peter Hart thesis (*The IRA And Its Enemies*), Trinity College Professor David Fitzpatrick, wrote in the Spring 2011 issue of *Dublin Review of Books*: "*In subsequent essays, such as 'The Protestant Experience of Revolution', Hart went further. He*

suggested that killings, raids and arson were the tip of an iceberg of social exclusion and personal harassment amounting to **'what may be called ethnic cleansing'** ..."

This was the preface to Fitzpatrick's savage and personally abusive review of Murphy's book, which must have profoundly wounded that author by treating it as a liability that would only take from the "legacy" of Hart:

"Gerard Murphy's disorganised dossier on forty-odd killings attributed to Cork City's IRA lacks the intellectual power and academic skill of predecessors such as Hart, to whose arguments and copious bibliography he is deeply indebted. This is the work of an amateur enthusiast who intended to write a novel but was advised by his publisher to refactualise the story. The vast, rambling outcome... deploys many familiar devices associated with bad fiction... At times the exposition resembles that of a mediocre essay by a bright but untrained undergraduate. As history, the book is almost impenetrable ... The fact that several Freemasons were 'struck off' the membership lists of Cork lodges in 1925/6 is attributed, not to the suspension of local lodge meetings for several years, or to emigration, or to a prudent decision to abandon a contentious association, but to unrecorded killings. Though ignorant of 'how many of them were actually killed', Murphy is 'of the view, however, that the majority of these men probably disappeared'. And so he goes on, building up a dossier of mysterious or unconfirmed killings without adequate confirmation, relying on his personal 'belief' or 'view'... Perhaps the most serious misreading concerns one of the basic sources for the hypothesis of *'ethnic cleansing'*, the sharp reduction in the Protestant population between 1911 and 1926... Murphy correctly observes that the non-Catholic population of Cork City declined by 50 per cent, compared with 40 per cent for the county. This leads him to assert that the city experienced a particularly rapid Protestant exodus, 'the reasons' for which 'are not hard to fathom'. After some more rumination, he almost bites the bullet of *'ethnic cleansing'*: 'If you were a Protestant living in Cork in the summer of 1922, you would be forgiven for thinking that a process was in place to drive you out'. The trouble with this analysis ... is that the reduction in Protestant population was invariably greater in urban than adjacent rural areas, partly because of the larger number of urban Protestants holding jobs associated with the military and civil services, which disappeared upon independence... The rate of departure of the city's Protestants was not abnormally high. The doctrine of Cork exceptionalism as a source of sectarian terror is not sustainable, at least on the basis of demographic inference... One can only lament that a major historical opportunity has been largely squandered."

This was a rather mean-spirited savaging of Murphy for loyally following the line of "what may be called ethnic cleansing", as Hart "suggests", to quote the language of the latter's own mentor, Fitzpatrick himself. Any self-respecting author would have met such a review with a robust response. *DRB* bloggers in March and April did in fact argue the toss with other articles in that same Spring issue, but neither as a blog nor as a contribution to the subsequent Summer issue did Murphy write a single word in his own defence against Fitzpatrick's onslaught. Nor did he issue a single word of correction to the more friendly voices that had enthusiastically welcomed him into the Hart camp of "ethnic cleansing" storytelling in 2010. "Historical detective trail reveals 'ethnic cleansing' by IRA in Cork" was the headline for John-Paul McCarthy's welcome in the *Sunday Independent* of 7th November last. Playing his customary role as Eoghan Harris's ever-faithful and fawning Sir Echo, John-Paul of Oxford continued:

"They would proceed to interpret the results of the 1918 general election as authorisation to redraw the sectarian geography of Cork City's south eastern side by terrorising hundreds of Protestant families out of the Blackrock and Douglas Road areas. Martin Corry's reputation should be interred with his victims in Sing Sing, along with Neil Jordan's Michael Collins, that celluloid titan who bears little relation to Murphy's jeering Mars who insists on something called 'vengeance by jesus' in his two cameos in this book. Professor John A Murphy fares little better. His claim that *'there was no ethnic cleansing on the South Mall'* is treated with derision."

Kevin Myers similarly welcomed Murphy to the Hart camp in the *Irish Independent* on 12th November, as he wrote of an "Interim Solution", with its implications of a "Final Solution" en route, demonstrating how such cheap Holocaust trivialisation possesses little moral superiority over Holocaust denial. But first out of the trap a week previously, in the *Irish Examiner* on 5th November, had been Eoghan Harris, writing as follows:

"Gerard Murphy recalls the continuing scepticism in certain republican circles about a systematic campaign against Cork Protestants. In particular he quotes Professor John A Murphy's jibe that there was *'no ethnic cleansing in the South Mall'*. It is a remark that the professor might want to revisit when he has digested this book. Gerard Murphy calculates that from the summer of 1920 to the start of the Civil War, 33 Protestants were shot in Cork city proper, while another 40 were put to death in the area around the city—

a total of 73 Protestant victims from the minority community. Let's put these killings in a European context. During the Nazi pogrom of *Kristallnacht*, November 28, 1938, no more than 91 German Jews were killed—but these 91 traumatised the entire German Jewish community. Imagine the psychological impact on the Cork Protestant community of the IRA murdering 73 Protestants—a figure not far from the German Jewish figure of 91, Gerard Murphy give short shrift to the notion that the 'South Mall' was spared. He points out that 13 Cork Protestant merchants—a comparatively huge number in a small city—were shot for the crime of being, in Florrie O'Donoghue's phrase, 'loyal loyalists'... Of the 33 Protestants killed in the period 1921-22, some seven were killed 'before and during' the War of Independence proper, whereas 26 were killed 'after' the Truce. From all of which we can draw two conclusions: the 'South Mall' suffered its share of 'cleansing' and Cork Protestants, more than most Protestants, were lucky the Republicans did not win the Civil War."

In the *Sunday Independent* of 9th January, Harris reprised the role of Holocaust trivialiser:

"Even a pluralist like Dr Garret Fitz Gerald, writing as recently as last October, could casually tell his *Irish Times* readers that Southern Protestants opted out of political participation in the new State in spite of the Senate giving them a voice... Historians have settled for huffing about the right of Dáil Éireann to wage war... I believe that what happened to Irish Protestants between 1920-23 is the last taboo in modern Irish history. And I also believe it is part of a European experience of denial that stretches from Spain in the Thirties to Vichy France in the Forties. In recent years this belief has been reinforced by the historical exhumations of historians like Peter Hart and Gerard Murphy... This was sublimated, just like the mistreatment of French Jews during the Second World War... The reluctance of Irish Protestants to engage with politics was a rational response to a period of prolonged marginalisation that began with what must have seemed like a prelude to a pogrom, in the period 1911-21."

John A. Murphy replied to John-Paul of Oxford—aka His Master's Voice—in the *Sunday Independent* on 14th November, as he had already replied to Harris himself, with a letter appropriately headlined "There was no *Kristallnacht* on the South Mall", in the *Irish Examiner* on 10th November:

"In his review of Gerard Murphy's new book, Eoghan Harris refers to a comment (not a 'jibe') that I made several years ago that *'there was no ethnic cleansing on the South Mall'*. Senator Harris suggests that in the light of Dr Murphy's book I might like to 'revisit' the comment. 'Ethnic

cleansing' is a phrase I shouldn't have used. Indeed, since it has a clear and specific meaning in the context of the Balkans in the 1990s, it is anachronistic and misleading to apply it to other complex historical conflicts, as in the Ireland of 1920-23. Otherwise I stand over my remark. I simply meant that the prominence of Protestants in Cork's commercial life was largely unaffected by the upheaval of 1920-23. Indeed, Dr Murphy makes it clear that, far from being an eccentric opinion, mine is 'a widely held belief' and that it 'is generally accepted by historians that... urban Protestants... maintained their hegemony and their control of the professions right into the years of the Free State'. Moreover, as far as I can see from the book, the author nowhere states that the exodus of Protestant residents from the Blackrock and Douglas areas was accompanied by a collapse of Protestant commercial interests in the city centre. Unless, of course, Senator Harris has startling new evidence of a *Kristallnacht* on the South Mall some night in the early 1920s?"

It is obvious that Gerard Murphy was rendered dumbstruck by the ferocity of David Fitzpatrick's springtime assault on both his analysis and arithmetic, what we might call the "think of a number and double it" school of statistics so beloved of Harris. But why—in the happier month of November's press adulation—had he not corrected Myers and Harris/McCarthy when they praised him for following in the footsteps of Hart on the "*ethnic cleansing*" of Protestants? For—as is evident from the manner in which he quoted John A. and was also interpreted by Fitzpatrick—"ethnic cleansing" of Cork Protestants had indeed been "suggested" by Murphy, in the manner of Hart before him. And it was not the only ethnic target "suggested" by Hart and eagerly echoed by Harris. In the *Sunday Independent* of 25th July 2010, in his personal obituary of the recently, and undoubtedly tragically, deceased Peter Hart, Harris emphasised—not just once, but twice—the following statement by Hart, with all the hares it might set running:

"Beneath the official rhetoric of courts martial and convictions, the IRA were tapping a deep vein of communal prejudice and gossip: about grabbers, Black Protestants, and Masonic conspirators, dirty tinkers and corner boys, fly boys and fast women, the Jews at No 4 and the disorderly house at No 30."

In other words, the "suggestion" was that the War of Independence was also anti-Semitic. And there is evidence that Gerard Murphy did indeed set off to chase that hare, by looking for a Jewish victim who either "*was killed by the IRA*" or

otherwise "*(was) disappeared*" by that same Army of Dáil Éireann. Had a single Jewish victim been found, it would then have been given the same statistical significance by Harris—as hysterically claimed by him in respect of Protestants—that the IRA had outdone what the Nazis would later do on *Kristallnacht*.

The problem posed for Hart, Harris and Murphy was the fact that there was not a single Jew to be found who had been a victim of the IRA, neither during the War of Independence, nor during the Truce, nor during the Civil War. Harris throws around terms like "*the Jews*" and "*prelude to a pogrom*" as one might confetti, but such statements are totally devoid of genuine conviction or concern, since they refer to non-occurrences. This is nothing more than a studied pose, as Harris studiously avoids any acknowledgement of those Jews who had actually been murdered in that period. "*Murder in Little Jerusalem*" is the title of a TV documentary transmitted by RTÉ on 11th October 2010, and introduced as follows:

"Even though the Dublin of 1923 was a troubled place, recovering from the war of independence and the very recent civil war, the city was shocked by a spate of murderous attacks on Jewish men walking home to the area off the South Circular Road, known then, as 'Little Jerusalem'. Bernard Goldberg, a 42 year old jeweller from Manchester and Ernest Kahan, a 24 year old civil servant in the Department of Agriculture, were attacked and shot dead. Within the space of two weeks, two Jewish men had been shot dead and two more had been badly injured—the tightly knit Jewish community in Dublin now feared the worst—that this was the beginning of a cold-blooded anti-semitic campaign... This is a story of intrigue, mystery, scandal, divided loyalties and cover up..."

I participated in that documentary by virtue of my own investigations into these murders. In April 2007—in an essay-in-review entitled "*GAA Founder No Blooming Anti-Semite!*" which was published at on the *An Fear Rua—GAA Unplugged!* website at www.anfearrua.com/story.asp?id=2126—I noted:

"The following set of circumstances have not otherwise been brought together and properly chronicled. In the turbulent early years of the Irish Free State, 1922-23, two people—who had been listed as residents of Dublin's Lennox Street on the occasion of the 1911 census—would find themselves murdered by Free State army officers: one victim a Catholic and the other a Jew; one a civil servant and the other a tailor. Confounding the stereotypes, it was the Irish Republican leader Harry Boland—War of Independence

comrade and friend (but Civil War enemy) of Michael Collins—who was both a Catholic and the tailor in question; while the Jewish victim—Ernest Kahan—earned his living as a civil servant in Ireland's Department of Agriculture."

I repeated this point in a further essay entitled "*Citizens of the Republic: Jews in Independent Ireland*" which was published by *Dublin Review of Books* in Summer 2007, while in a letter in the *Sunday Independent* on 1st July 2007 I added: "*The identity of the Free State Army officer who murdered Ernest Emmanuel Kahn in 1923 was known to the authorities from the very outset, and to society at large since 1934 when Sean MacEntee publicly named him in the Dáil as James Conroy and warned of his re-emergence on the scene as a Blueshirt activist.*" I was commenting on a report, headlined "*Killing spree led to fear of pogrom on Dublin Jews*", and published on the previous Sunday, 24th June 2007:

"A killing spree that saw two Jews gunned down on the streets of Dublin in the Twenties resulted from an anti-Semitic vendetta involving officers in the newly formed Irish Free State Army, according to previously unpublished secret files. At the time, the apparently motiveless murders, within a fortnight of each other, caused panic in the city's small Jewish community. Armed police were drafted in to patrol a terrified 'Little Jerusalem', Dublin's Jewish quarter just off the South Circular Road... The first to be murdered was Bernard Goldberg, 42, a Manchester jeweller and father of four who was shot on St Stephen's Green on October 31, 1923, after three men had stopped him and his brother Samuel and demanded their names. Samuel, who lived in Dublin, had a narrow escape. He was hit on the head but managed to run towards Cuffe Street, later discovering three bullet holes in his overcoat. Emmanuel Kahn, 24, a Department of Agriculture civil servant of Lennox Street, who was known locally as Ernest, became the second victim, on November 14, 1923. He was gunned down in Stamer Street in the Jewish quarter as he returned home after an evening playing cards. David Millar, a Victoria Street moneylender who was with him in the Jewish Club in Harrington Street, was also shot in the shoulder but managed to stagger home. Before the shooting, two men had stopped them, shouting 'Halt!' Millar said the men used 'profane language' and demanded their names and religion. They were told to 'go home to hell out of this', and when they turned to go, the two men opened fire on them."

Despite this report appearing in his own *Sunday Independent*, Harris has been determined to do his best to ensure that the murdered Jews Goldberg and Kahan

should return to the category of non-persons. But their names cry out in glaring contradiction and refutation of Harris's dishonest propaganda line that minority communities were so *"lucky the Republicans did not win the Civil War"*. The truth of the matter is that it had been left to the defeated Republicans of that War to expose the fact that James Conroy was a Jew-killing Free State Army officer in 1923 who had returned as a Fine Gael Blueshirt activist in 1934. Nor can Harris, inhabiting the historical fantasy land that he makes such efforts to conjure up, face up to the fact that Cork was indeed the only Irish city outside of Orange Ulster ever to experience an actual pogrom: not, however, the one his myth-making seeks to invent, that of Republicans against Protestants, but an anti-Irish—yet undoubtedly ecumenical—pogrom perpetrated by British Crown forces in December 1920 against all Cork citizenry—be they Catholic, Protestant or Jewish. In the March 2007 issue of *Irish Political Review* I observed:

"In the *Sunday Independent* on 4th December 2005, Eoghan Harris reviewed Conal Creedon's TV documentary 'The Burning of Cork'. While praising the quality of programme-making, he had no other conclusion to come to whatsoever on its subject-matter, except to offer the following excuse for British murder (in March 1920): *'Crown forces would see men like (Cork Lord Mayor) MacCurtain as a legitimate target. Historical truth hurts, but it is also a moral good.'* There is no indignation in Harris's heart at the burning of his own native city."

My article, entitled *"A Jewish Victim Named"*, concluded that the victims killed in *"the burning of Cork, as the British pogrom it undoubtedly was ... numbered not only the Catholics Jeremiah and Cornelius Delaney, but also the Jewish Sarah Medalie"*.

What, if anything, has this to do with Gerard Murphy? Not much, I would have thought, on first reading his *Disappearances*, for that name, in that form, did not ring any bells for me. But on recently attempting to tidy up my mail box I happened across an email from a Ger Murphy, dated 30th April 2008: *"Dear Manus, I doubt if you'll remember me, Ger Murphy. I rang you a few years back in connection with George Nathan of dead Limerick Lord Mayors fame. I heard that you recently published an article on the experiences of Jews in Cork during the 1919/23 period. Did you come across any reference to a man called Simon Spiro, who was a JP in Cork at the time? I wonder is there any possibility he disappeared? Regards, Ger."* There was no indication that a book with a particular

agenda was being written, and I innocently believed that the word *"disappeared"* was being used in its correct grammatical form as an intransitive verb, rather than being spun as a transitive one, with the meaning of *"was disappeared"*, as subject is converted into object. I replied on 1st May: *"The only Cork Spiro I've come across is the reference on page 6 of 'A Cork Pogrom'"*, and I attached the text of that article, with the full title of *"A Cork Pogrom's Excluded Friday Night"*, which had been published in the April 2007 issue of *Irish Political Review*.

I quoted from the reports of the British Crown forces pogrom that had been published in the *Cork Examiner* on 13th December 1920:

"Central Cork in Flames... Mrs. Medalie, a Jewess, died suddenly in her house in Tuckey Street, Cork ... as military entered her bedroom. 'We are Jews', she said, when she saw the soldiers, 'and have nothing to do with the political movement'. Then she exclaimed, 'Oh, my heart!' ... It is stated that the Masonic Lodge, Tuckey Street, was also searched. The Drapers' Club, Tuckey Street, was broken into about 11.20. The glass panels of the front door were broken and both doors leading to the bar were smashed. The caretaker states that articles from the club stock were taken... MacCurtain Street Post Office was broken into about 2 o'clock on Saturday morning. Mrs. O'Sullivan who is the postmistress, also carries on a large greengrocery business, and she states that a considerable quantity of stock must have been taken... The shutters were removed from the Cuban House, MacCurtain Street, and the window was broken, but as the boxes in the window contained only dummy cigars and cigarettes, the proprietor, Mr. Spiro, suffered no greater loss than is represented by the smashing of the glass. The burglars were unable to force the door and failed to gain access to the shop."

I concluded: *"Catholic O'Sullivans and Jewish Spiros were no more spared the 'neighbourly' attentions of the marauding Tans of MacCurtain Street Barracks, than were Catholics and Jews—and indeed Freemasons as well—spared the rampaging raids of the Tans from Tuckey Street Barracks."* So the Hart-inspired search for an elusive—by virtue of being non-existent—Jewish victim of the Cork IRA during the War of Independence had come a cropper. On 13th May 2008 Ger Murphy replied to me: *"Did not realize I was sailing into choppy waters with my question on Spiro. And no, I've no proof that he was killed by the IRA. I now suspect he probably emigrated, most likely to the States."* And so we were spared the inclusion of Spiro in Gerard Murphy's *"Disappearances"* and *"Political Killings"* narrative.

Manus O'Riordan

es ahora *

CHILD ABUSE, STATE AND CHURCH

In the Irish *Daily Mail*, 7th July 2011, Niamh Lyons, their political Correspondent wrote about the Irish *State's Damning Record*. Twenty-seven children and young adults died while in State care last year, leading to claims that inadequate services were failing our most vulnerable children. In February 2010, Daniel McAnaspie, 17, went missing from HSE care. His remains were found dumped in a ditch in Rathfeigh, Co. Meath, three months later. He had been stabbed and his throat had been slit. Elsewhere, in April 2010, the truth of what happened to Tracey Fay, 18, was revealed in a HSE report into her death. While in care, she had engaged in prostitution and has given birth to two children at the age of 16 and 17. In the four years before her death, she had gone missing 23 times. She died of a drug overdose in January 2002. Her body was found in a disused coal bunker in Dublin. What happened to those other 25 unfortunate youngsters remain unknown to the public at least. But when the Taoiseach got up on July 22nd 2011 and made his hysterical speech in the Dail, he had as his object of attack the Catholic Church, and the Vatican and past deeds. And not once did he or later Michael Martin, leader of Fianna Fail nor any political party ask the State to account for its own appalling *contemporary* record on its misdeeds in this area. Not one HSE member or social worker or politician has been asked to account for what in any measure is sheer savagery towards these dead kids. The media may comment but the only time they go for the jugular is when the past deeds of the Catholic Church is involved. And while the Taoiseach had no bother or squeamishness in referring to the *"rape and torture of children"* he made very sure that this did not apply to his own or previous Governments. The buck stops with the Catholic Church it seems and the State has a clear pass.

What utter codswallop! The State at all times worked *with* the Church and was the primary mover through its courts in putting children and pregnant unmarried women into the various institutions run by the Church. And when the religious orders begged for money (and the archives have this evidence), the State did *not* give it because they simply hadn't it. Ireland of the 30's to the 60's especially was poverty-

It Is Time

stricken. In 1961 public expenditure on all branches of education in Ireland was 17 dollars per head—one-third that of the UK. According to UNESCO statistics published in 1962 and covering the period from 1955-1957, the proportion of Irish children between fifteen and nineteen years of age enrolled in secondary, vocational, or technical schools was 36%. The proportion in NI was 75% and England and Wales 88% (this had everything to do with the adoption of the Butler Education Act throughout the UK post war by the Labour Government).

None other than David Thornley saw and wrote that the—

"modernising tendencies of Pope John XXIII and his great predecessor and the influence of the historic encyclicals '*Mater et Magistra*' and '*Pacem in Terris*', have redrawn the frame of *social thinking* in a predominantly Catholic community such as that of Ireland. The 'air of spring' which, as His Grace the most Rev. Dr. Conway has said blows so excitingly through the fields of ecumenism and liturgical reform, can be breathed no less in that of *social reform*...".

But Thornley saw that the political way of PR, enforced on Ireland by Britain, was never going to be beneficial to Irish society until it was totally gotten rid of. As he stated:

"The constituency organisation of our parties, the divisive influence of PR and the nineteenth-century character of our local politics, combine to make 'constituency service' the touchstone of electoral success. J.K. Galbraith would not be elected for an Irish constituency unless he were prepared, firstly, to hack his way through the undergrowth of the constituency machine, and thereafter, to demonstrate his zeal to his constituents by devoting the greater portion of his time to the battering of the administration on their behalf with petitions which are more often than not either superfluous or improper. And it is the victims of this machine who must form cabinets. If our legislators are to be both economic geniuses and keep their seats, they must develop the rare virtue of controlled schizophrenia."

But Thornley adds this caution which as we can now see today is the norm:

"But if administrations gives us five year plans, while democratic politics gives us an instant mix of vituperation and 'constituency service' democratic politics will come to seem a sideshow to the business of government, from which only the changeless and unchangeable minority of participants derive either amusement or profit."

That last bit of course is our modern media but for them now too, surely the bells toll. The media have rewritten our

past and made a foe of the faithful Church that always stood by us in good times and bad. And they have made a friend of an old foe whose designs have never been benign—how the English Queen must have surely laughed at our fawning, bowing and scraping. One journalist sneered at one of our former Taoisigh who wrote to the Holy Father in a what was then a most humble way—well forget then and look *at now* and how we bend the knee to our foreign neighbour who is Queen in her own realm and head of her own Church. Modern? Most definitely not! And with all the blarney and tokenism to a few media/political/academia heads, the only time Ireland had a State Church—the established Protestant one by which our people were enslaved by tithes et cetera, when English politicians eventually dis-established it, through the huge campaigns of the likes of Daniel O'Connell—the prelates of the Protestant Church were furious—but we as a people saw to it that we never had a State Church again. The Catholic Church has never or sought to be a State Church. But get this—all the so-called liberal societies including our nearest neighbour *have all State Churches*. I was recently reading a history of Sweden and their State Church is the Lutheran Church. Similarly with Norway, Denmark and the Netherlands—all their Royals are included in their State Churches. When Crown Prince Wilhelm-Alexander of Holland (the House of Orange) married a foreign Catholic, she had to abandon her religion in this day and age and had full instruction in the Protestant faith before she could get married to the future King and is now addressed as Crown Princess Maxima and all their children have to be brought up in the Protestant faith. Liberal societies my foot! But of course the UK and Irish media want to and have portrayed our society as "backward", "mediaeval" for being Catholic. There can be no doubt now that as we become increasingly anglicised, there is a corresponding realignment with Protestantism itself and its values especially its intolerance for those of us who are weak and sinful—i.e. that is all of us—whatever Taoiseach Kenny and Michael Martin say!

ORWELL AND JOHANN HARI

Johann Hari is a liberal and gay icon and one of the UK's Independent columnists. Since he began his journalistic career, he has been acclaimed for his reportage and viewpoints. He also apparently posted poison pen attacks on the Wikipedia entries of those who crossed him. But according to an article in *Private Eye* No. 1293, he was quite keen on the practice of plagiarism. With all the upheaval going in the UK over the Murdoch Empire and its appalling mispractices—which of course takes in Ireland too—I look forward to the day when our own crowd are unmasked.

Anyway as "*liberal England took Hari to its breast, he was awarded many press awards between 2007 and 2010*"—I am not sure if this newspaper is still owned by the media baron Sir Anthony O'Reilly of Independent News and Media or whether Dennis O'Brien owns enough shares to claim it for himself. "*In 2008, Hari entered the Orwell Prize and his work hit all the standards*", according to the *Eye* which contains the main source of this article. "*Hari offered the judges a heart-rending account of life in the war-torn city of Birao in the Central African Republic*". The charity that took Hari to Africa has contacted the *Eye* to say that what he wrote appalled its staff. Hari did not hire a translator, instead browbeating a charity worker into translating for him. He promised to give her his notes when they returned so she could file her own report on the war, and then broke his word. He continued to hold on to the notes even after she complained to Simon Kelner, the *Independent's* Editor.

The reason for this became clear when his article came out, as "*most of the content differed from what interviewees had told us*", the aid worker stated to the *Eye*. Hari "*completely exaggerated the extent of destruction in Birao*". He "*completely invented quotes, in particular those of the French soldiers*". In one gruesome vignette, Hari has French soldiers telling a piteous story of how "*children would bring us the severed heads of their parents and scream for help, but our orders were not to help them*".

"They did not say this. I know because I was there and I did the translating for him".

"Another of Hari's entries was a story on how multiculturalism was betraying immigrant women in Germany. He took all his case studies from a piece in *Der Spiegel*, conjured up names for the abused women even though the German magazine has not identified them, and muddled the facts about their cases as he transcribed them. Journalists warned Jean Seaton, the Orwell Prize's organiser, that Hari was a phoney. But the judges—John Tusa, Albert Scardino and Annalena Mc Afee—did not listen. With Scardino leading the way, the judges bestowed the 2008 Orwell Prize for journalism on Hari."

When stories of Hari's plagiarised interviews began to fly around the web last month, the Orwell Prize organisers thought it would be a simple matter to strip him of the 2008 prize. Not so. Scardino urged caution; Tusa worried that he would look like a fool for giving Hari the award in the first place; Polly Toynbee, Jenni Russell and Patrick Cockburn told the organisers that they must not publicly shame Hari.

Their pleas are unlikely to sway the council of the Orwell Prize when it meets next week. The *Eye's* new evidence is

damning, and lawyers have already advised its members to declare Hari's 2008 entry "void". But according to the *Eye* evidence of Hari's stories ratcheted up and even staff at the *New Statesman* "also knew that their new recruit was not an honest man. Cristina Odone, then its deputy editor and her assistant Barbara Gunnell told Statesman editor Peter Wilby that Hari was making things up. But Wilby did not fire Hari, and whatever reprimand he issued did not terrify him into mending his ways."

Of course I have never been able to understand the liberal left in the UK which has made a God out of Orwell. In my opinion, he was a particularly nasty man. In WW2 the Allies would never have won but for the Red Army and their incredible achievements today are whittled away by those types of historians and journalists (not unlike Hari to some extent). One year in Normandy while travelling there, we decided to look at the huge American cemetery which was kept like—to my mind—a military trophy. But in fairness to the US, there on the map was the red line that betold of the massive awesome march of the army of the Soviet Union. Orwell wrote his infamous *list* (file FO 1110/189 at the British National Archives) where he shook dirt over so many people. He "listed Communist Party members, their FT's (fellow travellers) crypto communists, and paid Soviet spies". The Dublin playwright Sean O'Casey was on the list—and he wondered why he wasn't getting work from the BBC—the latter to this day vet all their employees by MI5/MI6. Stephen Spender who was later knighted was sourly assessed by Orwell in 1948 to be a "Sentimental sympathiser... Tendency towards homosexuality". If any reader has time, it is worth a look as a necessary corrective to the thinking in today's Ireland as propounded by the likes of the commentariat that Dev himself banned all kinds of sex because he was so in thrall to the teachings of the Catholic Church. One of these days—and not in too distant a future, there will be some people whose thinking now is accepted but who will not be able to withstand the 'stare of history'. The tears of Archbishop Martin on RTE News at Six (20th July 2011) will not have been shed in vain.

Julianne Herlihy ©

On-line sales of books,
pamphlets and magazines:

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

The War and the Emergency

This letter was sent to the *Irish Times* on 14th May, but was not published

The otherwise interesting report by Michael Parsons of his interview with Liv Hempel, daughter of Germany's envoy to Dublin during the Second World War, in today's *Irish Times* (14th May) ('Hitler's death didn't mean a damn thing to my father'), was marred somewhat by the glib remark: "the second World War, known as the Emergency in Ireland".

This phrase was first put into circulation by Prof. Brian Girvan in his book on Irish wartime neutrality a few years ago, published by Oxford University Press. But the claim, regardless of its derogatory intent, is simply untrue, and the editors at OUP should have picked up on this at the time and excised it.

The term "The Emergency" was widely used to refer to the many restrictions put in place under the Emergency Legislation introduced by the Dáil for the duration of the European conflict. These ranged from the rationing of food, fuel and other commodities to the establishment of the Local Defence Force and restrictions on what the press could publish, so as to minimise the use of Irish media outlets for propaganda purposes by any of the belligerent powers.

The conflict itself then raging in Europe, and later in Africa, Russia and worldwide, was known as "the second World War" and was generally described as such.

The distinction between the two terms is obvious, as I know from many conversations over the years among my own family—many members of which served in the Irish forces, prepared to fight an invasion from whichever side it came.

Philip O'Connor

Israel Unresolved

The following letter of 20th July failed to be published in the *Irish Times*

Israel's Ambassador Boaz Modai writes that "the lessons in all this for Israel are that international resolutions remain a fiction if they are not backed by a real willingness to enforce them" (June 23rd). He was referring to Lebanon's failure to implement the provisions of Security Council resolution 1701, passed in August 2006, at the end of the last hostilities between Israel and Lebanon.

Before demanding that Lebanon cast the mote out of its eye in this matter, Israel should cast the beam out its own eye. It is in breach of over 30 Security Council resolutions that require action by it and it alone.

Had it implemented those resolutions, it would have (a) removed all Jewish settlements from the West Bank, including East Jerusalem (resolutions 446, 452 and 465), (b) reversed its annexations of East Jerusalem (resolutions resolution 252, 267, 271, 298, 476 and 478) and the Golan Heights (resolution 487), and (c) allowed the International Atomic Energy Agency to inspect its nuclear facilities (resolution 497).

David Morrison

John-Paul And The Brits

This appeared in the *Sunday Independent* of 1st May

In his article 'From O'Connell to Pearse and beyond, our Anglophile instincts remain intact', (*Sunday Independent*, April 17), Dr. John-Paul McCarthy implies that the intellectual traffic between Ireland and England (not to mention Wales and Scotland) was all one way. He claims O'Connell was influenced by the Chartists. Surely it was the other way about—or at least a matter of symbiosis? Two of the most distinguished leaders of the Chartists were Bronterre O'Brien and Feargus O'Connor.

Joseph Plunkett and PS O'Hegarty were admirers of HG Wells. Wells was translated into many languages. He was something of a hero in the Soviet Union. Presumably this admiration on the part of the Bolsheviks and Fenians did not extend to his appalling racist views. He believed that "mud coloured" people and other "racially inferior" types (we Irish among them) ought to be exterminated.

Dr. McCarthy muses on the notion that Pearse may have been influenced by Matthew Arnold. Pearse probably did come across Arnold's views but he was specifically influenced by Maria Montessori, the Italian educationalist.

Seán McGouran

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

CLOYNE REPORT 2011 & CATHOLIC CHURCH

It does not stack up since politics went Global. All the politicians are on the one wavelength since Global Capitalism got at them. Nobody believes politicians are straight any more even when they are, and very few of them are.

The killing in Norway by Anders Breivik is a symptom of the underlying illness in society which is Powerlessness.

Everyone, worldwide, knows they are powerless against politicians. Democracy is truly dead. Voting does not change anything more than the colour of the political scenery. The politicians are ruled by capitalism and this is Darwinian Capitalism red in tooth and claw where the weak are trampled underfoot and individual people do not matter.

One of the global businesses is the Business of Politics—the Politics Industry in which not only all the top politicians operate but also the heads of IBEC, Construction Industry Federation, CBI, Irish Farmer's Association, heads of State Departments and heads of Quangos, Heads of Semi-State companies, Planners and Statisticians. They are all in the Politics Industry. Worldwide they all understand each other and what they are about. They are about looking after themselves.

They are not about looking after ordinary people's interests. Sure, the roads must be reasonably road-worthy and foot-paths must be reasonably level and people must be given concerts and street-parties to keep them occupied. The Black Economy is allowed to flourish, but not too much, just to keep people quiet. The Black Economy is the retail arm of much of Global Capitalism. After all it keeps people on drink and drugs and prostitution and child trafficking which are the really big money makers for the global industries. The global politics industry depends for its power and money on the other global industries such as armaments, drugs, pharmaceuticals, alcohol, trafficking, construction and engineering and food. These are the biggies from which Politicians get their power and money.

And religions get in the way. Religion preaches peace and love, forbearance and toleration. All very well to keep the poor satisfied with their lot, especially when the priests were under the control of the State as they were under the British State in Ireland up to 1922 and as they still are in the UK, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and many other countries world-wide. But once the priests get free of State

control, as they did in Ireland after 1922, the priests became brave enough to preach peace, love and equality of opportunity not just to the poor but to all. Ireland was educated by the priests, by the Christian Brothers and by many other various orders of religious men and women. It was by the enormous and badly-paid efforts of Brothers and Nuns that the level of education in Ireland was raised to a high level. It is an acknowledged fact that the standards of education in Catholic schools was and is much higher than in Protestant schools. This has led to a well-educated intellectually-competent cohort of people in every Irish town. And with the Roscommon Hospital incident, where the Taoiseach Enda Kenny was caught out not only in making a false election promise but his denial of it was likewise caught out, and the Taoiseach (a former teacher himself) had enough of this education for the masses and he let fly at the Catholic Church. "*He thundered*" in the Dail, the media reported. However, he had no credibility because everyone knows the Catholic Church did move quickly to deal with the few, the very few, cases to come to its attention regarding abuse. And the only cleric named by Judge Yvonne Murphy in the *Cloyne Report* as being guilty of inappropriate behaviour is Bishop Magee himself. And the offence: kissing a seventeen year old male fondly on the forehead. Is no priest ever to show a normal sign of affection? But the main reason Edna Kenny sounded ridiculous when he went over the top against the Catholic Church is because we all know that the greatest abuser of children presently in Ireland is the HSE. The HSE has lost or mislaid countless children committed to its care and there have been many deaths of children in HSE care.

Additionally, we in Ireland all know now that when the Catholic Church's Religious Orders set up their homes for orphans and other unwanted children, and when the Catholic Church agreed to run Industrial Schools to which children were committed by the State Courts and by the children's families, the Church did so out of its charitable motivation for the good of the children. And also the Church did set up these Homes so as to prevent the children form being put into Protestant proselytising Homes, where not only were the children deprived of their religion but were in many cases starved to death. The 'Bird's Nest' syndrome is not a myth.

And so when Taoiseach Kenny "*thundered*" in the Dail against the Catholic Church, he was burying his "*Roscommon A&E*" embarrassment and at the same time serving the Global Politics Industry which wants to get rid of the Catholic Church by relegating it to the slums of the world where they think it belongs. The Taoiseach has appointed Ministers Shatter and Quinn whose mission is to take maximum assets from the

Catholic Church, reduce it to penury and take all the schools from Catholic management to State control, so that the curriculum can be controlled. That this happens in a time of economic crisis for the public purse is rather like that of Henry VIII whose exchequer was bare and then came Thomas Cromwell with his infamous Dissolution of the Monasteries. Bounty flowed into the King's coffers and it all came from the Catholic Church. So too in Ireland today—the question is *Qui Bono?*

Taoiseach Kenny did not seem to care whether he had the truth or not. He wanted to rant and he ranted. And so did Michael Martin, leader of Fianna Fail when his turn came. Arrogantly the media refers to the Report having been "*released*" on 13th May—just after the Roscommon lies were found out, but the Report is not as yet at the time we go to press released to the retail Booksellers. It is not yet printed and bound which seems to indicate that it was prematurely released on the internet on 13th July 2011 for a political reason.

There is another report, which is stated to be complete but not published and that is the *Raphoe Report*. Will that also be released to snatch the headlines and squash some awkward political story?

Yes, it all begins to stack up now. The politicians are not trying to rescue us. They are trying to sink us deeper in the morass morally and financially. Trying to get rid of the Catholic Church is just one part of the Project.

Financially, we have got ourselves into a deep hole—an economic depression funded by huge borrowings caused by avaricious overspending. The only way to get out of it is by paying off the borrowings. That is done by saving. Saving is a postponement of consumption. So what does our "*Global Politics Industry*" member do? Our globally-correct Minister for Finance, Michael Noonan, wants us to get deeper in the mire and he advises us to spend, "*spend our way out of the recession*". This may be good for him but it is not good for us.

USUK

There is every indication that the USA and UK economies are in a lot worse trouble than Ireland's. But they control the PR, and obviously they control Moodies which gave Ireland's bonds junk status recently and which still rates the US at triple AAA rating, even though President Obama states he will be unable to pay Federal wages after 1st August 2011 unless Congress approves more borrowing power. But, whoa! Back up there! How can more borrowing improve the economy? If USA borrows more, then USA will be deeper in the cesspit that it is now. And believe me if a country cannot pay its wages, like President Obama says, then it is in the pit now. Already.

But of course the Global Politics Industry, of which Congress and Obama are members, will make sure that the Global Armaments Industry will be paid by providing more borrowing power for USA Federal Government to spend. They will keep at this. On and on until the bottom is reached. USUK were never at the bottom of the pit before and so they do not know how far down it is. So they will keep drawing out from their economies i.e. their tax-payers until they hit bottom. It won't be long now but it could take five more years to get down. Then when it's down they might go away and let the rest of us get on with our ordinary (by then very ordinary) economic lives. Letting all of us with the debt burden to be paid back by us.

SOMALIA

Look at what is actually and really happening. Take Somalia:

1. Global Capitalism takes their oil and other minerals. The Somali Global Politicians get their portion of the wealth to buy jet planes and arms from Global Capitalism.
2. The land of the ordinary people is ruined from the extraction process and despoliation. Their fishing is ruined.
3. The Somali fishermen have to try to make a living from piracy. Global Capitalism fights back to stop the Somalis.
4. Famine caused by the despoliation of their resources hits the Somali people. Global Aid Industry swings into action to mop up charitable euros, pounds and dollars from well meaning ordinary people.
5. This Aid Industry spends the Aid money on food produced by Global Capitalist Food Industry. The packages of food are prominently labelled USAID—giving the impression that the best friend of the poor Somalia people is the US.
6. It all has a purpose: the industrial members of Global Capitalism and the Global Politicians get richer and the poor Somalis are poorer. We who donate aid are poorer also.

This scenario or a version of it is enacted and re-enacted around the world wherever there are resources to be plundered.

Michael Stack ©

THE DAY THE DREAM DIED

They had hope, those Afro-Americans. Radical whites, in their naivety, saw human and civil rights as equity. White supremacy, protest Rubicon. A black president and his family, voted for, and installed in the White House. His politics quickly turned inside-out, managing to sound-off mere homilies. Did you not learn from J.F. Kennedy, Irish-American Catholic, or black, must also sing that manic rhapsody. They fought for the right to invade and hack, the rich richer, poor poorer perfidy. That Yellow-Brick-Road was a cul-de-sac.

Wilson John Haire
11th May, 2011

WIKI-LEAKS continued

that the United States regarded only two locations in Ireland as vital to its interests. This wasn't mentioned directly in the *Irish Independent* expose.

One, is the Hibernian Atlantic communications cable, which connects the United States, Canada, Ireland, Britain and Europe. Its landing point is Dublin. The other is the Genzyme biotech plant in Waterford, which produce the tablet, Renagel.

THE LABOUR PARTY

"Tánaiste Eamon Gilmore privately told U.S. diplomats he would support the holding of a second referendum on the Lisbon Treaty—despite publicly saying the opposite, a leaked embassy cable reveals" (*Irish Independent*, 1.6.2011).

In a candid disclosure that will prove embarrassing for the Labour Party leader, a leaked US Embassy cable says he admitted a "public posture" of opposition to a second referendum because it was "politically necessary".

At the same time, Mr Gilmore fully expected a second referendum and said he would support it.

After the No vote in the first Lisbon referendum in June 2008, the Labour leader said the "Lisbon Treaty is dead" and opposed a second referendum being held.

But Mr. Gilmore presented a different scenario a month later to US Embassy staff, according to then US Ambassador Thomas Foley.

"Gilmore, who has led calls against a second referendum, has told the embassy separately that he fully expects, and would support, holding a second referendum in 2009. He explained his public posture of opposition to a second referendum as 'politically necessary' for the time being," the Ambassador said in a 'confidential' dispatch sent to his colleagues in Washington and across the EU.

Of course, a year later, when the Government secured concessions on Lisbon, Mr Gilmore and Labour did back the second referendum.

After the first referendum was rejected, however, Mr Gilmore said there was no question of the question being put a second time.

"The speculation that there will be a second bite at it—there won't be", he said on June 13th, the day of the Lisbon I count.

Mr. Gilmore told the Dail the following week the vote had to be fully respected.

"That is why there can be no question of going back to the people for a simple rerun of the Lisbon treaty", he said on June 18th.

And the Labour leader advised his col-

leagues in the European Socialists on June 19th against assuming a second referendum would be successful.

When French President Nicolas Sarkozy arrived in Dublin a month later, on July 21st, Mr Gilmore still held this position as he told him there was "no basis for believing that a second referendum would produce a result which is any different from the first one".

But in that same week in July, Mr Gilmore was presenting a different view to the US Embassy.

Mr. Foley wrote his cable on July 23rd—just two days after Mr Sarkozy met with the Yes and No campaigners in Dublin—where he presents Mr Gilmore's expectation of a second referendum and his "politically necessary" opposition to a second vote.

NEW LABOUR-SPEAK

"Mouth off as much as you want about Government policies and decisions—but be prepared to back them in the Dail.

"That was pretty much the stark message from Labour leader, Eamon Gilmore to backbenchers this week" (*Evening Echo*, Cork, July 23, 2011).

Mr. Gilmore said he and Enda Kenny had agreed that TDs would not be muzzled but that 'traps will be set for them'.

"I have cautioned my own backbenchers to understand that if they issue a press release on Friday about something, they may be facing a private members' motion in the House on Tuesday or Wednesday where they'll have to vote on the very same thing. They need to be aware that traps will be set", he said. (*ibid*).

His intervention came after Labour TDs sent out a barrage of press releases one Friday evening several weeks ago on the issue of Enterprise Minister Richard Bruton's stance on Wage agreements" (*ibid*).

THE HEALTH SYSTEM

The American Embassy in Dublin wrote to Washington warning visiting diplomats about the delays in Ireland's A&E wards—as they underlined the chronic overcrowding in the country's hospitals.

Embassy officials in Ireland regularly updated the US State Department on hospital overcrowding, writing last year that patients "can expect waits [of] up to 12 hours before being seen".

"It's not uncommon for persons to be treated in an emergency room or surrounding hallway", reads one cable—dating from January 2010—obtained by WikiLeaks and published by the *Irish Independent*.

Visitors from Washington were advised they would need to show extreme patience if they required medical attention while on any visits here.

with U.S. a draft copy of the agreement. Like McCoy, Sweeney believes that this is as good a deal as the unions could have reached in the current economic environment. He worries, though, whether IBEC can get its membership to approve the document. While some union reps have complained about the pay freezes, Sweeney estimates that inflation will fall below the projections used during the negotiations and that real wages will be significantly higher as a result. He also noted that the document does not substantially address non-wage issues, many of which are very important to his membership.

"8. (C) Sweeney said that the majority of the unions, with the exception of the "Trotskyites", will approve this deal. He said the worsening macroeconomic environment will make it easier to get approval because everybody wants certainty above all else. However, he noted that the union leadership intends to sell this as a shorter-than-customary transitional agreement designed to get the parties through a prolonged economic downturn in Ireland. Given this pitch, he said the unions will expect a better deal for labor in the next round of negotiations in 2010. In particular, he highlighted the issue of union recognition as being a key component of any future agreement and pointed out that the main opposition to this comes from the American Chamber of Commerce.

"9. (C) Sweeney dodged the question of whether the social partnership process was anachronistic, only admitting that it would likely have to evolve into something different. He did say that the recent negotiations were cordial (all the main players know each other quite well) but tense. He had nothing but praise for the way former Prime Minister Bertie Ahern had handled previous negotiations and, in a mild swipe at Prime Minister Brian Cowen said that, "the breakdown of talks in August would not have happened if Bertie were still Taoiseach (Prime Minister)".

Comment

"10. (C) We expect the agreement to be approved by all sides—not because the sides are happy with everything included (or not included) but because going back to the negotiating table raises the risk that a deal will never get done. With the Irish financial sector taking a beating and an historic turnaround in the government's fiscal situation for the worse, the government will not want to add labor unrest to the mix. The U.S. business community is watching the process with keen interest because economic stability is one of the key attractions for locating in Ireland. A breakdown in the social partnership model threatens this stability and could increase

the risk of investing here."

US STUNNED BY IRISH FARMER POWER

"Secret government cables reveal U.S. bewildered by reluctance of Ahern administration to rile farm lobby over GMOs and CAP (Irish Independent, 21.6.2011).

US Government officials were puzzled and bemused by the power of the farming lobby. US officials kept a watching brief on agricultural policy, including WTO negotiations, Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) reform and the Irish stance on genetically modified organisms (GMO).

One cable reveals that high, ranking Irish Government officials told the US Ambassador that Ireland could not afford to be more flexible in EU discussions on the WTO agricultural negotiations, given domestic political sensitivities with the farm community.

The Irish officials told the Ambassador of the "political dangers" if they reneged on EU commitments not to tamper with the CAP before Ireland's 2007 General Elections.

Another cable details a meeting between the US Ambassador and the then Minister for Enterprise, Trade, and Employment, Micheal Martin; Secretary General for Foreign Affairs, Dermot Gallagher and the Secretary General in the Department of the Taoiseach, Dermot McCarthy.

"The officials adopted the uniform line that the Government of Ireland (GOI) had previously promised the farm community that the CAP would not be revisited before 2013", wrote US officials. "The GOI had relied strongly on those promises to sell recent CAP reforms, and any renegeing on those commitments would be politically explosive ahead of the 2007 general elections in Ireland."

The cable continues: "The officials noted that while Ireland's 50,000 agricultural workers and their families were a community in conspicuous economic decline, they formed a political constituency that the Government was reluctant to rile in the run-up to the 2007 vote."

The Irish Government's staunch defence of the CAP in WTO negotiations clearly puzzled the Americans, who described the Irish position as "atypical", since the Irish Government "prefers to stand behind EU consensus on divisive U.S.-EU issues".

The officials added that Ireland's position was also "unusual" in view of the country's longstanding advocacy for developing countries.

Another cable details a meeting between American economic officials and their counterparts in the Economic Policy office

of the Taoiseach's Department. Irish officials told their American visitors that they were "preaching to the converted" in highlighting Ireland's potential gains from a Doha deal, particularly in services and manufacturing.

"They acknowledged that the Celtic Tiger period had pushed Ireland well beyond its former status as an agriculture-dominated society and that farm interests now figured less significantly in the overall economy", noted the Americans. However, the Irish officials insisted that farmers were "too important a political constituency to lose before the 2007 elections".

In a summary document, the Americans surmise that public statements in defence of the CAP from the then Taoiseach Bertie Ahern and Agriculture Minister Mary Coughlan "reflect, in part, decades-old reluctance within the governing Fianna Fail party to upset the farm community, the party's traditional base of support".

Bizarrely, the Americans also refer to the Great Famine as a possible reason for Ireland's reluctance to sacrifice Agriculture in favour of the Services and Manufacturing sectors.

"The 19th Century famine continues to make Ireland sensitive to increased dependence on foreign-sourced food", the cable concludes. (With the exception of potatoes imported from Israel, Edit.)

It describes the Irish Government reaction when US officials pointed out that a successful Doha round could take 300 million people out of poverty in the developing world: "They concede the point, but shrug, citing the political difficulties involved in confronting Irish farmers".

US officials also monitored the Irish attitude towards GMOs (Genetically Modified Organisms), including holding talks with Aidan O'Driscoll, Assistant Secretary in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. O'Driscoll wondered if the US understood the complexity of the issue for Ireland and other EU member states.

"As far as he is concerned, the question of Ireland's domestic stance on GMOs has been settled: Ireland will allow the import of GMOs, specifically feed, but will not produce them domestically. He said that this is a sensible political solution given that Irish farmers do not produce much grain but are quite reliant on beef exports, which depend heavily on GM feedstocks imported from the U.S.", noted the officials.

In a summary document, the Americans concluded that: "With a Green Party Environment Minister and junior Minister for Food, the Irish Government has gone about as far as it can go (at least publicly) on GMOs".

An earlier leak to 'The Guardian', UK showed

TRADE UNIONS

Below is an account from the *Irish Independent* (2.6.2011) on the US stance on the Trade Union movement and Social Partnership, it is followed by the actual cable as it was distributed by WikiLeaks themselves.

"America's top diplomat in Ireland told Washington that a breakdown in Ireland's social partnership model would increase the risk to investors here, according to a leaked US embassy cable.

"Other leaked cables showed how the US position on social partnership changed over the years, with diplomats coming round to the view that it was good for the economy.

"Then ambassador Thomas Foley issued a stark warning about the dangers of breakdown after a partnership agreement was struck in September, 2008, following a tough round of talks between the government, employers and unions.

"Just more than a year later, the Social Partnership system effectively collapsed when the Government and unions could not reach agreement on how to cut €1 billion from the public pay bill.

"An October, 2008, cable revealed the American Embassy attached much importance to the social partnership process.

"Mr. Foley briefed the office of then U.S. secretary of state, Condoleezza Rice that a breakdown of the social partnership model would threaten economic stability, which he described as 'one of the key reasons for the huge inflow of U.S.-sourced investment.

"Mr. Foley's fears had been stoked two months earlier during a meeting he had with then Tanaiste Mary Coughlan.

"In a cable marked 'confidential', he wrote that Ms. Coughlan was 'particularly worried' at the time that 'trade unions might adopt aggressive tactics, which could deter prospective foreign investors'.

"During the Celtic Tiger period, a previous U.S. ambassador questioned the need for having a social partnership agreement.

"In an April, 2006, cable, ambassador James Kenny described the original rationale for social partnership—moderate wage growth to make Ireland more attractive for foreign direct investment—as 'outmoded'.

"The Ireland of 2006, with full employment, low inflation, and steady growth, is a healthy economy, where labour and business presumably could work out the terms of employment through direct negotiations', he observed.

"However, Mr. Kenny was able to appreciate why partnership was still important in Ireland.

"The partnership process nevertheless retains its relevance for its psychologically reassuring message that Ireland is a

country of consensus. and a good place for business', he said.

"Mr. Kenny expressed these opinions after speaking to former Irish Congress of Trade Unions general secretary Peter Cassells, who told him social partnership agreements were central to Ireland's economic success at the time" (*Irish Independent*, 2.6.2011).

The WikiLeaks Cable:

CABLE REFERENCE ID: #08DUBLIN545

Subject *Ireland's Social Partnership Deal's Good Enough—For Now*

Origin *Embassy Dublin (Ireland)*

Cable time

Wed, 1 Oct 2008 12:25 UTC

Classification *CONFIDENTIAL*

Source <http://wikileaks.org/cable/2008/10/08DUBLIN545.html>

History *First published on Fri, 22 Jul 2011 21:39 UTC Media?*

SUBJECT: *IRELAND'S SOCIAL PARTNERSHIP DEAL'S GOOD*

Classified By: *PEO Chief Ted Pierce. Reasons 1.4 (b/d).*

1. (C) Summary: On September 18 the parties to the Social Partnership talks (principally business groups and trade unions) agreed on a provisional deal that, among other things, would freeze public sector wages for the next 11 months. A leading business representative told U.S. this is the best deal his membership could have hoped for given the tight economic situation. A representative from one of the leading unions agreed but added that trade union members will be expecting "a better deal" at the next round of talks in 2010. Both said that the current agreement is meant to get the nation through what looks to be a very sharp downturn for the Irish economy. It is now up to the government to "officially" present the draft to all concerned parties for an up-or-down vote. The American business community is watching the outcome of the talks closely because a breakdown of the social partnership model threatens Irish economic stability—one of the key reasons for the huge inflow of U.S.-sourced investment. End summary.

Social Partnership—What is it?

"2. (U) The Social Partnership process describes the (roughly) triennial discussions to reach voluntary agreements on workplace-related topics, most importantly wages. The government, the business community (represented by the Irish business and Employers Confederation (IBEC)), and the trade unions (represented, in part, by the Irish Congress of Trade Unions (ICTU)) participate in the talks. The first social partnership agreement was reached in 1987 and is often credited with being one of the sparks that ignited the Irish economic rebound. The government's role is to act as facilitator of the

process and to draft and present the official agreement for final approval by the parties.

The Deal

"3. (SBU) Under the terms of a deal covering the next 21 months, the participants in the social partnership talks agreed to halt public sector wage hikes for the 11 months, freeze private-sector, unionized workers pay for three months, and, according to the Irish Department of Enterprise, Trade, and Employment website, "set up a process to develop a national framework on the employment and rights of temporary agency workers". Given that the Irish government is expected to run a substantial budget deficit in 2008 and 2009, tax cuts, a key component of previous deals, are not included in this agreement.

The business Community

"4. (C) *Econoff* spoke to Danny McCoy, head of policy at IBEC and lead negotiator for the business community, who said that this was about the best deal his constituency could have hoped for in the uncertain economic environment. Initially, union representatives wanted pay increases tied to "unrealistically high" rates of inflation but ultimately had to settle for a hike of just over four percent for the 21-month period. McCoy said this was slightly above what his membership had indicated it had budgeted for 2009.

"5. (C) McCoy said that IBEC would be able to get its membership to back the agreement but was not sanguine that the private-sector unions could convince their members. He explained that there is much confusion about what was actually agreed on the pay deal and demonstrated—in great detail—that the public-sector pay pause would not actually kick in until late 2009. For this reason, he reasoned that the government would have little difficulty getting the public sector unions to fall in line.

"6. (C) McCoy agreed that, as union membership declines, the social partnership model may become unnecessary in the near future. For now, though, he said that "the best thing about the current deal is that there was a deal" and that the markets would have reacted poorly to a collapse in negotiations. He warned that, as a sop to the unions, the government in the next few years, "will likely put restrictions on the use of agency (temporary) workers", to the detriment of Irish business. However, he doesn't foresee that the government will enact any kind of statutory union recognition—a move strongly opposed by the American business community.

The Unions

"7. (C) *Econoff* met with Paul Sweeney, economic advisor to ICTU, who played a key role in the negotiations and shared

WIKI-LEAKS continued

the documents are themselves genuine, it does not always mean that the analysis and gossip reported in the cables are always correct.

By its very nature, field reporting to Washington is often candid and based on incomplete information. It is not an expression of policy, nor does it always shape final policy decisions.

These American diplomats have been trained to listen, probe and prod, milk sources, report and write—sometimes under witty and elegant headlines (one cable relating to the deepening fiscal crisis here was titled: *The Irish Economy—As Black as the Guinness*).

"Almost all of the time, they view Irish men and women simply through the reflected mirror of U.S. strategic interests and policy" (*Irish Ind.* 31.5.2011).

The US is routinely given access to sensitive information by the highest levels of the Irish government through an extensive network of official—but highly confidential—contacts.

American officials count Government Ministers, senior civil servants and top diplomats among "*confidential*" sources, the leaked US Embassy cables reveal.

Their activities are disclosed in the Ireland Cables—1,900 classified documents from the whistleblowing organisation WikiLeaks.

Roughly half the cables—dating from the Air India disaster in 1985 to the Vatican response to the Murphy Report into the sexual abuse scandal in the Archdiocese of Dublin in February 2010—originate from the US Embassy in Dublin. The rest are sourced from Embassies and Consulates across the globe.

One leaked cable reveals how former Minister and current Fianna Fail Vice-President Mary Hanafin briefed the American Embassy on tense ongoing coalition negotiations.

The word "PROTECT" appears beside her name in the cable, meaning her identity and/or her comments were not to be made public.

MINISTER HANAFIN

Ms Hanafin confirmed she gave the briefing at the behest of US Ambassador Dan Rooney.

According to the dispatch, Ms Hanafin made a number of derogatory comments about her Green Party coalition partners.

"She said she had the impression that, if some of the Greens had their way, the Programme for Government would

emphasize 'hares, stags and badgers while everyone else in the country is drowning in this economy'."

Other cables reveal the ease of access the US has to the top levels of successive Irish Governments—often being briefed on matters of huge public interest prior to the Opposition or the Irish people.

Much of this information was shared with US officials via high-ranking Irish civil servants and diplomats. And stringent efforts were made to keep the identities of these contacts under wraps.

The language used in the cables is diplomatic. But sometimes the mask slips a little, giving a telling insight into how the US State Department views Ireland, all set within the context of its own strategic interests.

Among the highlights in the cables are the following:

- * The United States government closely monitors the country's main mosques amid American concern over alleged Islamic 'extremists' operating in Ireland, leaked embassy cables reveal.
- * The IRA retained active support around the world right up until it finally put its arms beyond use.
- * The United States warned the Government that Ireland would be seen as a "*haven for terrorists*" unless it extradited the Colombia Three.
- * Former Taoiseach Bertie Ahern was "*generally considered softer*" on the Provisional republican movement than either of his two key Cabinet Ministers during the Northern peace talks.
- * Fianna Fail officials privately admitted they would be the last party to form a government with Sinn Fein—at the same time as they were negotiating to push the DUP into a power-sharing deal at Stormont.
- * US diplomats delivered a damning assessment of Ireland's ailing health system in leaked embassy cables.

Below, we publish items which dwell on the Labour and Trade Union movement mentioned in the WikiLeaks cables.

"SPILLAGE" NOT "HACKING" THANK GOODNESS!

"*It was the biggest spillage of U.S. secrets in history*", allegedly carried out by a 23-year old US Army Intelligence analyst at a Baghdad, Iraq military base.

If convicted, the officer, Bradley Manning faces 52 years in prison.

The key issue in the whole story is Manning's motivation.

He allegedly leaked the files, not for financial gain, recklessness or malice, but because he genuinely believed he saw

wrongdoing in occupied Iraq—15 detainees were arrested by the Iraqi Federal Police for printing anti-Iraqi literature.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

So we ask: "*Has Julian Assange and WikiLeaks contributed to the Freedom of the Press?*"

Maurice Hayes doesn't think so and Maurice was a one-time Director in Independent News & Media PLC, publishers of the *Irish Independent*.

"That said, one can only be struck by the banality and essential triviality of most of the information that was being collected and transmitted, little that could not be gleaned, much less expensively, from the better newspapers. One is struck, too, by the lack of selectivity or quality control in collection and analysis, the sheer overload of information, and wonders who has the time to read it all at the receiving end.

"The wider issue is what hacking of this sort and the wider dissemination of the information so purloined will do to the way in which civil servants and diplomats do their jobs, and to the wider public interest. It is a sad, if unforeseen, consequence of the Freedom of Information Act that there is now less information to access. Civil servants have resorted to not writing down what should have been recorded, or to using Post-It notes, which can be stripped from files. Applied to diplomacy this leads to lack of documentation and an impoverishment of the archive which future historians will curse. In the short term, it discourages candour and honest expression of opinion" (Maurice Hayes, *Irish Ind.* 13.6.2011).

One month later, the *Irish Independent* got upon its high horse to moralise on hacking at the *News of the World*:

"Here was a newspaper that was quite clearly out of control and whose senior management were, at the very least, prepared to condone serious wrong-doing in pursuit of a 'scoop'.

"Not only is listening in on people's voicemails illegal it is utterly immoral. Perpetrating such a gross violation of someone's privacy is never justified, no matter how juicy or salacious the story may be.

"Other journalists would be well-advised to learn the lessons of the affair. If we journalists seek to hold others to account for failing to adhere to the highest standards then we must expect to suffer the consequences when we fall short of those same standards" (*Irish Ind.* 8.7.2011).

But "*Spillage*" is not the same as "*Hacking*"? And what of hacking by our own security agencies and their old friends in MI5? It goes on every day!

continued on page 30



"Nations have neither permanent friends nor permanent enemies, only permanent interests"

George Canning

WikiLeaks and Labour

On 28th November 2010, five major newspapers—*The Guardian*, *The New York Times*, *Der Spiegel*, *Le Monde* and *El Pais*—dominated global headlines when they published a selection of cables that provided readers worldwide with what WikiLeaks described as "an unprecedented insight into U.S. government foreign activities".

The WikiLeaks database made available to the five newspapers comprised 251,187 cables from 280 US Embassies and Consulates in 180 countries across the globe.

At that point just 11 cables—all originating in Dublin—had been published.

"The Ireland cables were obtained by the *Irish Independent* through an arrangement with whistle-blowing organisation WikiLeaks that involved no financial transaction or any monetary obligations on either side." (31.5.2011).

An arrangement was reached with WikiLeaks, essentially boiling down to an agreed understanding on the terms and condition of publication, including redacting (*editing*), where necessary, the material and compliance with a security protocol to protect and handle the sensitive information at our disposal.

"We were able to begin the long, at times infuriating but ultimately fascinating process of trawling through the entire cache of just over 1,900 cables relating to Ireland by the first week of last month" (*Irish Independent*, 31.5.2011).

SECRECY

The cables are divided into five different categories; SECRET/NOFORN (not for foreigners' eyes); SECRET; CONFIDENTIAL/NOFORN; CONFIDENTIAL and UNCLASSIFIED.

The SECRET cables were an obvious starting point. This category only covered a limited number of themes; the spread of nuclear material and military exports to

countries considered unsavoury, such as Iran and Syria.

The bulk of the *Irish Independent* stories came from the 'confidential' documents. Some of these will scandalize, others will simply confirm long-held opinions and prejudices about the nature of Ireland's relationship with the US and the wider world. But almost all will provide new and telling insights into the behind-the-scenes politicking and horse-trading that goes on behind the closed doors of international diplomacy.

The *Irish Independent* published the cables (31.5.2011) just a week after the outpouring of pro-US sentiment that accompanied Barack Obama's on his first visit to this country. The Irish cache gives an unprecedented insight into the true nature of our relationship with the U.S..

It is clear from the cables Ireland enjoys a very 'special relationship' with Washington.

But this does not appear to be a relationship of equals.

In the global political arena, our own interests generally mirror that of the US,

and this is vividly reflected in the Ireland Cables.

In these instances, it is arguably extremely beneficial to have the world's most powerful political and military machine in your corner.

But on those occasions when our interests diverge, the US State Department is never shy about showing their displeasure.

Most of the time, particularly when it comes to something of strategic importance to the US, Irish Governments appear unwilling to stand up to its much bigger and powerful ally.

SHANNON AIRPORT

Shannon Airport is a good example. The cables reveal several Government Ministers expressed reservations about claims from human rights groups that the airport was being used to transit controversial rendition missions.

But, tellingly, they never pushed the issue too hard or took any action that would threaten the economic benefits of the US military's use of Shannon.

We had a good example of this during President Obama's visit in May, with the using of Shannon Airport for American military and Imperial expeditions, regardless of circumstances despite ongoing accusations about the transport of so-called terror suspects.

According to the cables, there was a high level willingness to provide detailed briefings to the Americans on delicate issues both at home and abroad.

This cosy relationship extended to a Cabinet member providing detailed information on sensitive coalition negotiations, Ministers promising to advance US interests at EU level and our own Ambassadors briefing American officials in sensitive trouble spots around the world.

It is also important to stress that, while

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

33 Athol Street, Belfast BT12 4GX 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>