

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

May 2011

Vol.26, No.5 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.25 No.5 ISSN 954-5891

*Queen to visit on 37th anniversary of the
Dublin/Monaghan Bombings of 17th May 1974*

Of Vampires And Other Blood-Suckers

Attention Shoneens. Let you all rise up and unite, for your hour is nigh. Unfurl your brightest banners and raise them aloft. Reach under the bed. Take out those medals. Make sure your shoes are shiny. Heels together. Toes at an angle of forty-five degrees. Arms held tight to the sides. Thumbs in lines with the seams of the trousers. Salute with right palm exposed Learn how to curtsy, bow and scrape. For the news has broken. She is to come amongst us. On the seventeenth of May, 2011. The Queen of England is on her way. All cackling ghouls rejoice. Oh, the Somme, the Somme. Some are put out of pain by this. Others have had their pain increased. The sale of drink will soar, for diametrically opposed reasons. She is to be the guest of said nation. Many citizens believe Her domain still includes part of said nation. Some will be drinking 'for' Her. Most will be drinking 'because' of Her. I might have one or two, myself. Poppies will come into bloom, early, too. But, where will She go? Her itinerary is unknown to me. Nobody told me. Though I admit this does give me the hump, it is not the reason that I am the way I am. Other matters impinge.

It is all so full of pathos. Bathos, too. By the seventeenth of May 1916, fifteen of the leaders of the Easter Rising had been executed. Casement still awaited the hangman. By then, fourteen bodies had been put into unmarked, quick-lime graves, in a corner to the rear of a little known British Army burial ground in Arbour Hill. Consigned to oblivion. (Thomas Kent had been executed and buried in Cork.) All this was done in the name of the ancestors of She who is to come among us. May, it seems, is a wicked month.

'Irish' elements of the British Army (I'll spare blushes and not name them) had been employed to put down the Rising. Even more ingloriously, they had supplied the Firing Squads, too. The final indignity. Tried by British Army Officers. Sentenced to death.

continued on page 2

European Union:

Don't mention the war!

"Irishwoman Catherine Day, the secretary general of the EU Commission, said the "shine" had gone off Ireland in Europe, and we had lost goodwill. People did not believe the Irish were "good Europeans" anymore" (Irish Times, 2 April, 2011).

This is undoubtedly true and some prominent EU-philes here have been so shocked by recent developments that they have had to think seriously about the European project for the first time. John Bruton is one of these. He had a long piece in the Irish Examiner to give us his thoughts. So he begins at the beginning: "*I hope to show this project has deep roots in post-war European history. It is part of a process to build a structure of peace and stability in Europe based on deep integration of European economies with one another*" (Irish Examiner, 7.3.2011).

Straightaway, John gives us the usual palaver about post-Second World War peace—as if nobody planned to have a structure for peace in Europe before that. But why start in 1946? The project was founded because of what had happened before 1946 and therefore it would be

continued on page 12, column 3

LIBYA:

When Is Regime Change Not Regime Change?

In a written answer in Dáil Éireann on 14th April 2011, Foreign Minister, Eamon Gilmore, said:

"Calling for Colonel Gaddafi to relinquish power does not amount to actively seeking regime change".

That remark is beyond parody. If the Qadhafi regime is no longer in power in Libya, the regime will have changed. So when, earlier in his answer, he said that

"Colonel Qadhafi and his family should surrender power and leave the political stage in order to allow the Libyan people to peacefully determine their future", he was seeking regime change—and arrogantly deciding on the Libyan people's behalf that their future must exclude Colonel Qadhafi and his family.

Libyan Foreign Minister, Abdul Ati al-Obeidi, was quoted in the *Guardian* on

20th April as saying:

"The US, Britain and France—sometimes those countries contradict themselves. They talk about democracy, but when it comes to Libya, they say he {Qadhafi} should leave. It should be up to the Libyan people. This should not be dictated from any other head of state. It is against the principle of democracy."

Minister al-Obeidi should add Ireland to his list of countries contradict themselves.

(Gilmore was replying to an interesting question from Fine Gael Deputy, Eoghan Murphy, who asked for "*details of all those Heads of State outside of the Euro-*

continued on page 14

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Queen's Visit On 37th Anniversary Of Dublin/Monaghan Bombing.	
Lt. Col. John Morgan	1
Don't Mention The War. Jack Lane on the EU History Project	1
Libya: When Is Regime Change Not Regime Change? David Morrison	1
Readers' Letters: Some Musings On The McCarthy Report. Eamon Dyas	
Gambling Debts? Conor Lynch	3
Editorial Digest. (Queen Of England; Northern Elections; Constable Kerr)	4,22
Unpublished Letters: <i>Embracing the Monarchy. Forgetting The Past.</i>	
<i>History Howler.</i> Donal Kennedy	5,35
Queen's Visit. Pat Walsh looks back Queen Victoria and John Redmond	5
Poems. <i>What's In A Name?. At Traitor's Gate. 1981.</i> Wilson John Haire	7,15,35
Moriarty Report On Michael Lowry. John Martin	7
The Gaddafi Creed. Report	15
Shorts from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (Moriarty Squeaks; Haughey's 'Corruption'; Denis O'Brien; Beauty Contest; Fianna Fail On Moriarty; Honeymoon; Revealing Pictures; Totalitarian Liberalism)	16
Talking Down The Irish Economy. Report: John The Optimist.	
Garret FitzGerald (Transcription and note by Philip O'Connor).	17
Exports Up! John Martin	18
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (Libya; Selling History; Gorbachev)	21
On Peter Hart And Other Matters. Jeffrey Dudgeon (Letter)	25
A Unionist Going South. Brendan Clifford (Reply)	26
Fintan O'Toole Reflects. Editorial	28
A Question Of Jewish Identity. Wilson John Haire	29
Bolshevism From Larkin To Lozovsky. Manus O'Riordan (Part 2)	30
Naval Warfare. Pat Walsh (Part 10)	34
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (The Law; Violence And The Law; Marriage)	36

Labour Comment, edited by Pat Maloney:

Connolly And Pilsudski

(back page)

Dispatched by fellow-Irishmen. Rushed, hastily, to their graves. Buried without a loved one present. In twos, threes and fours; One by himself; day by day at dawn they were shot and put under. The only kindness seems to have come from an occasional English soldier on guard-duty in Kilmainham Goal. Let it be said, too, that the prisoners were permitted religious ministrations before being executed. That was all. Soon the daisies would sprout. It would all be over. Forgotten. How wrong can you be?

I doubt that Talbot Street, Parnell Street or South Leinster Street will be on the visitation list. Or The Diamond in Monaghan town. These were the sites of the horrific bombing of the Seventeenth of May 1974, conducted under the aegis of the British Army and Intelligence Services (MI5) and utilising Irish Loyalist personnel of the UVF and UDA, as the pseudo-gang. (A system the British had initiated and perfected during the 'Mau Mau' war in Kenya.)

In the Dublin/Monaghan Bombings,

they had sought the maximum random killing of innocent civilians. Thirty-four, in all, perished. A coincidental bus strike in Dublin prevented a bigger blood-bath. Now, the anniversary of the Seventeenth of May, grotesquely, we'll witness the honoured presence in Ireland of the Commander-in-Chief of the Security Forces responsible. I believe She should be invited to the commemoration ceremony in Talbot Street. There She could apologise. In which case it should, I believe, be accepted. Atonement could begin. Perhaps it is all part of a master-stroke. Though I, for one, won't be holding my breath. I'll believe in the Moving Statues before I believe in that. (By now, 1400 hours on 31st March, all mention of the visitation planned for the Seventeenth of May has ceased on the Television news. Yesterday's gushing announcement has been replaced by silence.)

Is this all a gaffe or is it intentionally malign? The latter is hard to believe. The outrageous, inconsiderate date selection for the visit in question shows an in-

sensitivity that is bordering on the unbelievable. Any rational being would have deemed this as inappropriate. It is so bewildering, so unconscionable, that it beggars belief. But the Seventeenth of May is the date that has been officially proclaimed. One wonders if the seeds of self-destruction will grow and choke this awful infliction. Surely, at least, they will have to change the date. Or has all sense of pride, or propriety, been lost. Either way, heads are sure to roll. What will She say when She finds out? Who would be the one who walked Her into this? It is a rare one. Will the Tower of London be re-activated? What about Dublin Castle? Do I hear the clink of keys? Could it all be serendipity gone mad? Or does it matter, anymore?

The Dublin/Monaghan atrocity occurred while the Ulster Workers' Council Strike, designed to scupper the Sunningdale Agreement, raged in the North. There was mayhem there. The striking loyalists ruled the roost. The British Security Forces—stood by on Red Alert, as the region teetered on the brink. The whole political system of the UK was under threat. Mr. Wilson, the elected Prime Minister, was powerless. His wings were clipped. He was out of favour with the Securitat. Decisive action was beyond him. He'd face mutiny and political downfall. The Securitat and the USW Strikers had the same objective. Sunningdale would have to go. There was the nod and the wink. Strikers struck and the Securitat watched over all, in a type of hidden benignity.

In the Republic, at the time, it transpired that there was an absolute, inexplicable absence of any security. It is mind-boggling. Turmoil north of the Border. Sleepy valley to the South. The threat of car-bombings, emanating from the Six Counties, was a stand-out. Near a certainty. Dublin, the capital, and Border towns, such as Monaghan, were obvious targets. There had been paradigms. The British Securitat, too, along with some misguided key Garda Chiefs, desired harsher State action in the Republic against Republican paramilitaries. They would force the hand of the Government.

They were foolish. Here existed a dire necessity for a Red Alert in the Republic. The Border towns in the Republic could be cordoned by a system of check-points. The Boyne Bridges (10) could be similarly dealt with. So could the northern and north-western approaches to Dublin. Mobile patrols could link these three security lines. Psyops could be employed.

The media could, in a generality, convey the inaccessibility of Dublin and the Border towns to car-bomb attacks. It was all so easy.

But none of this was done. All stayed dormant. It was as if an invitation was being extended. *Fáilte*. It was accepted.

In this environment, a major military incursion was conducted. It was a conventional, professional operation. It involved a Main Attack (three Bombs) on Dublin, followed by a Supporting Attack (one bomb) on Monaghan, in order to create a diversion to enable all the Dublin participants to gain safe haven, back in the North.

It would never have been attempted but for the absence of any security in the Republic. The bombers knew it was non-existent. They knew it would stay so. They had collaborators in key positions in the Republic. It all went according to plan. In the fraught environment that existed; where mobs roamed and ruled; while anarchy let loose; a covert military operation—several months in the making—was launched. It penetrated through the heartland of the Republic, down to Dublin. It completed its business there. Unhindered. It withdrew successfully. Then ninety minutes later—still unhindered—it gained Monaghan town and bombed it, too. It is all quite mad. How could this happen? Why was it let happen?

British military and Intelligence ran the whole operation. Their main man straddled both services. He is well known. He is 'The Vampire Sans Merci'. He has been invited, on two occasions, by the Queen of England to Bucks Palace. There she has decorated him with an MBE and an OBE.

Loyalist paramilitaries constituted the pseudo-gang. They were mainly UVF members, from Portadown, though some UDA personnel were involved, too. All of them are well known to the authority. Quite a few are now dead. But some quite notorious ones remain.

At least five vehicles were used in the Main Attack on Dublin. These included the three bomb-cars (taken that morning in East Belfast) and two getaway cars. The cars retained their number-plates, so that, later, the finger would point to Belfast rather than to Portadown, which was the centre of the operation

All penetrated down from the North to Dublin, through a labyrinth of second-class roads (The Smugglers' Route) through Monaghan/Louth, crossing the Boyne at Oldbridge, aka The Obelisk

Some musings on the McCarthy Report

We have a situation where the State has incurred debt due to a loan from the IMF/ECB and, as a condition of that loan, it must show itself not only capable of paying back that loan but paying it back in a way that destroys the current State/private profile of the economy. In order to do that it must reduce the State sector to a fragment to what it was. Not only that but it must also get rid of thousands of civil servants directly employed by the Government. This is supposed to be balanced in some magical way (*a la* Cameron in the UK) by the emergence of thousands of new jobs in the private sector funded by the 'Investment for Jobs' programme. This is a gamble of massive proportions—almost on a par with the gambling instincts of the Finance sector that has got us where we are. Although we don't know what will happen with regards to the end result of the magical 'Investment for Jobs' programme (that, after all, is the gamble), we do know for certain that a number of things will inevitably happen in the first stage of letting this Geni out of the bottle and these have a direct implication for the Government and its ability to pay back the debt.

Firstly, presumably the services now 'freed' from the constraints of State involvement (those supplied by the ESB, Bord Gas, Bord na Mona, Aer Lingus, etc.—I notice that CIE isn't mentioned) will still be deemed to be marketable by whoever purchases them. But to realize that marketability will require a cut in costs and will inevitably involve either a cut in wages or workforce (or more likely, both). So the new situation brought about by the commercialisation of these services will not result in a like-for-like arrangement in terms of either job numbers or wage/salary payments to the new workforce.

Secondly, there will have to be a significant outlay in redundancy packages paid for by the Government to fund this commercial 'freedom'.

Thirdly, there will be a loss of tax income for the Government from the shedding of the 'surplus' employees and also from the reduction in the payment to those lucky enough to be kept on by their new commercial masters.

Fourthly, this does not include those thousands of jobs that will be lost from cutting the central Government workforce. Again this will involve the payment of redundancy and the loss of revenue through the non-existent payment of income tax from those thousands of jobs now gone.

Fifthly, on top of all of this will be the ongoing, and for an indefinite period, heavier payout in unemployment benefit, rent support and whatever other social underpinning costs that goes into assisting the newly created unemployed.

I wonder what the net benefit to the Government will be if these costs (not to say the inevitable hidden health costs that come with unemployment) are offset against the income from the sale of these assets—a hell of a lot less than the headline figure I bet.

Eamon Dyas

Gambling Debts?

Brian Lenihan, Fianna Fail Finance Spokesman, has stated: *"To be constantly demanding the dishonour of our debt, as some TDs do, is not good for this country, does not help its interests, and is a form of economic treason."* He is quite right. But the crucial words are *"our debt"*. If the Government borrows money on behalf of the Irish people, it must, of course, pay it back. But what about debts run up by foreign banks and bondholders? These are not *"our"* debts. They are gambling debts. It is argued that if we do not compensate these people they will not lend again. Yes they will. They are as much gambling addicts as the man coming out of the betting shop, except he cannot go to the Government to recoup his losses.

Former German Foreign Minister, Joschka Fischer, has said:

"In the backrooms of Dublin it was our state-owned Landesbanks earning all the money to the delight of our state governments of all political persuasions. No one tells the people here that part. I don't see in this a master plan, but a bit of the reality is being kept from view. Ireland could have gotten away well if Brian Cowen had said 'we will save Irish banks, but English banks and German banks are not our problem'"

Paying people's inflated mortgages is another proposal doing the rounds and supported by the *Sunday Independent*. What exactly happened back then? For a long time houses were indeed seen as commodities, but only in the sense that if at some future point the house was to be sold it could be sold at a profit. They were bought for living in. The 90s were different. Houses were bought with the aim of selling them on as soon as possible for profit.

Many people knew the the houses and apartments were being sold for ridiculous prices—the multiple of the buyer's salary showed all these people that the prices were, to say the least, way over the top. But the hope was that they could be sold quickly to someone else who was prepared to pay even more, with the banks throwing money at people. People knew very well that eventually the music would stop in this complicated 'pass the parcel' game. And it did stop. But the people caught in the end were playing the same game and hoping for the same results as their predecessors.

They took a gamble and now they too want a bail out. They should be made to continue paying and not allowed to declare themselves bankrupt. For the most part they are far from the worst off in society—indeed they type of people who run and write for the *Sunday Independent*. There is, of course the problem of dependents. Fine, let them grow up. But let them only inherit if they to continue to pay up. Society, as society, has no responsibility for the casino years.

Conor Lynch

Bridge. They proceeded to *rendezvous* at the Car Park of the Coachman's Inn, near Dublin Airport.

Meanwhile, Robin Jackson, aka The Jackal, a notorious paramilitary loyalist killer, had also gained the same Car Park. He had collected the three Dublin bombs in a farm-stead, well known to all and sundry, in Glennane, in South Armagh. In his chicken-truck, now bomb-laden, he crossed the Boyne at Oldbridge and made for the Coachman's Inn. (It had also been rehearsed, over and over, down the previous months.) There, in the Car Park, the three bombs were transferred to the three bomb-cars. The Jackal returned north.

The three bomb-cars, one by one, entered the city traffic-flow. They made their way, as rehearsed, to the city centre. They entered their selected city streets. They parked their cars, as planned. The removed the bomb-dowels. Time-systems were then in motion. The setting was 1730 hours. It was now 1715 hours, approx. The bombers withdrew. They proceeded quickly to a *rendezvous*, boarded a getaway car and returned north.

It had all been well thought out. The bombs were proportionate in size to the respective bomb-streets' traffic densities. The three streets were parallel. They ran east-west. All led from busy thoroughfares to rail and bus stations (Busarus, Tara Street Station, Pearse Station, Connolly Station). The streets were sufficiently far apart as to ensure that, if one bomb was located, the others would not be readily discovered, in the follow-up street-clearing. Not in sufficient time, anyway.

The detonation time, 1730 hours (peak city rush-hour), was chosen to ensure crowded streets and high casualties. However, the bus-strike—not a planning factor—helped diminish the awful cost. But for it, the slaughter would have been even more horrific. There was no warning. Naturally. Errors had been avoided. Shape and symmetry had been preserved. All three bombs could have been placed in Talbot Street, but this would have increased the risk of discovery. A bomb could have been placed in Henry Street. Many more lives would have been taken there. But, shape would have been lost. The dividing line between clean and dirty would have been violated. The bombers' withdrawal to a *rendezvous* in the clean (West-side) area, for their getaway, would have been jeopardised. But such pit-falls were seen. Professionalism ruled. It worked a treat. The blind-eye collusion in the Republic was vital, too.

I know it all sounds quite insane, but these are the facts. It gets worse. Ninety minutes later, at 1900 hours, a car-bomb exploded outside Greacen's Pub in The Diamond, in Monaghan town. This was the Supporting Attack. The bomb was assembled in the home of a loyalist terrorist, Harris Boyle, in Portadown. (He was killed later, along with Wesley Somerville, when their own bomb exploded prematurely in The Miami Showband massacre.) The bomb was transported to the Border. It was now positioned, most probably, at Ward's Cross. There The Vampire armed it.

It was now 1830 hours, approximately. One hour after Dublin had been devastated. But the Republic was still wide open. The Monaghan bombers drove the bomb into the Republic. (The Vampire remained in the Six Counties.) They had a bomb-car and a getaway car. After some mis-adventures, they parked the bomb-car at Greacen's Pub and returned North in the getaway car. As they crossed the Border, at 1900 hours, their bomb exploded in Monaghan. They had had a free run. The Vampire must have smiled in satisfaction.

The ready accessibility of Monaghan is the sorest point of all. The town lay there, all that time, a sitting duck. The Vampire had been a frequent visitor there. He had a special relationship with a Branchman in the town. A witness identified him as having armed the Monaghan bomb. He had been assisted by an officer of the Ulster Defence Regiment.

The State has all of this information. Its relevant principals have all be made aware of the situation by me. I have given evidence to the Barron Enquiry. As a reward for my endeavours, the Barron Enquiry misrepresented me grievously in its eventual Report. It put me at some risk too. Judge Barron, a former Supreme Court Judge, had erred badly. We fought it out in subsequent correspondence, wherein I had made complaints. Barron backed down. He agreed that he had erred in the matters complained of. He published two pages of *Errata* in a subsequent Report. I had won. But my victory was a Pyrrhic one. Had he not retracted, I believe he knew he was going back to the Courts. I was bringing him there. Into the dock. There, the whole Dublin/Monaghan outrage could have been teased out. He knew that. But I was deprived of my opportunity. He backed down. He published the *Errata*. Expert lawyers informed me I no longer had a case. I'm sure they were right. I was back to square one as regards bringing the true facts into the public domain. Ignored.

I am in a possession of a letter (copy), written by Mr. Michael McDowell SC, the former Minister for Justice. It deals with the Dublin/Monaghan atrocity. It shows some naivete, along with the hard-headed, hard-hitting style of expression so typical of the man. He states, without any nonsense:

"...From what I can see, there can be little doubt but that the car bombs in question were assembled with the active assistance of members of British Intelligence. It would be hard to believe that the Loyalist Paramilitaries had the expertise and the capacity to manufacture car bombs 20 years ago; but do not have and somehow lost that capacity in the intervening years... this suggests, in turn, that they must have had outside assistance in making the bombs. Discounting, as I do, the possibility that the IRA assembled the bombs for the Loyalists, the only available candidate is British Intelligence..."

But, did he tell Barron? If not, why not? Must the little people always fight the battles? Alone.

Another consideration is the institutionalised sectarianism of the monarchy, which is anathema to all pluralists and places the Queen of England beyond the pale.

But, above all, the British authorities have always refused proper cooperation in bringing out the facts over the Dublin/Monaghan Bombing. Important files have been withheld. So, when the head of that State is given the full honours of the Irish State on the very day that the Bombings took place, I wonder has the world gone mad!

John Morgan

Lt.-Col. Morgan (retired) has produced a military analysis of the Dublin/Monaghan Bombing which is in the course of publication

Editorial Digest

The Queen of England

Jeffrey Dudgeon of the Ulster Unionist Party is attempting to win one of the Seanad seats allocated to Trinity College. Referring to Queen Elizabeth's proposed visit to the Garden of Remembrance he said: "It is a very heavy imposition on a British monarch to have to venerate those who waged war on her people and armed forces." *Brian Ervine* of the PUP (which is connected with UVF), and admirer of both Dudgeon and the UUP "*said he would like to see a serious consideration by the Republic to rejoining the Commonwealth in return for the Queen's gesture*" (News Letter, 9th April). He is in the company of David Norris, John Bruton, and a good few others.

John Stokes is a publican in Fairview, Dublin. Some time ago he hung a large banner outside his pub saying the Queen of England would not be welcome there. The Garda took great exception to this and launched a campaign of harassment. Stokes gave a very good account of himself on the Joe Duffy show on RTE radio, in the teeth of sarcasm and opposition from Duffy and his followers.

The Gardai then threatened to have Stokes' late license removed through the courts. Stokes, never a member of any political organisation, then removed the banner, though he continued to sell T-shirts opposing the Queen's visit, and that seemed to be the end of the matter. Then on the night of the 8th of April, a large force of armed Gardai and Special Branch raided the pub and arrested John Stokes and two members of his family.

The police claimed to have "found" a few bullets and some cocaine in an outhouse at the back of the pub. Stokes was well known for his opposition to the drugs trade—which is more than can be said for quite a few members of the Gardai! As the Queen's visit approaches it is a certainty that people opposing the visit will be harassed and arrested, to the point where a virtual state of internment could exist over the days of the visit. God bless you ma'am!

Mr. Stokes and his two relatives were released without charge within 48 hours.

Reaction to the visit by her supporters in the South has been mostly of an economic kind—more British tourists, more British investment, etc. Pathetic really. Cork Lord Mayor, Labour's Michael O'Connell stated: "It will be a great boost not just for Cork city but for the southwest region as it will really bring us world attention and help promote us as a tourist destination."

Cork Chamber of Commerce Chief Executive Conor Healy recalled the visit of King Edward VII in 1903: "We welcome the visit from a business perspective—the UK is obviously a major export market for Irish business and traditionally a strong tourist market which has declined somewhat in recent years and this gives us an opportunity to promote the Cork region and win back that business." Fianna Fáil Senator, Labhrás Ó Murchú in Tipperary said: "I know Cashel Town Council was anxious that she would come and I'm pretty sure they will give her a special *céad míle fáilte*." That's the *gaimbín* men!

The trustees of Muckross House near Killarney went all the way and asked her to follow in the footsteps of her great-great-grandmother Queen Victoria who visited Killarney and stayed in Muckross House in 1851—as people were still dying of starvation—though they did not, of course, mention that bit.

But what about Ireland's reputation, its good name? This writer has in recent years been in New York, Spain, Iran, Syria, Lebanon and Palestine. Coming from Ireland meant something to people. Something honourable. The Celtic Tiger

was not mentioned. The Irish were a good people, a people to be looked up to. What they will make of Queen Elizabeth's visit and the welcome from the *gaimbín* men I shudder to think.

The Queen of England's visit to Ireland will include the Republican Garden of Remembrance; the British WW1 memorial at Islandbridge; Croke Park the scene of Bloody Sunday on November 21st, 1920, when the British killed 14 people including the Tipperary player, Sean Hogan, after whom one of the two main stands is named; the Guinness Storehouse—actually the Diageo Storehouse, as Guinness no longer exists; Government buildings; *Áras an Uachtarán*: all in Dublin. Then its the National Stud in Kildare and the Rock of Cashel and on to Cork where she will visit the English Market and the Tyndall National Institute.

Her visit to the Garden of Remembrance takes place on May 17th and, as Gerry Adams, among others, pointed out is particularly insensitive. It is the 37th anniversary of the day that her soldiers bombed Dublin and Monaghan.

The following letter was sent to the Irish Examiner on 5th April, but was not published

Embracing The Monarchy

William Regan (5 April) says we need to move on and to embrace the British monarchy.

He says that if the Jewish people and Europe can get over Hitler's crimes Ireland should be able to get over the past.

I'm unaware of Hitler being welcomed by any free people after or during the Second World War.

The London *Times* today is full of the crimes committed by the British in Kenya in the first eight years of Queen Elizabeth's reign, crimes repeated by them in various countries, including Ireland, which won them promotion, decorations, knighthoods and peerages.

I do hope that if Queen Elizabeth visits Cork's Butter Market, nobody is so naive to think that butter wouldn't melt in her mouth

Donal Kennedy

This letter was sent to the Irish Examiner on 13th April

Forgetting The Past

The news that Queen Elizabeth will be visiting Cork's English Market led to my finding out that the Butter Market there has been closed since 1920.

Could this closure have been connected with the activities of those praised by Lloyd George that year, which were "getting the right men" such as Lord Mayor MacCurtain or in burning down the co-operative creameries founded under the inspiration of Sir Horace Plunkett? It's nice to know how much of that is forgotten now, and how a matured Ireland can believe that butter wouldn't melt in a gracious lady's mouth.

Donal Kennedy

Queen's Visit

The last time the British Queen came to Ireland, England was fighting in Africa as well. Some things never change.

In March 1900, the new Chairman of the Irish Parliamentary Party, John Redmond was confronted by a tricky problem when Queen Victoria decided to visit Ireland to raise Imperial sentiment and recruit Irish cannon-fodder for the war it was fighting to expand the British Empire in South Africa. Irish Nationalists had been pro-Boer and had greeted the early British defeats with favour.

Redmond knew he had to make some public statement about the visit but, since the war had turned in England's favour by this point, he thought it would be politic to show moderation. The Queen had announced that, in recognition of their services in South Africa, Irish soldiers in the British Army were to be granted the right to wear the shamrock on St. Patrick's Day (and Kipling had rewritten *The Wearing Of The Green* to celebrate this little national recognition for the loyal Irish).

Redmond announced in the House of Commons that the Irish people had received with "gratification" the announcement permitting the Irish Regiments to wear the shamrock and that the royal visit would be treated with respect. John Dillon was furious at Redmond for "*falling on his hands and knees to crawl*" to the Queen, and William O'Brien apparently set out to "*smash Redmond*" (*Letters And Leaders Of My Day*, Vol II., p448.) And, if it hadn't been for the Boer War, and the closing of Irish ranks, Redmond's career as Party Chairman might have been very short.

But then the British Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, made a famous speech as Grand Master of the Primrose League, admonishing the Irish for their pro-Boer sentiments and signalling that a great militarization of English society was about to be put into place to meet any challenge ahead.

John Redmond made a reply to the speech of Lord Salisbury's, in which he tried to atone for his miscalculation in grovelling to the Queen's visit. He argued that, despite what some Irish people might think, loyalty to the Empire never got Ireland anywhere and there was only one thing England really understood:

"Certain he was of this, that to those enthusiastic persons who believed that Ireland was likely to reap some substantial benefits from a Royal visit and a British

wearing of the green (laughter)—to those simple-minded persons who had been declaring their belief that the best way to obtain the concession of Irish rights was to conciliate English opinion, to earn English gratitude by services to the Empire; this frank and brutal speech would, come as a douche of cold water. If this speech of Lord Salisbury represented the real voice of the ruling classes in England, it was well that it had been made (hear, hear). The somewhat excited and fevered condition of Ireland would be steadied and reinvigorated by this application of iced water, and the Irish people would see more clearly than ever that so far at any rate as those for whom Lord Salisbury spoke were concerned, the work which Ireland had to undertake in the future was once more to make it inconvenient and dangerous to withhold Irish rights (cheers). They were obliged by the speech of the Prime Minister to recall the fact that it was not by conciliation, nor blind loyalty that Catholic Emancipation was won (cheers). It was not by conciliation that the Irish Church was reformed, the Irish Land Acts passed, and the franchise won for the mass of the Irish people; and Lord Salisbury had by his speech made it perfectly plain that so far as he and his friends were concerned it was not by conciliation nor by loyalty that the remaining Irish grievances were to be redressed. He sincerely hoped that the lesson would not be lost upon Ireland or her representatives.

"... Lord Salisbury spoke of the dangers ahead to the Empire. If those dangers came to a head, if the opposing forces of which Lord Salisbury spoke were to dash upon these shores, there was one spot where they would not be perceived as enemies or invaders (cheers). Lord Salisbury spoke of the necessity of safeguarding the heart, as he called it, of the British Empire. He (Mr. Redmond) did not know whether the Premier was speaking only of Great Britain or whether he included Ireland; but every man knew that, so far as Ireland was concerned, Ireland would welcome, instead of rejecting, the contingency to which he referred (cheers and a voice—'No'). The one great remedy for the danger would be to make the heart sound, to conciliate Ireland, and to turn it from a hostile into a friendly nation (cheers); but no; in his remedy Lord Salisbury left Ireland entirely out of account. His remedy was to provide for the arming of the British people... and for the universal creation of rifle clubs (a laugh). That was an admirable suggestion. For his part he believed every people ought to be armed (cheers); but this remedy of Lord Salisbury did not apply to Ireland. In Ireland they were not permitted to have volunteers (hear, hear); they were not permitted to bear arms. Therefore, Lord Salisbury's proposal to meet the danger before us all was to Ireland an insult, and so far as the rest of the Empire was concerned was puerile and absurd

(cheers)..."*(Freeman's Journal, 14 May, 1900)*

The *Freeman's Journal* was much happier with Redmond's new attitude to the Royal visit, but could not resist chastising the Leader for his previous foolishness in its Editorial:

"Mr. Redmond's able reply to Lord Salisbury will be thoroughly approved. It did not need Lord Salisbury's brutal candour, however, to prove to any intelligent Irishman familiar with the history of his country, that the sacrifice of Irish life in South Africa, the hysterics of the music halls on Saint Patrick's Day, and the frustrations of the flunkeys on the occasion of the Queen's visit, would be absolutely barren of result to the country. The proper attitude to such demonstrations is Lord Salisbury's own one of contemptuous indifference. The three men who died at Manchester, and the three who were murdered in Mitchelstown, did more for Ireland than all the thousands of Irishmen that ever died 'for the pirate Empire'."

In 1900, Redmond and the Party were still with the Fenians—in spirit at least. But by 1914 they had gone over to recruiting Irishmen for the "*pirate Empire*".

Below is a more straightforward view of the Queen's visit:

Maud Gonne

"THE FAMINE QUEEN (1900)

'The Queen's visit to Ireland is in no way political', proclaims the Lord Lieutenant, and the English ministers. 'The Queen's visit has no political significance, and the Irish nation must receive her Majesty with the generous hospitality for which it is celebrated', hastens to repeat Mr. John Redmond, and our servile Irish members whose nationality has been corrupted by a too lengthy sojourn in the enemy's country.

'The Queen's visit to Ireland has nothing at all to do with politics', cries the fishmonger, Pile, whose ambitious soul is not satisfied by the position of Lord Mayor and who hankers after an English title.

'Let us to our knees, and present the keys of the city to her Most Gracious Majesty, and compose an address in her honour.'

'Nothing political! Nothing political! Let us present an address to this virtuous lady', echo 30 town councillors, who when they sought the votes of the Dublin people called themselves Irishmen and Nationalists, but who are overcome by royal glamour. Poor citizens of Dublin! Your thoughtlessness in giving your votes to these miserable creatures will cost you dear. It has already cost the arrests of sixteen good and true men, and many broken heads and bruised limbs from police batons, for you have realised—if somewhat late—the responsibility of Ireland's capital, and, aghast at the sight of the men elected by you betraying and

dishonouring Ireland, you have, with a courage which makes us all proud of you, raised a protest, and cried aloud, 'The visit of the Queen of England is a political action, and if we accord her a welcome we shall stand shamed before the nations. The world will no longer believe in the sincerity of our demand for National Freedom.'

And in truth, for Victoria, in the decrepitude of her eighty-one years, to have decided after an absence of half-a-century to revisit the country she hates and whose inhabitants are the victims of the criminal policy of her reign, the survivors of sixty years of organised famine, the political necessity must have been terribly strong; for after all she is a woman, and however vile and selfish and pitiless her soul may be, she must sometimes tremble as death approaches when she thinks of the countless Irish mothers who, sheltering under the cloudy Irish sky, watching their starving little ones, have cursed her before they died.

Every eviction during sixty-three years has been carried out in Victoria's name, and if there is a Justice in Heaven the shame of those poor Irish emigrant girls whose very innocence renders them an easy prey and who have been overcome in the terrible struggle for existence on a foreign shore, will fall on this woman, whose bourgeois virtue is so boasted and in whose name their homes were destroyed. If she comes to Ireland again before her death to contemplate the ruin she has made it is surely because her ministers and advisors think that England's situation is dangerous and that her journey will have a deep political importance. England has lived for years on a prestige which has had no solid foundation. She has hypnotised the world with the falsehood of her greatness; she has made great nations and small nations alike believe in her power. It required the dauntless courage and energy of the Boers to destroy forever this illusion and rescue Europe from the fatal enchantment. Today no one fears the British Empire, her prestige has gone down before the rifles of a few thousand heroic peasants.

If the British Empire means to exist she will have to rely on real strength, and real strength she has not got. England is in decadence. She has sacrificed all to getting money, and money cannot create men, nor give courage to her weakly soldiers. The men who formerly made her greatness, the men from the country districts have disappeared; they have been swallowed up by the great black manufacturing cities; they have been flung into the crucible where gold is made. Today the giants of England are the giants of finance and of the Stock Exchange, who have risen to power on the backs of a great struggling mass of pale, exhausted slaves. The storm approaches; the gold which the English have made out of the blood and tears of millions of human beings attracts the covetousness of the world. Who will aid the pirates to keep

their spoils? In their terror they turn to Victoria, their Queen. She has succeeded in amassing more gold than any of her subjects; she has always been ready to cover with her royal mantle the crimes and turpitude of her Empire, and now, trembling on the brink of the grave, she rises once more at their call. Soldiers are needed to protect the vampires. The Queen issues an appeal in England, the struggling mass of slaves cry 'Hurrah'; but there is no blood in their veins, no strength in their arms. Soldiers must be found, so Victoria will go herself to fetch them; she will go over to Ireland—to this people who have despised gold, and who, in spite of persecutions and threats, have persisted in their dream of Freedom and idealism, and who, though reduced in numbers, have maintained all the beauty and strength and vitality of their race.

Taking the Shamrock in her withered hand she dares to ask Ireland for soldiers—for soldiers to protect the exterminators of their race! And the reply of Ireland comes sadly but proudly, not through the lips of the miserable little politicians who are touched by the English canker but through the lips of the Irish people.

'Queen, return to your own land; you will find no more Irishmen ready to wear the red shame of your livery. In the past they have done so from ignorance, and because it is hard to die of hunger when one is young and strong and the sun shines, but they shall do so no longer; see! Your recruiting agents return unsuccessful and alone from my green hills and plains, because once more hope has revived, and it will be in the ranks of your enemies that my children will find employment and honour! As to those who today enter your service to help in your criminal wars, I deny them! If they die, if they live, it matters not to me, they are no longer Irishmen.'

Pat Walsh

WHAT'S IN A NAME

Interacting globalisation has
Many blame-games and names
Peacekeeping and all that jazz
Errand of mercy to put out the flames
Recoiling at the sight of the civilian
population
Inextricable, after the mould
Accepting the daily proclamation
Like humanitarian bombing. Then the
polls
Installing the puppet, worm-holed
Slowing down, to come, the apocalypse
Mollifying the eclipsed.

Wilson John Haire
18th April, 2011

Moriarty On Lowry

Part One

The Moriarty Report is not an objective Report into political corruption. After fourteen years of investigation costing tens of millions of euros it could not avoid being a defence of the record of the Tribunal. A finding of 'no corruption' would have invited ridicule.

This is not to say that the findings of the Report are automatically untrue. However, it is not a detached, even-handed examination of the evidence. In this writer's opinion the lengthy and expensive nature of the process must have influenced the result.

The Moriarty Tribunal succeeded the McCracken Tribunal. McCracken found that, although Charles Haughey and Michael Lowry received money from businessmen, there was no evidence of them giving favours in return. So while the politicians were severely criticised he fell short of concluding that they were corrupt.

Moriarty, on the other hand, concluded that Haughey was corrupt on the grounds that he gave a "real and tangible" benefit to Ben Dunne. In this writer's opinion the evidence for this was flimsy (see *Irish Political Review*, January 2007 and the "Shorts by Long Fellow" section of the current issue).

The payments to Haughey were dealt with in Part 1 of Moriarty's Report, which was published in late 2006. Part 2 of the Report dealt with payments to Michael Lowry and was published in March 2011.

Political corruption occurs when a holder of a political office uses his position to obtain favours either for himself or others to the disadvantage of the State. In the case of political favours given to others, there are two elements: the first is the payments made by private citizens or corporate entities to politicians; the second element is the favours given in return.

However, it could be argued that these elements are necessary but not sufficient to prove corruption. In order to prove political corruption it must also be shown that the State was disadvantaged as a result of the favours being conferred. So, for example, a reading of the Beef Tribunal Report in the 1980s shows that Larry Goodman contributed substantial sums to Fianna Fáil and Fine Gael. Also, the State conferred a benefit on Goodman by giving him favourable export credit insurance terms. But a very strong case was made that, if more than one Irish beef exporter

was allowed in to the relevant market (Iraq), competition would depress prices. So, in this instance, conferring a favour on the largest beef exporter was in the interests of the State and therefore a finding of corruption was unwarranted.

The part of the Moriarty Report which has just been published is divided into two volumes. The first largely deals with the money trail or alleged payments by Denis O'Brien to Michael Lowry. The second volume looks at the awarding of the mobile phone licence. This article will analyse the first volume. A later article will deal with Volume 2.

The most important aspect of the Report is the awarding of the licence to the Esat consortium. The award enabled the winners to become very wealthy. If it could be proved that there was corruption involved, this would have very serious consequences for the State. All other issues pale in comparison, but Moriarty did investigate two separate issues: the first related to Lowry's tax evasion; the second related to a favour requested by Ben Dunne.

TAX EVASION

Lowry's tax evasion was covered in the McCracken Tribunal and Moriarty discovers nothing remarkable on this matter. For the record it was found that his company had a tax liability of euro 1,26 million. Of this 707k related to underpayment of taxes and 555k related to interest and penalties. He also had a personal income tax liability of euro 192k. 64k related to underpayment of tax and 129k related to interest and penalties.

Lowry was one of those businessmen who liked his customers to pay part of his fees through the company and part in the form of a "bonus" which was kept off the books. All of this is very interesting and is certainly illegal, but it has nothing to do with political corruption. Political corruption in this instance could only occur if Lowry used his political office to gain favourable treatment for his tax affairs. Moriarty found that there was no evidence that this occurred. Indeed he admits that Lowry could have avoided some of his company's tax liabilities by winding it up.

Moriarty also admits that the evidence indicated that his customers were very satisfied with the service he gave them. Again there was no suggestion that any political influence was used to win contracts.

BEN DUNNE

Although Lowry had a number of customers by far the most important was Ben Dunne. So was Lowry Dunne's kept man? Moriarty comes up with only one incidence of Dunne's influence on Lowry. This occurred in April 1995 when Lowry was Minister for Communications.

Dunne made a phone call to Lowry asking him to use his influence to resolve a rent dispute with Telecom Eireann and Dunnes Stores. Telecom Eireann was renting a property owned by Dunnes. The dispute was being arbitrated on by Sherry FitzGerald, a property firm partly owned by Mark FitzGerald, the son of Garret FitzGerald (a fellow member of Fine Gael). Lowry contacted FitzGerald a couple of times on an informal basis. The exact details of the contact are disputed. Lowry claims that he was trying to speed up the process of rent arbitration while FitzGerald said that Lowry wanted him (i.e. FitzGerald) to contact the Sherry FitzGerald employee directly involved in the arbitration process and suggest that the rent should be doubled.

Moriarty finds FitzGerald's evidence more convincing and in truth it is difficult to see why the latter would lie. If one accepts FitzGerald's evidence Lowry's intervention was "*corrupt*". There is no doubt that the intervention, if successful, would have been to the disadvantage of the State. Telecom Eireann, a semi State company, would have been forced to pay a higher rent than would have been otherwise the case.

Predictably, Moriarty is ecstatic. Here is evidence of corruption! *Voila!* He describes this as being "*profoundly corrupt to a degree that was nothing short of breathtaking*".

On page 31 of the Report he claims that the value of the benefit to Dunne was £2.38 million in the short term and £7.35 million in the long term. The £2.38 million figure is calculated by multiplying the difference of the rent which Dunne was looking for (£10 per square foot) and what was actually decided (£6 per square foot), multiply by the area of the premises (85,000 square foot), multiply by the term of the lease (7 years).

I have no idea where Moriarty gets the £7.35 million figure. He says that the capital value is measured by 15 times the annual rent. So, if this is accepted the long term benefit would be (15 x 4 x 85,000), which is £5.1 million. But, it is doubtful that calculating the "*long term*" value is of any relevance. The term of the lease was only 7 years. Rents would be reviewed at the end of the term at which point another

corrupt act would need to be committed in order to keep the rents at their inflated value.

Also, on page 410 of the Report we are given a different view of the value of the benefit to Dunne. He says that the Dunnes were claiming an annual rent of £890k and the arbitrator had decided that the rent was £640k a year. Moriarty doesn't do the sums, but on this basis the value of the benefit over 7 years would have been £1.75 million and not the £2.38 million he calculates on page 31. This is an example of the Report being more like a statement for the Prosecution than an objective, dispassionate analysis of what happened.

So, were Dunne and Lowry "*profoundly corrupt to a degree that was nothing short of breathtaking*"? The first thing to be said is that the "*corruption*" failed in its implementation. It was "*attempted corruption*" which did not succeed in its objective. The impression given was that the attempted corruption was fairly half-hearted. Ben Dunne said in evidence that his phone call to Lowry was "*spontaneous*". He did not consider the implications of what he was doing. That is, he was not only attempting to use personal contacts to obtain an advantage, but that he was involving a public office holder whose duties involved protecting the interests of the State.

Lowry, made two informal attempts to exert influence. To Mark FitzGerald's credit, he considered the approaches improper and refused to make any contact with his employee conducting the rent review. There was no further pressure or threats exerted on FitzGerald and the arbitration was allowed to proceed untainted.

If FitzGerald's evidence is correct—and it probably is—the behaviour of Dunne and Lowry was improper, but in my opinion to call it "*profoundly corrupt to a degree that was nothing short of breathtaking*" is an exaggeration.

THE MOBILE PHONE LICENCE AWARD

Except for the involvement of Michael Lowry, there is no connection between Lowry's tax affairs, his relationship between Ben Dunne and the awarding of the Mobile phone licence to the Esat consortium. As indicated above, the implications for the State are far more profound if a finding of corruption is made regarding Esat. The fact that the terms of reference of the Tribunal—as well as Moriarty's interpretation of them—are so broad is, in my opinion, problematic.

If a person is charged with being a bank robber, it is considered inadmissible as evidence that he might also be a wife beater. This principle does not apply to the Tribunal. So, the fact that Lowry evaded

tax and that he was amenable to improper influence from Ben Dunne is allowed influence a Report on the question of corruption in the awarding of the mobile phone licence.

The decision to grant the licence to Esat was made in October 1995. There followed a period of negotiation which concluded in May 1996 with the formal award of the licence. Moriarty could find no evidence of any corrupt payment by Esat before the awarding of the licence. In my opinion, the evidence that he adduces after the award is very weak.

The following was the evidence examined:

- 1) Verbal evidence of Barry Maloney
- 2) Payment by Telenor, an Esat partner to Fine Gael
- 3) Payment to Lowry by David Austin
- 4) Mansfield property transaction
- 5) Cheadle property transaction
- 6) Doncaster property transaction
- 7) Share transactions in Esat

VERBAL EVIDENCE OF BARRY MALONEY

Barry Maloney was a College friend of Denis O'Brien. Maloney was a successful businessman in his own right and was employed as a senior Executive in Rank Xerox in the USA before O'Brien appointed him as Chief Executive of Esat Digifone. Esat Digifone was the successful bidder for the mobile phone licence. It consisted of Esat Telecommunications, led by Denis O'Brien; Telenor, a Norwegian telecommunications company; and a Dermot Desmond investment company IU. The ownership of the consortium was divided 40%, 40% and 20% respectively.

Maloney claimed that, around October of 1996, he had a conversation with O'Brien in which O'Brien said that he had made a payment of £100k to Lowry; £100k to another unnamed person; and £100k that got "*stuck with an intermediary*". This was done shortly after the awarding of the licence in May 1996.

O'Brien has not denied that a conversation, or at least a similar conversation, might have taken place. However, he gave two mutually exclusive but not contradictory explanations. Firstly, he was being jocose. The reason for the joke was that he was frustrated by Maloney's unwillingness to pay consultancy fees following the award of the licence. This was a source of embarrassment to O'Brien who had to meet the relevant people socially. I don't find this explanation implausible. It has also been my experience that successful businessmen are driven by ego. They often like to pretend that their influence is far greater than it actually is.

O'Brien also gave another explanation. He said that at the time it was very clear

that he was about to become an extremely wealthy man. By contrast, Michael Lowry's business was in serious trouble and his political career was in ruins. O'Brien, who seemed to share a similar right-wing political perspective, had thought of making a payment to Lowry, but then thought better of it. O'Brien denies that he ever made any payment to Lowry.

The problem with Maloney's evidence is that the Tribunal could not find any corroborating evidence. The amounts that Maloney gives don't tie in with any transactions known to have been received by Lowry. Moriarty makes great play of the phrase "*stuck with an intermediary*", but elsewhere in the Report any evidence of payments being "*stuck with an intermediary*" occur after Maloney's conversation.

PAYMENT OF \$50,000 BY TELENOR

This payment was initiated by David Austin. Austin is a person who appears quite often in this Report. He was a Smurfit Executive who was also an enthusiastic supporter of Fine Gael. He was a lifelong friend of both O'Brien and O'Brien's father. He also was a friend of Michael Lowry on the basis of a shared interest in politics and horseracing. Lowry claims that his friendship with Austin was very close and at times they were in almost daily contact.

In 1995 Austin was retired and living in the UK. Fine Gael's finances were in very bad shape. Its debts amounted to about £3 million. Austin had the idea of copying Fianna Fáil and embarking on a fundraising drive in the United States. The idea was to organise a dinner in New York at which the Taoiseach John Bruton would appear. In November 2005 Austin approached his longstanding friend Denis O'Brien. It was agreed that a contribution of \$50,000 for a table would be made.

This approach by Fine Gael and David Austin was probably injudicious, given the awarding of the licence only a month before and formal contracts had not been signed. O'Brien says that he suggested that Telenor (a 40% member of the Esat consortium) would contribute, since that company wanted to become involved in Irish affairs. Also, at that time Esat was not in a position to come up with that money.

This version of events is disputed by Telenor which claimed that it was always its understanding that Esat would compensate Telenor for the payment. Moriarty suggests that the payment was routed through Telenor to hide its true source (O'Brien and Esat).

The arrangement was that Telenor would pay David Austin and Austin would

transfer the funds via an offshore account to Fine Gael. When the time came for the deed to be done, Telenor insisted on documentation (those damn Scandinavians!). Austin decided to invoice them for "*consultancy services*".

When the payment was received by Austin, he transferred the funds to Fine Gael. It seems that it belatedly dawned on Fine Gael that all of this might not look good. What followed is the stuff of pure comedy. The party decided that it had to give the money back. But who to give it back to? It decided to return the cheque to Telenor since this was where the payment had come from. But Telenor had already been compensated so it had to give it back to Esat. Esat did not want to take it back because acceptance would imply that there was something improper about the original payment.

At the time some enterprising charities suggested that if nobody else wanted the money well...

Moriarty does not claim that the payment had anything to do with the Esat award. Nor was there any suggestion that Lowry had any involvement in the transaction. Indeed the legal advice that Fine Gael received was that the payment did not come under the terms of reference of the Moriarty Tribunal. But Moriarty justifies his interest in this by arguing that, even though Lowry did not participate in the US funding event, the fact that he was a Fine Gael trustee placed it under the terms of reference of the Tribunal.

Earlier we have seen that Moriarty attached great significance to Barry Maloney's evidence that O'Brien said that 100k was "*stuck with an intermediary*". It could be said that in this instance a sum of money was stuck with an intermediary. But this is hardly corroborating evidence. The amount involved was not £100k, but \$50k, which equalled about £31k at the time. Secondly, this amount was not stuck with the intermediary at the time Maloney had his conversation with O'Brien. It was only in 1998 that Fine Gael attempted to return the money paid to them by Telenor.

So what does Moriarty conclude? He says:

"Any suggestion that the payment by Telenor was legitimate as an expression of interest in Irish affairs, but not by any other entity or shareholder within the Esat Digifone consortium was specious and untenable."

This reads more like a sneer than a detached conclusion of a judge wishing to keep within the terms of reference of his Report.

PAYMENT TO LOWRY BY DAVID AUSTIN

The ubiquitous David Austin paid £147k to Michael Lowry in Autumn of 1996 via an offshore account. By coincidence in August 1996 O'Brien had concluded a two part payment totalling 150k (the first one amounting to 50k, the second 100k). Moriarty thinks that the payment was in effect a payment of 147k to Lowry from O'Brien and the payment to Austin was just a smokescreen.

Here again we return to the evidence of Barry Maloney that 100k was "*stuck with an intermediary*". But at the time of Maloney's conversation it wasn't stuck with an intermediary it was safely in an offshore account owned by Michael Lowry. Secondly the total amount involved was not 100k but 147k.

O'Brien claims that his payment of 150k to Austin had no connection with the payment of the 147k from Austin to Lowry. His payment to Austin related to the purchase of a holiday home in Marbella. The original price agreed in July 2006 was 165k, but Austin wanted the use of the house until the Autumn of 1997 when the Ryder Cup was played in Spain. Accordingly, the purchase price was reduced to 150k.

The Report goes into the detail of the transaction and finds it extraordinary that a competent businessman like Austin couldn't find the deeds of the house; and that the legal formalities were not completed until 1998.

I don't know why Moriarty finds this extraordinary. I don't find it in the least surprising. Also the rather loose attention to legal formalities would not be at all untypical of transactions between close friends.

It is very interesting that, for all his analysis, Moriarty doesn't give an opinion on the value of the Marbella home. Was it worth 150k or 165k? This would seem to be an obvious question but the normally voluble Moriarty doesn't pronounce on it. It seems that Moriarty wanted to avoid the detail of the sale of the Marbella house. Media Reports indicate that O'Brien had to practically force the late David Austin's widow to appear before the Tribunal to confirm that the house had indeed been sold and that they had vacated it permanently in October 1997 as stated by O'Brien.

So what conclusion does Moriarty come to? After all his bluster about the legal documents not been in order, he doesn't deny that a sale of the Marbella property did occur. His contention is that the 150k that O'Brien gave to Austin did not relate to this sale but was used to transmit 147k to Lowry. But, if the sale did in fact take place, then there must have been two

payments of 150k to David Austin: one to bribe Lowry and the other in consideration of the house. But Moriarty couldn't find the second payment. And if O'Brien was intent on putting 150k into Lowry's account through an intermediary, why complicate matters by buying a property from the same intermediary?

The payment of 147k by Austin to Lowry was a loan for the purposes of a refurbishment of a property in Carysfort Avenue, Blackrock, Co. Dublin. It might be said that it was a coincidence stretching credibility that roughly the same amount of money left O'Brien's account and then ended up in an offshore account owned by Lowry. But is it really so implausible? Austin had a very close relationship with O'Brien and it appears that Lowry had also a very close relationship with Austin. Following the sale of his Marbella property, Austin had 150k in cash. What could he have done with it? In the circumstances it does not seem far-fetched that Austin would lend the cash to his friend Michael Lowry.

Moriarty attaches great significance to the fact that the transactions were routed through off-shore accounts. But neither O'Brien and Austin were resident in Ireland. At one stage Moriarty suggests that Lowry, rather than Austin, wanted the 147k to be transferred to an offshore account. He thinks that such an open and sociable person such as Austin would not instruct Lowry to open an off-shore account so as to receive the 147k. Here, in my view, Moriarty is grasping at straws. The idea that a sociable person would not contemplate clandestine transactions is just nonsensical. We already know that he did precisely this for the \$50,000 Telenor payment. And Lowry had no direct connection with this transaction.

In November 1996 Lowry's political career was in ruins. He was forced to resign from the Cabinet following revelations of tax evasion in connection with transactions with Ben Dunne. He may well have felt that he would not be re-elected to the Dáil and decided to divest himself of the property in Carysfort Avenue in January 1997. He repaid his loan of 147k plus interest to David Austin in February 1997. So the transfer of funds which had supposedly originated with Denis O'Brien had reverted to Austin, or to use Barry Maloney's phrase had "*got stuck with the intermediary*". The only problem (apart from the amount involved) is that according to Maloney this had already happened by October 1996.

Instead of coming to the obvious conclusion that Lowry was repaying a loan from

Austin (and Lowry was able to produce a document from Austin confirming repayment of the loan), Moriarty concludes that the only reason that the so-called loan was repaid was that Lowry became aware of the setting up of the McCracken Tribunal. But as we will see later the same prudence did not apply to later transactions involving associates of O'Brien.

Moriarty often uses a circular argument to 'prove' his case. So, if it is assumed that O'Brien paid Lowry 150k via David Austin, proof that the assumption is correct is the fact that O'Brien concealed his payment to David Austin from the Tribunal. But this logic only works if it is assumed that O'Brien is guilty in advance. If, on the other hand, O'Brien's version of events is accurate, and the 150k payment to Austin related to a property transaction, then it is perfectly in order for O'Brien NOT to declare the transaction to the Tribunal since it had nothing to do with Michael Lowry.

MANSFIELD TRANSACTION

At this stage a foreign reader of the Moriarty Report might well think that, if "Paddy" is corrupt, he is not very good at it. All these transactions take place and yet there is a persistent pattern of the money failing to end up in the corrupt politician's bank accounts! What's the matter with these people?!

If Moriarty is correct in his suspicions, it is a very sad reflection on our educational system that O'Brien was apparently still trying and failing to pay off Lowry 3 years after the license award. In March 1999 a stg£300k payment was made from an account controlled by O'Brien to a lawyer in the UK. The payment was made by Aidan Phelan, Denis O'Brien's accountant. According to O'Brien this stg£300k was owned by Phelan and related to consultancy work surrounding the Esat Digifone bid.

The stg£300k was for the purpose of engaging in property investment in the UK with, of all people, Michael Lowry. It seems that the prudence which led Lowry to pay back his 147k loan to David Austin did not apply to doing business with another O'Brien associate. The initial property investment was in Mansfield and would cost stg£250k. Lowry paid Stg£25k in to the same account opened by the English lawyer. According to Lowry the arrangement was that he would buy a 10% share in the property and Phelan would own 90%. The surplus of Phelan's funds would remain in the lawyer's account for future property investments.

Moriarty's contention is that the person behind the transaction was O'Brien.

However, ownership of the Mansfield property was vested with Lowry. Moriarty adduces no convincing evidence to support this contention. The only thing he comes up with is that Lowry sought taxation advice on the capital gains transaction. Moriarty believes that such advice would not have been sought for such a small investment of stg£25k. Therefore Lowry must have really owned 100% of the property. Again, I find Moriarty's argument very unconvincing.

There are at least two reasons why Lowry would have sought taxation advice. After his recent experience of having had all prospect of ever again holding high public office destroyed through revelations of tax evasion, it would be very understandable that he would want his tax affairs in order. Secondly, Lowry intended to make a number of investments in the UK. The taxation advice he would receive for the small transaction would also have applied to other transactions.

Here we have another *lacuna* in the Moriarty investigation. We saw earlier that Moriarty had no interest in the value of the Marbella property sold to Denis O'Brien, but here he seems uninterested in the nature of the taxation advice given to Lowry. It seems to have been quite detailed and expensive, since Moriarty concludes that the expense couldn't be justified by an investment of a mere stg£25k. Presumably, the advice would have included calculations of anticipated gains and costs, but Moriarty gives no details about this which would have been very relevant to his theory.

CHEADLE TRANSACTION

The second UK investment was in Cheadle. The original plan was that Lowry would invest 100% in this property. Aidan Phelan did not wish to participate in this investment, amounting to stg£445k. However, he lent Lowry the balance of the funds he had in the English lawyer's account and introduced him to Woodchester Bank. Lowry initially obtained approval for a loan from Woodchester on the basis of a guarantee given by a Cork businessman called John Daly. For once this person had no connection with Denis O'Brien.

Unfortunately, Daly, having signed the guarantee and faxed it to Woodchester, then got cold feet and decided that he would not send the original document to the bank and therefore the guarantee was not validated. It appears that Aidan Phelan was very embarrassed by this. He had introduced Lowry to the bank, with which he had a close relationship, and Lowry had failed to deliver as regards obtaining a guarantee. Secondly, there had already

been a legally-binding commitment to purchase the Cheadle property. Phelan stepped in to the breach and borrowed from Woodchester to finance the investment. Lowry had ceased to have any financial involvement in the Cheadle investment. It was now 100% owned by Phelan... or at least that is how it appeared. But Moriarty knows better.

Moriarty believes that the efforts of Lowry to borrow from Woodchester were an elaborate charade. There was never any intention for Lowry to borrow from Woodchester. The funding was always going to come from Aidan Phelan and Phelan was merely a front man for Denis O'Brien. And, although the source of the funding was to come from O'Brien, 100% ownership would be vested in Lowry.

It's certainly an interesting theory, but the evidence to support it is pretty flimsy. Unfortunately the Woodchester's files relating to the transaction are incomplete. This might be considered suspicious if we didn't know about Irish banking practice which seemed to operate on the basis that the wealthier the client the sloppier the paperwork. It also seems that when Woodchester was taken over by Investec Bank some files went missing.

The bank official dealing with the transaction was Michael Tunney. Although there has never been any documentation to show involvement by Denis O'Brien in the loan of stg£420k by Woodchester to Aidan Phelan for the Cheadle investment, Moriarty still believes that O'Brien was involved.

The basis of his belief is the evidence of bank officials who had a peripheral involvement in the transaction. Michael Tunney does not deny that he might have given the impression to his colleagues that this was a Denis O'Brien transaction. Moriarty asks rhetorically: if Denis O'Brien had no involvement in the transaction why would bank officials be under the impression that that was the case?

Well, I can see why Tunney might in certain circumstances have given that impression, even if there was no foundation to it. He had authorised a loan of stg£420k with the most flimsy paperwork imaginable. How could he have justified such an action, especially to the new owners of the bank? It is very plausible that he would have said something like: Phelan is an "O'Brien man"; it's an O'Brien transaction; don't worry about it; it will be repaid.

But the hard facts of the matter are that, if Phelan had defaulted on the loan, the bank would have had no legal recourse to O'Brien. All else is speculation.

In normal circumstances the question

of who had owned an asset could be deduced from how the sales proceeds were distributed. However, at this stage since the parties involved are aware of the Tribunal's scrutiny, Moriarty could argue that any distribution of the proceeds not according with his theory is unconvincing as evidence.

However, late in 2000 there was a possibility that both the Mansfield and Cheadle properties would be sold together in one deal to the same purchaser. Moriarty discovered documentation from the prospective purchaser's lawyers indicating that Lowry's consent was necessary for the handing over of the title deeds to the properties. The implication seems to be that this is proof that Lowry owned both properties. But in my view the fact alone that Lowry owned 10% of one of the properties would have been an impediment to the transfer of ownership of both properties in the same deal.

Moriarty mentions in passing that the lawyer for the vendors, Christopher Vaughan, wanted both properties to be valued separately. He doesn't draw any conclusions from this, but one reason why this might have been necessary is that the two properties were NOT owned by the same person (Michael Lowry) and Lowry did in fact only own 10% of the Mansfield property and had no financial involvement with the Cheadle property.

The deal to sell the Mansfield and Cheadle properties fell through. However, it is interesting to note the proposed sale price. It was stg£1.3 million. Remember, only a short period before, the purchase price of Mansfield was stg£250k and Cheadle stg£445k. So it looked like the owners of the properties would make a killing.

But how must Lowry have felt about all of this? If his evidence is to be believed, he came very close to owning 100% of the more valuable property (Cheadle) but ended up not owning any of it. All he had was 10% of the smaller property (Mansfield). So what could have been a jackpot was only likely to result in a very modest capital gain. The other galling point from Lowry's point of view is that he seems to have had a much more 'hands on' role in the property transactions than Phelan. Phelan had used his financial clout to extract Lowry from the Cheadle deal and yet Lowry was under a moral obligation to help sell the Cheadle property with no benefit for himself.

It seems that Lowry wanted a greater piece of the action. Aidan Phelan in his evidence to the Tribunal suggested that Lowry was "*running in the undergrowth*".

Moriarty doesn't speculate as to what this might mean, but it is at least a possibility that Lowry wanted to find a purchaser for both properties. Before selling the property Lowry himself would buy the properties from Phelan and then sell on to the purchaser making a very substantial profit. In order to implement this plan he needed to give the impression to the English lawyer, Christopher Vaughan, that he had had a greater financial involvement than was actually the case.

THE DONCASTER TRANSACTION

Denis O'Brien does not dispute his involvement in the purchase of the Doncaster Rovers stadium. The plan was to purchase the stadium with a view to developing the property as a retail centre and relocate the stadium on the outskirts of Doncaster. The deal was done around 1998. It appears to have been a complicated deal involving retention clauses. This gave rise to a legal dispute with the vendors.

Unfortunately for O'Brien he used the same property agent as Lowry and Aidan Phelan had used for the Mansfield and Cheadle investments. This was a person based in Northern Ireland called Kevin Phelan, who was not related to Aidan Phelan. Perhaps because the same property agent was used, the same lawyer, Christopher Vaughan, was used for legal advice. And to really put the cat among the pigeons O'Brien's accountant Aidan Phelan was also involved in a professional capacity in the deal.

If that wasn't bad enough, Lowry had only recently been introduced to Kevin Phelan and was sniffing around. It is important to emphasise at this point that the Doncaster deal was in train before the Mansfield and Cheadle deals. The Moriarty narrative is not in chronological order, which can be confusing, but is in the order in which he discovered the evidence.

Moriarty's interest in the Doncaster deal arose from a series of articles published in *The Irish Times* by Colm Keena in 2003. The article included details of a letter written by Christopher Vaughan to Michael Lowry dated 25th September 1998. This letter followed meetings with Vaughan over the previous two days. The letter indicates that he had not realised Lowry's "*total involvement*" in the Doncaster transaction. It seems that the only reason that he had come to the conclusion that Lowry had "*total involvement*" is that Lowry gave that impression to him and Lowry had been present at a meeting with Kevin Phelan in which the details of the Doncaster deal were discussed. Vaughan said in evidence that Lowry had no input before or after the deal.

Moriarty attaches great significance to this letter which is the sole piece of evidence linking Lowry to the Doncaster deal. He further goes on to say that Vaughan is an "experienced and astute solicitor" and couldn't have been mistaken about Lowry's involvement. But this "experienced and astute solicitor" was inaccurate about the dates of the meetings he had with Lowry. He was also inaccurate about the times and venues. He also consistently managed to misspell Aidan Phelan's name in his documents as well as showing sloppiness in the drafting of letters.

It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss the constitutional aspects of the Tribunal. Nevertheless it is worth mentioning that the Tribunal lawyers did not consider it appropriate to even ask *The Irish Times* journalist Colm Keena for the source of this document or other documents that were leaked to the Tribunal. On the other hand, confidentiality did not apply to the solicitor/client relationship. Moriarty denies this was the case. But the Tribunal was able to obtain two versions of confidential advice to Denis O'Brien senior from his solicitor.

The mere existence of the Tribunal became a handicap for Denis O'Brien's ability to do business. When a legal dispute arose over the Doncaster Rovers property one of the vendors obtained the letter of 25th September 1998 referred to above and attempted to blackmail Denis O'Brien Senior.

The property agent Kevin Phelan also became embroiled in a dispute with O'Brien over fees for consultancy services. It is widely believed that he was the source for the leaking of various documents to *The Irish Times*. And yet, because Phelan is resident outside the jurisdiction, he could not be compelled to account for his role in the various UK transactions, neither could the English vendors of the Doncaster Rovers property be compelled to submit to questioning by either lawyers for Denis O'Brien or even the Tribunal's lawyers.

SHARE TRANSACTIONS

I am reluctant to bring the reader up another garden path. This relates to share transactions following the flotation of Esat. Errors were discovered in the allocation of shares to David Austin. The errors were corrected and Moriarty has to conclude:

"there was no evidence that connected this transaction, or indeed the initial share transaction on behalf of Mr Austin, of which \$50,000 was funded by Mr. O'Brien, to Michael Lowry, within the meaning of the Tribunal's terms of reference, or in any other respect"

CONCLUSION

Moriarty's Report on alleged payments

to Lowry is biased. It certainly is not an even-handed objective investigation, which one would expect in a Tribunal process.

It would not be quite accurate to say that there is no evidence linking Denis O'Brien payments to Michael Lowry. But the evidence is circumstantial. To an outside observer it is certainly surprising that O'Brien seemed to have entangled himself, albeit indirectly, with Lowry in various business transactions after the award of the licence. But there were other extraordinary coincidences that could not have had a sinister implication. For example, one of Lowry's customers in the meat-packing business had also done business with Kevin Phelan, the property agent involved in the UK investments. And it seemed Phelan always used Christopher Vaughan, the English solicitor.

A benign interpretation would be that Ireland is a small place and within that small place there were only a very small number of Irish people involved in investing in the UK commercial property scene in the late 1990s. It is possible that, if an Irish person wanted to become involved in this area, there was a very strong possibility that he would have had dealings with Kevin Phelan.

Lowry's position as Minister for Communications would have put him in contact with Esat employees, which would explain his relationship with Aidan Phelan.

More important, O'Brien had a close personal and business relationship with David Austin. Michael Lowry had also a close personal and business relationship with Austin. Under the circumstances it does not seem extraordinary that Lowry and O'Brien's paths would cross.

The malign interpretation, which Moriarty believes, is that O'Brien wanted to make payments to Lowry a significant amount of time after the awarding of the licence. O'Brien might have felt some sympathy for Lowry, but it is difficult to believe that he would take the risk of making such payments. What possible benefit could there have been to O'Brien? The licence had already been awarded. Lowry was no longer a Cabinet Minister, so there was nothing that he could give O'Brien in return. The benefit was zero and the risk was enormous.

Could Lowry have been blackmailing O'Brien? It doesn't seem plausible. If this was the case, any payments would have further compromised O'Brien. And what could Lowry have had to blackmail O'Brien with? If there was anything, it would most likely have implicated Lowry as well.

Moriarty completely fails to provide

any convincing hard evidence to show that there were corrupt payments made to Michael Lowry. He relies on speculation and hearsay. And the speculation and hearsay is just not plausible.

John Martin

Don't mention the war!

continued

crucial to explain how and why the EU project arose from the previous events. The fact is that it was the experiences of the generation of European leaders who had lived through two World Wars that determined them to avoid such events again. It was not based on some idealistic wish for peace but an effort to save Europe's internal conflicts from being used by Britain again to exacerbate those conflicts to the point of war. That is why Britain was initially excluded—and excluded itself—from the efforts at European integration until the Union proved a success. It then joined on the basis that 'if you can't beat them you had better join them'.

The economic policies of the Project were just that—economic policies—to help achieve its political aims. But these aims themselves were not an economic policy. The founders knew, again from bitter experience, that politics determined economics and not the other way round.

Naturally John does not mention any of this. He is far from being alone in having a 'don't mention the war' syndrome about the history of the European project. Those magnificent men and women in the European Parliament have a plan to write the history of Europe but it has run into trouble:

"Despite opposition from EU governments and amid deep cutbacks to national museums and galleries in Britain and other countries, the European Parliament is planning to spend at least £58 million on its own "House of History". On Thursday they will spend £2.2 million as down-payment. The project, aimed at fostering a "common historical memory" for the EU is to go ahead even though MEPs are unable to agree on a common understanding of fundamental European history, including what happened during the Second World War. Parliament officials have been deeply embarrassed because plans to begin Europe's history with Greek civilisation up until today were sunk because MEPs were split on every significant event for the last 200 years. Because of deep divisions between German, Polish and East European deputies over interpretations of both World Wars the official EU version of history will have to begin in 1946. Disputes over the exhibitions continue to rage with many East European MEPs

angered over pilot display that suggest that the first direct elections to the EU assembly in 1979 somehow triggered the fall of Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union. Derk Jan Eppink, a Belgian centre-right MEP, said: "Nobody wants to be involved in this, when people cannot even agree what happened in the last war. It is self-aggrandisement at the expense of the taxpayer. If the parliament wants this project then it should get donations from Federalists, well paid MEPs themselves or companies who want to support it." Hans-Gert Poettering, a German Christian Democrat MEP and the former parliament president, has made the "house of history" a personal mission. "If we'd asked the other EU institutions for financial assistance at this stage, we wouldn't have got it and it would have been the end of the project", he admitted to MEPs on the budget committee two weeks ago. The £53.2 million start up cost of the museum and £6.3 million in estimated annual costs, not including staffing, have led the parliament's budget committee to complain "there is still no overview of the global cost of the project available"... (Bruno Waterfield, Brussels, 23 Mar 2011).

If the EU is such a simple and straightforward project, as John Bruton and many others seem to think, it becomes incredible that such a body as the European Parliament cannot even agree on the issues of WWII after all that has been written and said about it! That war has been turned into a nice cosy morality play by British propaganda—Good versus Evil—but, when any specific aspect of it is inspected in any detail, the nice story disintegrates. And if Europe today cannot get its head round WWII then the project that is based on the fairy story about it will also disintegrate. Reality will just keep upsetting the plan as it has already done.

The most ironic aspect of all this is that the one country in the EU that could be objective about the War is Ireland. At the time it saw the War exactly for what it was—another British attempt to do down a Germany that had become the major power in its region. Ireland knew Mr. Churchill quite well and, when he encouraged war, they knew he spoke from the heart. After all, didn't he explain succinctly: "*The Hun is either at your throat or at your feet*". Concerns about Jews, Poles, Fascism, Democracy, etc., had absolutely nothing to do with it. Ireland, because of what it had learnt the hard way, had the measure of the War and should have been able to write its history better than most. This should have been a distinctive contribution it made to the European project. But as its leading and most influential academic historian, T.D. Williams, was a MI6 operative and was put in place

in UCD at a crucial moment, that avenue of thought was firmly closed off. John Bruton is not going to reopen it. He probably does not even know it was ever closed off.

After a potted history of the early years he says: "*The goal of the Treaty of Rome was never simply a free trade area. It was always more than that. It was an economic union.*" (ibid.) For him there was no politics at all involved. We then get another a long potted history of technical efforts towards a single currency but major events like Britain's entry, Thatcher's assault on the whole concept, enlargement, the destruction of the Commission's authority by Pat Cox and the Liberals, the war it initiated in the Balkans, the support for all USUK wars and their threatened wars, the forced acceptance of the Nice and Lisbon Treaties, are all blithely ignored as if they never mattered. Instead, he gives the impression that for decades all development was focussed on and determined by internal reports on currency plans. But, despite all the expertise, they contrived to miss out on having a banking policy: hence our current problems. All the significant political developments, which go to make up Europe's real history, are simply ignored by John.

He muses that: "*I am not sure it is sufficient to rely on heads of government policing one another to ensure that commitments are delivered. While small countries may submit to peer pressure from big countries, I am not sure the process will work in reverse, when bigger countries are the ones needing to respond*" (ibid). He reminds me of someone who has just woken up (John van Winkle?) to the reality of inter-Governmental relations. If he is not sure at this stage of his life that large States try automatically to put their interests before smaller countries, one wonders what planet he has been on all his life. He seems oblivious to the fact that the European project created a unique mechanism, the Commission, to try to equalise relations between States but that it is now useless in that role thanks to Pat Cox's great achievement. That 'achievement' was about the most significant fact in creating the current incoherent mess that is the EU. But John is as blind to that as he is to everything else of significance.

"To conclude, I would say the problems the European Union faces are challenging not only politically, but intellectually. But they are problems the rest of the world will have to face sooner or later."

The first half is very, very true but why

would the rest of world have to experience Europe's problems? The rest of the world is coping very well, thank you very much, and it would cope even better if Europe stayed well out of its affairs.

"To sustain an economic and monetary union we need to create a true European Demos and a European patriotism. That is needed to make politically acceptable the occasional transfer of funds from one part of the union to another, that help a single currency to work. We have not created this patriotism as has unfortunately become all too obvious. But that is an argument for another day." (ibid.)

John has got matters the wrong way round if he believes we need a European Demos and a European patriotism to sustain economic union, but that we can and must create the latter first. He seems to think that this economic union can be created and then the Demos and patriotism will emerge to crown it on '*another day*'?

John seems to have fallen for the economic determinist view of these matters—sort out the economics (particularly the banks at the moment) and all else will follow. It's an attractive notion to lazy minds—to be euphemistic. But all European history (and Marx) refutes that notion. No wonder our EU-philes have nothing to contribute to the EU's problems.

GERMAN ANGST

Some leading Germans also see the solution in purely economic terms. The solution is for Germany to pay for all the problems because they are guilty of causing them.

"Germany should admit its part in causing European crises, says former minister. Two leading figures have asked Germans to look a little more critically at themselves, writes Derek Scally. The EU is facing "creeping death" unless Germany seizes the eurozone crisis as a chance for final European integration, German philosopher Jürgen Habermas and former foreign minister Joschka Fischer have warned. Mr Fischer said Berlin was being disingenuous in factoring out the culpability of German banks—particularly state-owned institutions—in the Irish financial crisis. "We are currently going about sinking 50 years of European history", said Prof Habermas at a Berlin event organised by the European Council on Foreign Relations" (Irish Times, 7 April, 2011).

As with John Bruton and the European MPs the world here begins after WWII and we are presented with the reality of a collapsing EU and the possibility of an easy "*final*" integration, simply if Germany would accept its guilt—again—and hand over the money. Fischer explains: "*Awareness of a historical-moral obligation was*

the source (in the EU) of German restraint and readiness to adopt the position of others and to defuse conflicts through advance payments", he said. So it's reparations time again for Germany. There is no doubt that, if this was simply an economic or banking problem, Germany could solve it without much of a problem as Germany is doing quite well with a low value Euro. But the Germans are not, any more than anybody else, some sort of economic autonomons. They were traditionally the 'poets and dreamers' of Europe. The Germans were reluctant joiners of the Free-Trade, freewheeling, globalist world. They hardly knew what credit was until very recently, and plastic money was weird to them. They would not even shop at weekends. Banks were there to serve industry. But they were persuaded legally and otherwise to join the brave new wonderful world of Globalism and now they are blamed for the inevitable slump that followed the credit bubble. They may feel a bit confused. And if they pay the bills what will they get in return? A return to the system that caused the problem? Hardly an inspiring prospect!

But Mr. Fischer has a bigger prize in store for Germany:

"If Germany no longer sees integration as its greatest interest, the EU will not just stagnate but decline", he said. The time had come to take the bull by the horns and make a final push for European integration. "I think the people who want Europe should come out and say where they want to be", he said. "The goal isn't something diffuse, the child needs a name. What we are talking about here is the realisation of the United States of Europe"..."

Mr. Fischer, as German Foreign Minister, made a singular contribution to the current political state of the EU. He was an enthusiastic supporter of Enlargement, Globalism, and every war in sight, not to mention Lisbon and all else that has discredited the project. Now he thinks that the awful reality will disappear if people, and the Germans in particular, put another concept in their minds (after paying the bills) and ignore all current experience. Lie back and think of the U.S.E! But I think that most Germans might adopt the attitude of 'Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me'.

There are regular outbreaks of shock and outrage when neo Nazis appear in the news but the awful reality is that, when it comes to German and European history, they may well begin to make more sense than their denouncers. Because their denouncers are the very people who admit that they just cannot explain or deal with Europe's history. And it is now clear that if you cannot deal with Europe's past you cannot deal with its present or future. The past is not past.

Jack Lane

Libya & Regime Change

continued

pean Union that the European Council has formally called on to step down". Currently, it seems that Colonel Qadhafi is the only head of state that the EU has called on to step down.)

WHO DO THEY THINK THEY'RE KIDDING?

In their letter to various papers on 14th April, Obama, Cameron and Sarkozy were also reluctant to use the phrase "*regime change*", while saying they wanted regime change. They wrote:

"Our duty and our mandate under UN Security Council Resolution 1973 is to protect civilians, and we are doing that. It is not to remove Qaddafi by force. But it is impossible to imagine a future for Libya with Qaddafi in power."

Who do they think they're kidding? Of course, they are trying to "*remove Qaddafi by force*".

They have been attempting to destroy as much of Qadhafi's armed forces as possible; they have been giving air support to the armed rebellion against his regime; they have admitted to supplying non-lethal equipment and training to the rebel forces (they haven't so far admitted to supplying arms); they have now got boots on the ground, albeit in limited numbers.

One could be forgiven for thinking that they want the rebellion to succeed in overthrowing the Qadhafi regime by force with their help.

NATO Secretary-General, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, once foolishly took the provisions of Resolution 1973 about protecting civilians literally and suggested that NATO would be prepared to bomb rebel forces if they were threatening civilians. He said it only once.

WHAT IS AUTHORISED IN RESOLUTION 1973?

There has been a lot of media chatter about what actions by NATO are authorised under Resolution 1973. Arming the rebels? Providing forward air controllers to the rebels to identify targets for NATO bombers? Training the rebels? Putting foreign troops on the grounds? Targetting Qadhafi? Academic lawyers and politicians have given their various opinions *ad nauseam*.

But, the truth is that if you are a veto-wielding member of the Security Council, as the US, UK and France all are, you can make a Security Council resolution mean what you want it to mean, because, even if you stretch its meaning way beyond credibility, you are immune from sanction by the Security Council for doing so, since you have a veto.

Remember, the US/UK claimed Security Council authority for invading Iraq in March 2003 in Resolution 678 passed in November 1990 for the very different purpose of expelling Iraqi forces from Kuwait.

Of course, there may be a more general political price to pay in claiming authority way beyond the obvious meaning of a Resolution. Perhaps, Russia and China, who allowed Resolution 1973 to pass by abstaining in the Security Council, will be less inclined to sit on their hands in future. But, it is absurd for them to be complaining, as they have been doing, that US, UK and France have been acting beyond the terms of the resolution. It's even more absurd for South Africa, which voted for 1973, to be complaining. The US, UK and France were always going to interpret the resolution as authorising whatever they think is necessary for the rebellion to succeed in overthrowing the Gaddafi regime.

STALEMATE

Up to now, the Imperials have been pinning their hopes on destroying Gaddafi's forces from the air and giving air support to the rebel forces in the Benghazi area as a means of achieving regime change. However, the rebel forces don't show much sign of becoming effective.

The US, UK and France seem to be strangely reluctant to arm them, even though the arms embargo imposed by Resolution 1970 was specifically cancelled in Resolution 1973 in the context of taking action to protect civilians. Could it be that they are worried that arms they supply might eventually fall into the wrong hands?

At the time of writing (24 April) a military stalemate exists. The Chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, has admitted as much. The best way to protect civilians and minimise civilian casualties is to have a ceasefire, as soon as possible, and to take up offers of mediation from, for example, Turkey, which has offered to mediate from the outset.

But that is intolerable to the US, the UK and France, because that would leave Qadhafi in power. So, the likelihood is they will continue to bolster the rebels, and turn civil unrest into civil war. Whether they eventually succeed in making the rebel army into something that, with close air support from NATO, can take control of more territory from Qadhafi remains to be seen. What is certain is that a lot of civilians will die in the process.

The overthrow of Gaddafi may require substantial numbers of NATO troops on the ground, something which the US, the UK and France are reluctant to commit to, because they don't want to become embroiled in another country after their experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan. That, rather than Resolution 1973's ban on "*a foreign occupation force of any form on*

any part of Libyan territory", is what is deterring them. If necessary, NATO troops could be portrayed as "a liberation force", as journalists have already been speculating.

So, the likelihood is that bolstering the rebels will continue for the foreseeable future.

WAS A MASSACRE IMMINENT?

The US, UK and France constantly justify their intervention in Libya on the grounds that it has saved many, many lives, especially in Benghazi.

In his weekly address to the American people on 26th March, President Obama told them that Qadhafi was threatening a "bloodbath". But he reassured them:

"We're succeeding in our mission. We've taken out Libya's air defenses. Qaddafi's forces are no longer advancing across Libya. In places like Benghazi, a city of some 700,000 that Qaddafi threatened to show 'no mercy', his forces have been pushed back. So make no mistake, because we acted quickly, a humanitarian catastrophe has been avoided and the lives of countless civilians—innocent men, women and children—have been saved."

Two days later, he asserted:

"We knew that if we waited one more day, Benghazi—a city nearly the size of Charlotte (NC)—could suffer a massacre that would have reverberated across the region and stained the conscience of the world."

That implies that, without NATO intervention, Gadhafi might have killed nearly 700,000 people.

The view that a massacre was imminent in Benghazi is based on a speech made by Qadhafi on 17th March, in which he threatened "no mercy" for his enemies.

He did say: "We will have no mercy on them". But by "them" he clearly meant armed rebels, who stand and fight, not all the city's inhabitants. He also said: "We have left the way open to them. Escape. Let those who escape go forever" and that "whoever hands over his weapons, stays at home without any weapons, whatever he did previously, he will be pardoned, protected".

But the best evidence that he was not planning a massacre in Benghazi was that he didn't perpetrate a massacre in the other cities his forces recaptured, either fully or partially, including Zawiya, Misurata, and Ajdabiya. There is no doubt that considerable numbers of civilians have been killed in the process of regaining control of these cities, but it cannot be said that massacres have occurred.

(Strangely, in their letter on 14th April, Obama, Cameron and Sarkozy didn't claim to have saved any lives at all, merely, that "tens of thousands of lives have been protected" by their action.)

David Morrison
April 2011

**Recollections Of My Life by
Mu'ummar Qaddafi (extract, 8.4.2011)**

The Gaddafi Creed

"In the name of Allah, the beneficent, the merciful..

For 40 years, or was it longer, I can't remember, I did all I could to give people houses, hospitals, schools, and when they were hungry, I gave them food, I even made Benghazi into farmland from the desert, I stood up to attacks from that cowboy Reagan, when he killed my adopted orphaned daughter, he was trying to kill me, instead he killed that poor innocent child, then I helped my brothers and sisters from Africa with money for the African Union, did all I could to help people understand the concept of real democracy, where people's committees ran our country, but that was never enough, as some told me, even people who had 10 room homes, new suits and furniture, were never satisfied, as selfish as they were they wanted more, and they told Americans and other visitors, they needed "democracy", and "freedom", never realizing it was a cut throat system, where the biggest dog eats the rest, but they were enchanted with those words, never realizing that in America, there was no free medicine, no free hospitals, no free housing, no free education and no free food, except when people had to beg or go to long lines to get soup, no, no matter what I did, it was never enough for some, but for others, they knew I was the son of Gamal Abdel Nasser, the only true Arab and Muslim leader we've had since Salah' a' Deen, when he claimed the Suez Canal for his people, as I claimed Libya, for my people, it was his footsteps I tried to follow, to keep my people free from colonial domination—from thieves who would steal from us—

Now, I am under attack by the biggest force in military history, my little African son, Obama wants to kill me, to take away the freedom of our country, to take away our free housing, our free medicine, our free education, our free food, and replace it with American style thievery, called "capitalism", but all of us in the Third World know what that means, it means corporations run the countries, run the world, and the people suffer, so, there is no alternative for me, I must make my stand, and if Allah wishes, I shall die by following his path, the path that has made our country rich with farmland, with food and health, and even allowed us to help our African and Arab brothers and sisters to work here with us, in the Libyan Jammohouriyah,

I do not wish to die, but if it comes to

that, to save this land, my people, all the thousands who are all my children, then so be it.

Let this testament be my voice to the world, that I stood up to crusader attacks of NATO, stood up to cruelty, stood up to betrayal, stood up the West and its colonialist ambitions, and that I stood with my African brothers, my true Arab and Muslim brothers, as a beacon of light, when others were building castles, I lived in a modest house, and in a tent, I never forgot my youth in Sirte, I did not spend our national treasury foolishly, and like Salah'a'deen, our great Muslim leader, who rescued Jerusalem for Islam, I took little for myself...

In the West, some have called me "mad", "crazy", but they know the truth but continue to lie, they know that our land is independent and free, not in the colonial grip, that my vision, my path, is, and has been clear and for my people and that I will fight to my last breath to keep us free, may Allah almighty help us to remain faithful and free."

Translated by Prof. Sam Hamod. April 09, 2011
<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article27856.htm>

AT TRAITOR'S GATE

A remaindered Libyan monarchy,
Prince Mohammed el-Senoussi,
king-in-waiting,

welcomed by Benghazi with anarchy,
exiled in London, Foreign Office free.

Khalifa Hilter, a CIA asset,
exiled in Langley, Virginia,
now a preset
rebel commander
with an arms cornucopia.

Nuri Mesmari, former Chief of Protocol,
absconded to Paris,
October, 2010,
will see tribal Libya devolved
when entering the lion's den.

All three handed NATO the key
to unlock
the gateway to Africa
to plunder that rainbow crock,
to rid the continent of Eastern exotica.

Wilson John Haire
23rd April, 2011

On-line sales of books, pamphlets
and magazines:

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

Shorts

from
the Long Fellow

MORIARTY SQUEAKS

In January 2007 the *Irish Political Review* reported that, after nine years and tens of millions of euros in legal fees, the Moriarty Tribunal had "brought forth a mouse". Four years later the squeaks have become more high pitched, but still nothing of substance has emerged.

It will be recalled (but only by those with very long memories) that in Part 1 of his report Moriarty noted that Charles Haughey had received 11.6 million euros in private donations by 1988. Moriarty concluded that this had a value of 45 million euros in 2006. His calculation was not based on inflation, which would have given 19.7 million at 2006 prices but was based on the ratio of contributions to the then Taoiseach's salary. Since the Taoiseach salary had increased by much more than the rate of inflation from 1988 to 2006 he was able to arrive at the 45 million figure.

It's a pity that Moriarty couldn't find the time to redo his calculation in 2011. The recent 30% reduction in the Taoiseach's salary would have put a serious dent in the value of Haughey's receipts!

HAUGHEY'S "CORRUPTION"

Moriarty's predecessor, Justice McCracken, found that Haughey was innocent of corruption. While Haughey received money, McCracken could find no evidence that he gave anything in return. It could be said that the former Taoiseach was an ungrateful "f***er" or that he was too arrogant (or principled) to allow himself feel any obligation towards his benefactors. It seems he thought Ben Dunne was an awful ejjit.

Moriarty, in contrast to McCracken, found that Haughey had conferred a favour on Dunne. But the evidence for this was pretty flimsy. The Revenue Commissioners put in a tax demand against the Dunne Family Trust for £38.8 million. The Dunnes disputed this on the grounds that the legislation making such a Trust liable for tax had post-dated the setting up of the Trust. Haughey, following representations from Dunne, requested that the head of the Revenue Commissioners Seamus Pairceir meet Dunne. Haughey gave no direction to Pairceir and, according to Pairceir he himself, had intended to meet Dunne in any case. Pairceir had already met a Dunne Trustee following representations from Alan Dukes.

Arising from the meeting Pairceir agreed to reduce the tax demand from

£38.8 to £23.6 million. He then reduced it further to £16 million. Moriarty concluded that Haughey had therefore conferred a "real and tangible benefit" on Dunne.

It seemed that all Fintan O'Toole's fantasies had come true. At long last proof of corruption had been found. The only problem with the scenario is that Ben Dunne refused to avail of the "real and tangible" benefit. He *rejected* the Revenue Commissioners offer of a reduction in the family's tax liability of £22.8 million! And when he brought his case to the Appeal Commissioners the tax liability was reduced to zero.

It is clear that the legal basis for the Revenue Commissioners' tax demand was very shaky. Pairceir made the calculation that obtaining £16 million was better than nothing at all. Unfortunately Dunne also knew that the tax authorities' case was weak.

And yet the so called £22.6 million reduction in Dunne's tax liability is presented as a "real and tangible" benefit, even though if the offer had been accepted the Dunne family would have been £16 million poorer!

DENIS O'BRIEN

When Moriarty gave his verdict on Haughey, the former Taoiseach was on his deathbed and was therefore not in a position to defend himself. His family were angered that he had not been afforded the opportunity of responding to preliminary findings. But no such oversights were possible against Denis O'Brien who had employed a battery of lawyers to defend his interests.

As a result Moriarty could not sustain his initial finding that the award of the licence was illegal. When the final report eventually emerged, it was hardly criticised at all by the media. O'Brien made a robust defence of his reputation on radio and television but received little attention in the print media. His radio interview on the Pat Kenny show was not made available for download unlike the rest of the programme.

BEAUTY CONTEST

The analysis from Colm Keena of *The Irish Times* and former Supreme Court Judge Catherine McGuinness on the Marian Finucane show (27.3.11) was quite superficial. They both felt that a *Sunday Independent* poll indicating that "the people" believed Moriarty was somehow significant.

However, an interesting insight into the workings of the Tribunal was given by Eileen Gleason, a former Marketing Executive with Esat. She dismissed Moriarty's finding that Michael Lowry was conferring an advantage on Denis O'Brien by telling him that the lack of financing was a weakness in the Esat bid. She argued that this was well documented

in numerous articles in the media before Lowry was supposed to have discussed the matter with O'Brien.

The economist and An Bord Snip supremo Colm McCarthy also dismissed this Moriarty finding for different reasons. He said that the nature of the competition for the mobile phone licence was such that the winner was in effect bound to make a fortune and was therefore never likely to encounter problems obtaining finance.

The competition was based on qualitative criteria and was designed so that the winner would have had no difficulty in competing with the existing State monopoly. McCarthy believes that such licensing competitions should be on the basis of a bidding war between the candidates. No allegation of corruption could be levelled against the highest bidder and the State would also have obtained a windfall revenue gain from the process.

FIANNA FÁIL ON MORIARTY

Why should anyone vote for Fianna Fáil? In the past the answer might have been that it defended the interests of the State. Its project was to undermine the Treaty settlement and thereby give the State the maximum room for manoeuvre. It is therefore disappointing to hear Micheál Martin defend the Moriarty Report.

The first part of the Moriarty Report related to Haughey and by extension Fianna Fáil. The second part dealt with Lowry and by implication Fine Gael. Perhaps it was too much to expect Martin to resist the temptation to 'put the boot in' to Fine Gael, but there is a higher State interest at stake. If Moriarty is vindicated, the State may be liable for loss of earnings from the unsuccessful candidates for the licence. And why did Martin think it was necessary to criticise O'Brien for defending his reputation?

If it is accepted that the State is corrupt, Fianna Fáil is not likely to benefit from the political consequences. There are only two tendencies which could benefit: Sinn Féin who have only recently accepted the legitimacy of the 26 County State; and the substantial West Brit element in the society represented by *The Irish Times*, which has always denigrated Fianna Fáil's efforts in developing the State.

THE HONEYMOON

It is perhaps churlish of the Long Fellow to criticize the media's heart-warming love-in with the Government. The course of true love never did run smooth but there is no sign yet of an end to this honeymoon.

There was no ridicule heaped on the Minister for Finance Michael Noonan when he described the date of the Bank Guarantee as the "blackest day in Ireland since the Civil War broke out". But there was no Civil War on 30 September 2008. Quite the contrary, Fine Gael and Sinn

Fein supported the Guarantee and Labour only opposed it on pedantic grounds.

But, if it was the "*blackest day*", the logic would be to reverse it by "*burning the bondholders*", but no such action is being contemplated by this Government. To quote Joe Higgins, the troops which Eamon Gilmore mustered to challenge "*Frankfurt's way*" have not even departed from Dublin Bay!

The Government is more concerned about optics than reversing the policies of its predecessor. The idea that reversing the reduction in the minimum wage is of any significance is doubtful. The manner in which it intends doing it is laughable. In order to avoid annoying employers, it will reduce employers' PRSI by 50% for those earning under 356 euro per week. This will cost the State 400 million euro.

It is doubtful that reducing employers' PRSI for the low-paid will have any effect on employment. But as Sinn Fein's Pearse Doherty pointed out it will give employers an incentive to reduce the pay of their existing employees.

It seems that the Government is desperate to prove that it can tamper with the existing IMF/EU deal even at the price of new more onerous conditions being imposed on it. The price of the reversal of the reduction in the minimum wage appears to be the dismantling of the Joint Labour Committee structures. Here is the spin that *The Irish Times* puts on it in its front page article (16.4.11):

"The revised document states that the targeting of sheltered sectors of the company—a reference to the pharmacy, legal and medical professions—would be examined, as would the joint labour committee structures setting out pay rates, terms and conditions for workers in other sheltered sectors".

The newspaper's conflating of the restrictive practices of highly paid professionals with structures designed to protect the living standards of low paid workers is odious.

REVEALING PICTURES

It is said that a picture tells a thousand words. But a picture can also distort reality. When the IMF arrived in Ireland last November the front pages of newspapers in this country and abroad showed the lead negotiator Ajai Chopra walking past a beggar. The message conveyed was that we were a mendicant nation. The fact that the beggar in the picture was a Roma gypsy was not allowed give perspective to the image.

However, when Chopra and the boys returned last month, they were photographed passing the Shelbourne Hotel, which was overflowing with people. The accompanying article in *The Irish Times* (16.4.11) told us that the event was an auction for distressed assets in which a total of 15 million euros was spent in five

hours. Although most of the assets were Dublin properties, the buyers were "*from the country*". It is true that the properties were purchased at prices of about 40% of the peak, but this would put them at levels similar to prices in continental Europe. The picture of Ireland's economic crisis is more complicated than the one presented last November.

In his recent influential article in *Vanity Fair*, Michael Lewis said that Ireland's crisis was different to that of Iceland. Ireland borrowed to buy herself, while Iceland borrowed to buy other countries. So, in Ireland, while there were many people who were sunk into the mire of unsustainable debt when the bubble burst, other Irish people (the vendors) made a fortune.

The call to "*burn the bondholders*" is a populist policy designed to prevent people from thinking about the massive transfer of wealth that occurred within the country when the bubble burst. The Long Fellow agrees with V.I. Lenin who advocated at

the outbreak of the First World War turning the international conflict into a domestic conflict.

Ireland has the means to emerge from the economic crisis. Pretending that 'burning the bondholders' is a panacea is a way of avoiding the task of reforming our tax system.

TOTALITARIAN LIBERALISM

Whatever about the rights or wrongs of the Corrib Gas project, the Long Fellow has some sympathy for the two Gardaí caught having a private joke about rape. It could be said that the joke was in poor taste, but it was only offensive because it was inadvertently revealed to the targets of the joke through a video recording.

It used to be a liberal demand that the private thoughts and conversations of citizens should have constitutional protection. But it appears that the content of some private conversations are not allowed such protection.

Report of the views of 'JohnTheOptimist', expressed on *Irishconomy.ie*, 3rd April

Talking Down The Irish Economy

"Garret Fitzgerald is a truly great statesman who has served this country for half a century. The 'celebrity doom economists' are not fit to lace his boots. Although he had retired from politics by the time the Good Friday Agreement was negotiated, he laid the groundwork for it in the 1970s and 1980s. Even in his mid 80s, he shows infinitely greater grasp of economic and demographic statistics than the wretched 'celebrity doom economists' who dominate the Irish media.

While one can argue all day about the nitty-gritty of every economic forecast, and who was right and who was wrong, the broad picture is that the central argument of the 'celebrity doom economists' is false. Not only that, they know it is false, but continue to promulgate it because 'doom' is now a lucrative industry for them, and anything which undermines their 'doom' prognostications must be airbrushed away.

Their central argument is that ALL the economic growth that Ireland experienced up to 2007, especially that between 1997 and 2007, was a fraud, a hoax, a Ponzi scheme, a property scam, etc etc etc etc, blah blah blah, *ad nauseam*. This they repeat endlessly in every media outlet day-in-day-out, week-in-week-out. This has indeed been very damaging. It has undermined international confidence in Ireland's ability to grow out of its debt problem (which is not significantly worse than that of many other OECD countries) in coming years, even though the growth required is very modest by historical stand-

ards, barely one-third of Ireland's long-term average growth rate between 1958 and 2007.

I have repeatedly challenged one of the leading 'celebrity doom economists' to post on here and explain why, if all the growth between 1997 and 2007 was a fraud, as he has repeatedly claimed, then how come the recession bottomed out in early 2010, leaving GNP around 75% higher in real terms than it was in 1997, a far larger increase in that time than that of virtually every other OECD country? To no avail.

Regarding specific economic forecasts, the 'celebrity doom economists' got it spectacularly wrong in late 2009 and early 2010 about Ireland's export growth in 2010. They ALL forecast that the volume of exports from Ireland would FALL in 2010. It ROSE +9.4 per cent. Do they mention this now in any of their daily 'doom' commentaries? Of course not! Because, as I said, 'doom' is now a lucrative industry, and anything that undermines 'doom' is a threat of those making a lucrative income from predicting 'doom'. They also failed spectacularly to forecast that GNP would RISE by +4.0 per cent between Q1 2010 and Q4 2010, a failure which they now neatly get round by claiming that it is GDP, rather than GNP, which matters, a complete reversal of their previous position.

Frankly, we should seriously consider putting the 'celebrity doom economists' on trial for high treason, unless they were born in Russia, in which case the treason charge obviously wouldn't stick.

I have a feeling that, with a new Government in power, and the economy clearly upturning, we can expect a backlash against the 'celebrity doom economists'. Their era is passing. But, they will put up a strong fight, as they now have such a financial investment in 'doom'. Let's suppose, just for arguments sake, that Garret Fitzgerald is proved correct and that reasonable to good economic growth occurs in coming years to bring down the debt burden, improve living standards and employment prospects. That is, exactly as occurred from 1987 on, the last time there was a similar situation. Where would that leave the 'celebrity doom economists'? It would leave them sunk at the bottom of the ocean, that's where. Totally discredited and a laughing-stock. Their lucrative income from the 24/7 peddling of 'doom' would be gone. Does anyone seriously think that they want that to happen? Sean Lemass once said: "a rising tide lifts all boats". He was wrong. A rising tide in Ireland over the next few years will sink quite a few boats, as Messrs McWilliams, Kelly, Gurgiev *et al* may well find out."

Report: Transcript of Interview with *Garret Fitzgerald*, The Saturday Night Show, RTE 1 television, 2nd April 2011

Optimism On Economy

"Brendan O'Connor (BOC): After the week we've had there's kind of one question on everyone's mind: what happened to us.... I was reading your piece in *The Irish Times* today and I suppose there were two major things I took out of it. One is that you're very very positive about this, this bailout, this fifth bank bailout, which, as you know a lot of people aren't positive about. You know, people out there watching feel angry that we're pumping more money into this black hole.

Garret Fitzgerald (Garret): Well, people should be clear about what's involved. We had already committed between {sic.} 10 billion in to the banks, and then it was seen that even more might be needed. So this study was done, making very pessimistic assumptions, to arrive at a figure which can be relied on as the maximum we're likely to need for the banks. And that showed another 8.7 billion was needed. Now we have provisions for that, because the bailout last November provided {interruption by O'Connor: 25 billion} 35 billion but only a third will therefore be needed for that. But then the {European?} Central Bank felt, to be sure to be sure, they should up that to 34 billion, em, 3 billion of that would be temporarily into the banks, the Government would probably get back in three years time, there's interest on it in the meantime, but of that money—it's not going to cost us that much—but first of all we are going to deal with some of the subordinated debtors, and {interrupt-

ion by O'Connor: *which we'll get back*}—yes—we have money of our own which put in, so in fact the total amount we need to borrow to do this is between 5 and 6 billion which will cost us 250 million a year. So it's not as bad as people think ...

BOC: I know but Garret at the same time it's kind of if you think, people are saying "*only 24 billion*", do you think we should ... but that National Pension Fund was our own pension fund, you can understand that it's very hard for people to, given that this is the fifth bank bailout, we've been told before that this is it, do you agree ...

Garret: I entirely agree, there is no question about that, it's miserable to have to do this {interruption by O'Connor: *but it has to be done*}, but it is a lot less bad than people thought. Reading the papers the last couple of weeks you'd think it was a vast sum, several times that, so it's not as bad as it looked like being. The other thing that's clear now is that, a lot of the money that the banks lent, they lent elsewhere, not in Ireland, and it's not doing us any good, particularly. So, by dealing with those loans, starting early next year, we can raise 73 billion there, in order to pay back some of the money we've been lent ...

BOC: This is the deleveraging of the But we are going to lose 14 billion, they've built in costs of 14 for getting rid of that 70 billion, haven't they ...

Garret: Well, I'm not sure of the exact figure, I'm sure you're right though, you lose a bit ... that's built into the whole deal. At least that will deal with the problem of the money the ECB has been lending in to us at one percent.

BOC: OK, so, now the other feeling that is out there—and I'm conscious that we don't want to bamboozle people with figures, ok?, but people feel a bit conned by Fine Gael, don't they? Because they feel, you know, Noonan and Enda Kenny to an extent and in fairness, Labour as well, you know, Gilmore, Frankfurt, it will be our law not Frankfurt's law, and they did seem to promise us, in the run-up to the election, that they were going to take on the bondholders in a serious way, that there would be some kind of, not a default, but that they would get some kind of a burden sharing situation going, they promised us that they were going to do what Fianna Fáil hadn't managed to do. Then they got the chance and they came back and they said "*well, actually guys, it's very tough out there, we can't do it*". People feel a bit let down, don't they?

Garret: Well, I think it would have been better in the campaign if those two parties hadn't spent so much time {laughing} attacking each other, and promising, seeming to promise things, which couldn't be secured without agreement on the Europeans and the IMF. So it would have been better had those promises not been made. {interruption by O'Connor: *... should have said it was impossible ...*} But in fairness it has to be said they did say, it was clarified during the debate, after the first week or so, that in fact this would have to

be renegotiated and there had to be multi-lateral agreement with the other side, and we couldn't impose this, and that was perhaps not clear enough. And I understand {interruption by O'Connor: *no ...*} people are concerned about that.

BOC: Speaking of the idea of burden sharing and of default, and everything, the other more playful aspect of your column today, I thought, was that—not 'playful', none of this is playful—but you were basically saying that, you feel that, a lot of the lack of faith that the markets and the people internationally have in Ireland now, is the fault of the celebrity columnists for talking about the possibility of default.

Garret: Yes, that doesn't help us, and there's no basis for it at all. I've just given you figures ... {interruption by O'Connor: *Who do you have in mind specifically...?*} I'm not going to name people, but if you've been watching your television or read the papers you can see people talking about default in a way that has damaged us. Because everything said here, in the election campaign and now, by people on television and radio, it all gets back to Europe, and the effect is, it undermines our credibility, so I think people should be very careful about what they say ... and it's all nonsense, in fact,

BOC: But, at the same time, Garret, it has to be said that to blame people for talking about default for the lack of confidence in this country, when it's actually certainly, the last government and their carry on for two and a half, three, years, and the new government we have now and so on... Are they not the ones who lost the confidence in the country, with a series of appalling decisions, which, which ...

Garret: Yes, of course they were, but at this stage what we need is to try and restore our credibility and to be talking about default, which would destroy all our living standards completely because if we defaulted we would lose the deal we have, the bailout deal, and we have nowhere else to borrow from,

BOC: But then, on the other hand, what these guys will argue is that we have no chance of paying off that kind of money

Garret: That's nonsense, and they shouldn't be saying it,

BOC: But like it's not just them either, Garret, like, a lot of international commentators, from both the right and the left, and a lot of, you know, Nobel, we've had Nobel economists and everything saying it, the markets have priced in a high inevitability almost of an Irish default, even after the confidence boosting measures of the other day the markets, nothing really changed on that score, so ...

Garret: Yes, we have a problem there. You see the markets are these people, you lend this money, buy bonds, or who make assessments of how good our credit is, and none of these people have any expert on Ireland, they have experts on France, Germany, Britain etc., but none on Ireland. They don't understand our economy and

all they hear is this default rubbish coming from people here, and the result s they are not making a fair judgement of the situation ... we're stuck with that and ...

BOC: OK, so you think that all the measures we've taken, remember, we kept doing these things on a Sunday, to reassure the markets on a Monday, and everything, but the markets would end up unconvinced again, do you think that all of that is kind of peripheral, that what they're doing is listening to the loudest voice in this country that's saying 'default' and everything

Garret: You won't get an immediate positive reaction to what's just been done, from some of these people. But the fact that the reports from all of these capitals are pretty favourable, that they do really accept—the serious people really do accept—and the other Governments accept obviously, and the EU accepts, and the IMF, that this a serious assessment, and this is a worst case, and that we've finally got this thing sorted out, we know what the worst case is, and get on now with sorting it out.

BOC: I suppose as a cynical layman, I think that it's that they're patting us on the head today because we've been suckered into putting another 24 billion of our money into paying off their reckless debts, you know what I mean, and their reckless gambling, but anyway,

Garret: But I don't think we should be so cynical about people who have provided such massive aid to us, without which we'd be busted at this stage

BOC: Ok, now Garret, can I ask you, I'm conscious of people watching at home, ok?, and there's people at home, ok, we've had, what is it, two years of austerity effectively, we sucked now what, 20 billion out of the economy ...

Garret: I don't know about that, but a lot,

BOC: So people have endured, some people have endured unemployment, what, the ultimate eh pay cut, people have endured pay cuts, people in the public sector have had their eh pension contributions, eh, diminished, we've had tax increases, all kinds of new taxes as well, more on the way, and then the universal social charge thing in January, which seemed to completely sucker punch a lot of people, and so people feel that they are doing all this to pour money into the banks, and like can they take, is there three more years of this austerity, sucking more money out of the economy? Do you think that people can take it, Garret?

Garret: Well, I think people have been very patient with the appalling mess left to us by the previous Government which, since the beginning of the last decade has been wrecking our economy in a series of different ways, and people obviously are bound to be very angry and upset, and everyone is suffering as a result. And so it's not surprising, these reactions. On the other hand, people have accepted it, with, eh, ill grace, you may say {BOC: Yes!}, but they're not rioting in the streets, and I

think that Irish people, in the long run, are pretty sensible, and there's more to come. And we will have further tax increases, probably mainly in property taxes and in the water charges, both of which we should have had long ago, {interruption by BOC: *but hang on, can I ask ...*} but we had, we had {BOC: *sorry*}, you know, a property tax, the residential property tax, which invented, which was abolished in the mid-90s, and ... if it were only there now ...

BOC: But is the time to re-invent it, Garret, when at least 300,000—I think it's a lot more—of people of my generation are in this awful horrible hole of negative equity, where their properties aren't actually an asset, they're a huge liability for them, it has probably ruined their lives in fairness, and they will probably never recover from it. And then we shove a property tax on them, it's kind of ... to pay again ...

Garret: It will be necessary to make provision to deal with people who've been hit in that respect. It's probably ... there's a huge mortgage problem. In this assessment of our, of the banks, allowance is made for them, it makes very tough assumptions on the mortgage side that the banks are going to have to cope with,

BOC: But you and I know that Irish people, despite what anyone says that it's going to get more and more closer to a tipping point, Irish people will pay their mortgages, if they can at all, they will ...

Garret: We have a good record, and may I also say that if there still is a problem at the end of the day, banks in the past, and building societies, have been reasonably good about that, we don't have massive—eh—taking back of houses that other countries have, but it is a huge problem. So, the two really damaging things are unemployment and the mortgage interest. The issue of reducing pay, obviously no one likes it, but we have been paying ourselves, mostly, we having been paying ourselves more than other countries. Do you know what a doctor gets in France? In France—I saw it in *The Irish Times* about four months ago, the French Government decided that the GP rate was to go up from 22 to 23 Euro, what is it here? It's nearly three times that. {interruption by BOC: *Yea*} And this runs right throughout society, we've all been overpaid. Ministers were overpaid, Ministers' pensions are overpaid. And unfortunately apparently, the last Government, didn't feel it could cut the pensions. We have to volunteer if we want to, and not everybody wants to volunteer, so we have this problem.... and the one thing ...

BOC: But you know Garret a lot of people don't feel that they're overpaid, ... people, you know, who aren't Ministers, or doctors

Garret: I know they don't feel it. And d'you know the one thing is that we think we are overtaxed, in fact we're undertaxed. Our taxes now on people are much lower than in any European country or the

United States, we were undertaxed by 4 billion, it's probably about two and a half billion now. So, we all believe these things, but we don't realise, we've been so cosseted in the past, by Governments and what they've done, that we don't understand what a mess we're in, that we're overpaid and under-taxed ... So there's a lot to be done, and it's going to be painful for the next couple of years ... to get out the far end.

BOC: OK, Garret, now I'm conscious that we don't have much time left. But can you give us anything positive about the next few years {audience laughs} where the future, is there hope? {audience laughs}

Garret: Yes, we've seen the worst. But we are going to have to see further cuts, in spending, and hope {audience laughs}, and tax increases to get out the far end, and we have probably, it could probably be another two years before the economy starts to recover, though we can't be certain about that. But, on the other hand ... {interruption by BOC: *Do you suggest...*} that what we have going for us is that we are a very successful exporting country, and over the last twelve months there has been a huge increase in exports, and not just the big multinationals from America, yes, there doing very well, the pharmaceuticals, but the majority of Irish indigenous sectors are in fact increasing their exports ... and have you seen the output at all?—and in time, that increased output will require more workers, so you will be moving to a point where more workers will be needed, in industry, and as people recover confidence, they'll be more willing to spend, and that will increase employment also ...

BOC: Am I right in saying, I seem to hear recently that exports aren't actually great at creating jobs, in general, and we've started hearing this phrase then, we heard 'export-led growth' then we heard 'jobless export-led growth', and I mean, meanwhile Garret, a lot of people will say that, the domestic economy, where we're trading with each other, where the vast majority of people work, is being hammered every year, and it's going to be hammered more to pay this 24 billion, isn't it?

Garret: All recoveries, including export-led recoveries, take time before they reach the point where extra jobs are required. At this early stage, I mean employment has been cut, you have a labour force which still has the capacity to produce to export, without extra workers needing to be employed, and we're at that stage, but then you come to the point where that growth continues and you do need more workers and when people see there are more workers they are more willing to spend at home, and that spending at home creates employment. That takes time ... and I'm just saying it might be two years before we see the recovery. Recovery takes time {interruption by BOC: *so we'll see the recovery in two years time then you say*} ... and it will be rapid, more

rapid, because I believe, I think we have a great capacity for growth and our growth rate, when we get out of this mess, will, at least for some years as we recover, will be higher than the rest of Europe, will be catching up, in the middle of the ... {interruption by BOC: *you mean as fast as we went down we could shoot up again?*} yes, that's right, we have an open economy, we go down when there is trouble and when things recover we go up faster...

(Transcript by Philip O'Connor, who comments: What the hell is going on? After a bruising election campaign in which catastrophist economists were given front page billing, and utopian "New Republicans" were unleashed on us with their utopian answers, they are all now being reined in, and the structure of the deal negotiated by FF is being implemented without change as the practical and effective way forward? And everyone is selling it now to us, in its new "positive" FG-Lab clothing? So, like Iraq, it was just all about achieving regime change and wiping out FF as a serious force!!)

Exports Up!

The country's exports surged in February with provisional CSO figures showing a rise of 11% in goods and services sold abroad. Imports fell by 3% in the same month.

The Central Statistics Office said preliminary figures for the month showed exports totalled $\text{€}8.1\text{bn}$, while imports were almost $\text{€}4.3\text{bn}$.

As a result the seasonally adjusted trade surplus rose by 33% year on year to $\text{€}3.83\text{bn}$ for the month. This is the highest trade surplus since December 2009. Compared with February last year, exports were up 14pc, while imports rose by 18%.

However, both the *Irish Independent* and *Irish Times* tried to play down the significance of the latest figures. But they were superseded by Richard Bruton, Fine Gael's Minister for Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation, who said, "*I am pleased that this reassuring positive trend in the growth in our exports over recent months has been maintained*", adding that the February trade figures were a reflection of the efforts of his Government.

As the Coalition took office in March, it must be the best Government in the history of the State. Its policies have had retrospective effect!

John Martin

(See <http://www.independent.ie/business/irish/exports-soar-11pc-during-february-as-imports-fall-says-cso-2627338.html> and <http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/finance/2011/0422/1224295255376.html>)

es ahora *

WAR IN LIBYA

"We do not lack communication, on the contrary we have too much of it. We lack creation. *We lack resistance to the present*"

G. Deleuze and F. Guattari

"Had journalists questioned the deceptions that led to the Iraq war, the invasion would not have happened."

John Pilger. Guardian, 10 Dec. 2010

"If men could learn from history, what lessons it might teach us! But passion and party blind our eyes, and the light which experience gives us is a lantern on the stern, which shines only on the waves behind us!"

Coleridge,

from T. Allsop, *Recollections*, 1831

In December 1917, in a private conversation between the Prime Minister of Britain, David Lloyd George and C.P. Scott, Editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, the former admitted: "*If people really knew the truth, the war would be stopped tomorrow. But of course they don't know, and can't know.*" In the wake of this—the First World War—the war to end all wars, Edward Bernays, a confidante of President Woodrow Wilson, coined the term "*public relations*" as a euphemism for propaganda "*which was given a bad name in the war*". In his book, *Propaganda* (1928), Bernays described PR as "*an invisible government which is the true ruling power in our country*", thanks to "*the intelligent manipulation of the masses*". This was achieved by "*false realities*" and their adoption by the media. (One of Bernays's early successes was persuading women to smoke in public. By associating smoking with women's liberation, he achieved headlines that lauded cigarettes as "*torches of freedom*".)

John Pilger, one of the few thought provoking journalists left in the media meditates on the above and said it only impacted on his understanding when he was a young journalist in Vietnam. PR terms like "*pacification*" and "*collateral damage*", and later "*quagmire*", became "*staples of a news vocabulary that recognised the killing of civilians merely as tragic mistakes and seldom questioned the good intentions of the invaders*"—not that the latter were ever called that. Almost no reporter ever used the word "*invasion*", but "*involvement*" and other such euphemisms. And the infamous My Lai Massacre in 1968 was not reported from Vietnam, even though a number of reporters knew about it (and other atrocities like it), but by a freelance in the US, Seymour Hersh. The cover of Newsweek magazine called it an "*American tragedy*" implying that

the invaders were the victims: a purging theme enthusiastically taken up by Hollywood movies such as *The Deer Hunter* and *Platoon*.

After Vietnam, USUK became much more cunning in their strategies of deceit when making war and thus modern conflicts had "*embedded*" journalists and ever more strategic language. Iraq was "*liberated*", people were killed by "*friendly fire*", and entrenched war was "*mission creep*". Language itself became totally debased and even when the American President, George "Dubya" Bush dismissed torture as "*an asset*" in obtaining information, with the accepting of "*water-boarding*" as a legitimate technique, the "*new world order*" of "*regime change*" by Rumsfeld and Cheney became part of our "*water-cooler*" conversation. The "*mad jihadists*" had to be stopped otherwise we'd all burn in our beds. Better far that they and their children were burning in theirs. And if we inadvertently saw burning bodies—we were assured—that they had been used as "*human shields*" by their "*bad dictators*".

So now to Libya for another rerun of the same scenario. Today, Good Friday, 22nd April 2011, France 24 showed us a clip of Robert Gates, the US Secretary of Defence, stating that American Predator Drones were being used to bomb "*strategic targets*" in Gaddafi-held areas in Tripoli and other cities. The "rebels" are also being helped by Britain and France. Germany, Spain, Russia and China have refused to participate with them—and even the UN has asked for the "*conflict to be stopped*" and "*discussions to start*" for over a week now. I have seen President Gaddafi being feted by his people in Tripoli but such trifles are mere incidentals to the progress of a war against him by USUK/France/Italy/Canada and Denmark.

The Italian island of Lampedusa has been swamped by Tunisian/Egyptian and Libyan refugees—over 20,000 of them and they were given temporary resident permits by the Italians who want them to be dispersed throughout the EU. Some of them were put on trains to France and were stopped at the border by President Sarkozy. Italy cried foul and said France was in breach of the Schengen Agreement. But the EU found in favour of France, stating that French Interior Minister Claude Gueant was "*entitled to grant entry only to those with sufficient means to support themselves*". M. Gueant stated that France "*had applied the letter and the spirit of the Schengen Agreement*".

But the real problem for the EU is that many countries, including France, are having to combat the fact that immigration has become a major battleground. And in what has been seen as a shift in policy, Mr. Gueant said that "*as well as increasing the expulsion rate for migrants, he also wanted to cut the number of work visas issued*

It Is Time

each year by 20,000". He added: "We must listen more to the French people and bring forward precise solutions to address what they expect of us". The problem though is that attacking and interfering in the internal affairs of those countries in North Africa has the affect of displacing people and not unnaturally these migrants run to those countries who are waging war against their leaders. So how can any country thus involved then state that they need not account for their actions? It is pure nonsense and the height of hypocrisy. Bombing Libya equates to fleeing migrants. Thus also the freezing of oil/gas assets of those countries equates to fleeing economic migrants. *In the end, it is that simple and that solvable.*

HISTORY AND HOW IT IS SOLD

Now that I have found that the History channel is part of my Sky package, I have been dipping into its fare now and then. What has amused me is that Fergal Keane and Roy Foster have sold the history of Ireland as *The Story Of Ireland*. But when it comes to USUK it is very certainly their "History" that is commodified. And what a to-do there has been recently about the history of Britain. When that most respected historian, Richard J. Evans, Regius Professor of History at Cambridge, President of Wolfson College and author amongst other books of *In Defence Of History*, wrote a piece about the subject in the *London Review of Books*, Vol. 33, No. 6, 17th March 2011, such was the blow-back from letter-writers that even I was taken aback at the swell of opinions. Evans began by quoting Michael Gove, the Secretary for Education, who addressed the Tory Party Conference last October:

"One of the under-appreciated tragedies of our time has been the sundering of our society from its past. Children are growing up ignorant of one of the most inspiring stories I know—the history of our United Kingdom. Our history has moments of pride, and shame, but unless we fully understand the struggles of the past we will not properly value the liberties of the present. The current approach we have to history denies children the opportunity to hear our island story. Children are given a mix of topics at primary, a cursory run through Henry VIII and Hitler at secondary and many give up the subject at 14, without knowing how the vivid episodes of our past become a connected narrative. Well, this *trashing of our past has to stop.*"

Simon Schama is the person tasked with the job of putting things right and, as Gove stated, he "*has agreed to advise us on how we can put British history at the heart of a revived national curriculum*". Evans gave a side-swipe at Schama by referring to him as teaching in New York. But anyhow Evans says that "*the first task of the curriculum*", as Gove and Schama

see it, "*is to foster a sense of British national identity*". Schama writes,

"At a moment fraught with the possibility of social and cultural division, we need citizens who grow up with a sense of *our shared memory* as a living, urgently present body of knowledge."

Or as the popular historian Dominic Sandbrook puts it, "*we need to return to 1, the stories that make a nation's collective memory*", 2, "*that fire the imagination*", and 3, "*that bind the generations*"—New Labour's curriculum favoured "*themes*" over "*actual content*"—what "*we need is a return to narrative history*". Schama went on to develop his Gove-like theory stating: "*Our children are being short-changed of the patrimony of their story, which is to say the lineaments of the whole story, for there can be no true history that refuses to span the arch, no coherence without chronology.*" Evans theorises that the running here has been made by "*a self-appointed pressure group calling itself 'Better History', formed in 2006 to advise the Conservative shadow education team*". Its leader is a former schoolteacher, Sean Lang. Gove wants "*school history to place far more emphasis on factual knowledge, including the lives of kings and queens*". Facts are the essential thing here and Evans is concerned that the whole enterprise is up-playing an essentialist "*Britain centred narrative*". And ultimately it will be a "*celebratory history*", for how otherwise "*could it serve as the cement of national identity*"?

But surely Evans argues that British society is a multi-ethnic one and therefore its history should reflect that fact? As he goes on to further elucidate:

"National identity is a complex, many-layered thing, and to treat it as if it were simply and exclusively the culmination of a centuries-long march of events within the narrow confines of the British Isles is a radically ignorant form of dumbing down."

"History is by its nature a critical, sceptical discipline. Historians commonly see one of their main tasks as puncturing myths, demolishing orthodoxies and exposing politically motivated narratives that advance spurious claims to objectivity. Schama advocates the return of "storytelling in the classroom" as the "necessary condition" of debate and analysis since distinctions can be made "between just and unjust conflicts" and students can develop "analytical knowledge of the nature of power".

But Evans, Gove, Schama and their allies are confusing history with memory.

"History is a critical academic discipline whose aims include precisely the interrogation of memory and the myths it generated. It really does matter to historians that there isn't any evidence that Alfred burned the cakes, or that Nelson and Wellington weren't national

heroes to everyone. For those in power, this makes history as a discipline not only useless but dangerous too".

In the *London Review of Books*, Vol. 33, No. 7, 31st March 2011, the Letters page exploded at Evans and his 'take' on history. Robert Tombs from the University of Cambridge noted that he had been part of a think-tank, which issued a pamphlet in 2002 and he "*advocated less emphasis on skills and more on knowledge, a less constraining examination system, and a curriculum in GCSE and A level History that would move away from teaching history as disconnected fragments—dismissed by Evans as "a return to narrative"*". Moreover he asked of Evans "*Is it unreasonable for schoolchildren to gain a basic knowledge of the history of the country in which they live?*" Christopher McGovern wrote that he "*helped write the current National Curriculum for History*" and he too is "*sadly displeased with Evans*".

"The mass exodus of pupils when the subject becomes optional at age 14 is testimony to the failure of the curriculum. Evans underplays the importance of narrative and the way in which children, especially young children, need it to make sense of the world and its past".

Evans argues that "*narrative is unreliable*", but doesn't mention the degree of subjective judgement involved in selecting and using historical evidence in the classroom. He sees the "*transmission and regurgitation*" of facts as "*calamitous*", but "*fails to acknowledge the extent of factual ignorance revealed in survey after survey*".

And so it went but—whatever the nature of polite discourse—what seems most definite to this reader is that Anglo-centric History is now prevalent in Irish schools and academia. The island-theme is not Ireland but England and our Oxbridge-educated historians are not in the least apologetic—they positively glow in their orientation. The *Irish Daily Mail*, 22nd April 2011, laments that somebody "*put gunpowder and glass in a drink bottle and tried to blow up the Wellington monument in Trim, Co. Meath. There was only some minor scorching to the statue but the Defence Forces attended the scene and sealed it off before making the area safe.*" Having driven to Trim some two years ago, away in the distance I saw this formidable statue rising over the hinterland of this lovely County and thought it was some Irish hero. When we stopped and I got out to look, there loomed hugely this stone monument to the *loser* of the Battle of Waterloo. Had not the great Prussian General Blucher arrived at 2 pm and saved Wellington's bacon, it would have been curtains for him. The *Irish Daily Mail* noted that, though he had been born in Ireland, "*he denied his Irish roots*" and famously said: "*Being born in a stable does not make one a horse*".

"He changed his name from Wesley to Wellesley and was a powerful but not popular landowner in Ireland, he was deeply disliked by the 19th century community and has long been a hate figure among hard-line Irish Republicans. Christened the 'Iron Duke' Wellington served as British prime minister from 1828-1830. His death in 1852 was marked by a grand funeral and the honour of a burial in St. Paul's cathedral alongside Lord Nelson."

Fittingly or not—this piece was filed by Ali Bracken, the Crime Correspondent for the Irish *Daily Mail*.

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV

Hello magazine, No 1169, 11th April 2011 celebrated the former Soviet leader's 80th Birthday in style. The Nobel Peace Prize laureate marked his personal milestone with a glittering gala concert and awards ceremony which cost a reputed £3 million and was attended by VIP guests, including former Californian Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, Israeli President Shimon Peres, Earl Spencer, the former UK Prime Minister Sir John Major, and many more luminaries of world politics, movies and industry. Billed as *Mikhail Gorbachev: The Man Who Changed the World*, the gala was held in London's Royal Albert Hall. Tickets sold like wildfire with the glamorous audience paying anything from £195 to £100,000 for seats or an exclusive box and giving Mikhail repeated standing ovations. The American movie actor and Oscar winner Kevin Spacey said: "I think you could look around the world now and you see that there are still people fighting for freedom and there is a kind of a direct link to Mikhail Gorbachev. And yet I don't think he's received the kind of due or kind of respect or kind of adulation that I think he deserves." Arnold Schwarzenegger said Mikhail "is widely credited with laying the foundations for Russia's transition to democracy and helping to end the Cold War in the late 1980's and early 90's". Guests at the high-security event also included fellow Nobel Peace Prize winner and former Polish President Lech Walesa, who referred to the ground-breaking negotiations he had with Mikhail during that time. Proceeds from the evening, which also included video messages from Bill Clinton, Sting and Bono, went to the Raisa Gorbachev Children's Institute and Macmillian Cancer Support. The ex-Soviet President used the evening to introduce the inaugural annual *Gorbachev Awards* to his personally chosen winners "who included CNN founder Ted Turner, World Wide Web inventor Tim Berners-Lee and Kenyan engineer Evans Wadongo, 25 who developed an inexpensive solar lamp that has helped change the lives of tens of thousands of Africans".

Julianne Herlihy ©

Editorial Digest, Northern Elections

On 5th May Northern Ireland voters will decide three different matters. Apart from elections to the Northern Ireland Assembly, and to Local Government, there will be participation in the UK Referendum on the Alternative Vote system. If this referendum is carried, there will be proportional representation in Single Member Constituencies (as happens currently in Dail By-elections) in elections to the Westminster Parliament.

Assembly Elections

Numbers of candidates. There are 218 candidates for 108 seats—theoretically giving everyone almost a 2 in 1 chance of a seat, but in reality meaning that most of the main party candidates will be elected. The DUP has 44 standing; Sinn Fein 40; the UUP 29; SDLP 28; Alliance 22; TUV 12; Green 6; UKIP 6; People Before Profit (SWP) 4; Socialist Party (Militant) 3; BNP 3. There are 15 Independents.

Of much interest is the fact that there will be *no UUP candidate in Foyle* (Derry). The Party muttered something about not getting papers in on time. But the dogs in the street know that Michael McGimpsey's cancellation of the proposed local cancer unit would lead to a humiliating vote for the UUP in the area. (It should be noted that Stormont Ministers are effectively mini-Prime Ministers in their autonomous Departments. So any credit or blame is theirs and theirs alone.)

Who are real sectarians? The Saint Andrews Agreement decided that the First Minister should come from the largest Party rather than, as was then the case, from the largest designation. To ensure weighted voting, all MLAs must designate themselves Unionist, Nationalist or Other. For the moment at least the largest designation is Unionist—of whatever hue. *Tom Elliott*, leader of what is left of the Ulster Unionist Party, has been attacking the DUP for its agreement to de-sectarianise the selection of the First Minister and allowing for the possibility of a Sinn Fein First Minister. Here is the "moderate" bigot on his web site on 25th March:

"The fact is that the possibility of Sinn Fein ever taking the First Minister's post only emerged following the legislation which resulted from the DUP/Sinn Fein deal at St. Andrews... Following the deal done... the rules inexplicably changed and the First Minister will now be drawn from the largest Party, irrespective of designation."

Until 11th April the DUP more or less stayed out of all this. But then Peter Robinson, fearing he was being out-Unionated, unfortunately joined in the fray and said that people on the doorstep were very worried about this matter and therefore so was he! Let's hope this is a passing phase.

The only way there could be a Sinn Fein First Minister is if the SDLP vote

collapses into Sinn Fein and Unionism is split down the middle. By attacking the DUP for not being sectarian enough, Elliott is trying to stem the flow of voters to the DUP. But mostly he is worried about being outflanked on the 'right' by the Unionist dissidents of the Traditional Unionist Voice (TUV).

For a while the DUP was also worried about the TUV. But then, at the General Election, Ian Paisley Jnr. wiped the floor with the TUV's leader, Jim Allister, in North Antrim.

DUP joins the bigots? The early days of the election campaign saw the UUP and the TUV concentrating on the bogeymen of Martin McGuinness becoming First Minister. This is something beyond the bounds of possibility and those who want to keep sectarianism at the centre of Northern politics know this very well.

Ulster Unionist Assembly candidate for Fermanagh/South Tyrone, Kenny Donaldson, wrote a letter to the *Belfast Telegraph* (7th April) ostensibly condemning the killing of Constable Kerr and extending his sympathies. But the bulk of the letter was making a 'case' for pinning the blame for the killing on Sinn Fein. This was not a one-off. Since Constable Kerr's death there has been a constant stream of letter to the papers pushing the same line. Some, like that from Mr. Donaldson, acknowledge their authors' UUP affiliation. Others appear to be from private citizens—but these are usually recognisable as coming from inveterate UUP letter writers.

Jim Allister of the TUV got in on the act on 8th April, with letters to the *Belfast Telegraph* and the *News Letter*—old Jim is slowing down a bit! After a lot of other stuff, he says: "The organisation that murdered Constable Kerr shares the same DNA as IRA/Sinn Fein, the same goal and the same methodology".

Majority voting. The TUV wants majority rule in Stormont. The DUP wants laws passed provided the proposers get a 65% majority. It is highly unlikely that the real government, the British Government, will permit either of these proposals.

Unionist pacts against Sinn Fein have been urged from many in both the UUP and the DUP. But these have only come to fruition in West Belfast and North Belfast. However, the UUP, in particular, is relying on transfers from the SDLP, especially in areas like South Down, or from the Alliance Party in areas like East Belfast and South Belfast.

In their latest spat the UUP has condemned the DUP for "achieving nothing" in government. The DUP has replied that it {along with Sinn Fein, of course!} achieved many things, some of which we include here: free travel on bus and rail for over-60s; regional rates frozen for three years; water charges deferred indefinitely; largest single investment in Northern Ireland, £520m, creating 800 jobs; £150 to each of 150,000 households to help with heating over the cold Winter; free prescriptions for every-

one; 800 new homes last year; and on and on. Forty measures in all. Egg appeared on the face of the UUP. The SDLP seems wisely to have stayed out of it.

The SDLP launched its election campaign on 7h April in Belfast's Hilton Hotel. Margaret 'Poppy' Ritchie gave a long rambling speech promising, well, nice things. According to the *Newsletter*, she "pledged to make Northern Ireland a better place", and "said that the Party was 'brimming over with ideas'". That sort of thing. The SDLP said that it is running 28 Assembly candidates and 150 local Government candidates. That must be near enough the entire membership!

SDLP, Derry. The following is part of a letter that appeared in the Derry Journal, 8th April, under a pseudonym:

"...the article in last Tuesday's Derry Journal by Pol Callaghan [SDLP] is without doubt the best case of delusional thinking I have seen since Comical Ali claimed victory in Baghdad.

"Mr. Callaghan tells us that the election results in the south 'bodes well for the SDLP'. The SDLP have been inextricably linked to Fianna Fail for years, even to the point of contemplating merging not that long ago. In recent elections in the North we have been tripping over Fianna Fail ministers and politicians canvassing for the SDLP while every SDLP election leaflet that fell through our doors had the obligatory photo with Brian Cowen or Bertie Ahern. It wasn't that long ago that Pol Callaghan was boasting that Brian Cowen congratulated him on his co-option to the Assembly.

"The irony of this article is that Margaret Ritchie, leader of the SDLP, has said recently that the 'SDLP doesn't interfere in IRISH politics'. Yet we have Pol Callaghan claiming victory and attempting to align the SDLP to Fine Gael and Labour, the parties that have just announced water charges, 25,000 public sector job cuts and privatisation of state assets—to name a few... if I were Pol Callaghan and his colleagues in the SDLP I would be cautious in looking for green shoots of recovery on the backs of the Irish Coalition for Cuts."

Margaret 'Poppy' Ritchie appears to want to have her cake and eat it. She is insisting that the British Government guarantees funding for the North for the next 25 years, even if there is a United Ireland in the meantime! (News Letter, 16th April). On the banks, she states: "As for Martin [McGuinness] his big idea is another levy on the local banks—£400m over the Budget period. Does he not realise that while it might be populist and a clever stroke to to have a pop at the banks our four local banks are in no position to pay" Poor banks!

The Alliance Party's main proposals are that the public housing organisation, the Housing Executive gets involved in the provision of private housing; new rules against the display of flags; a 20% target for pupils attending integrated schools; more mixed housing estates.

DUP policies. The most startling one is Peter Robinson's proposal the charities and private companies should run the

prisons. Three such charities are called: No More Prison; Revolving Doors; and Unlock. Should be interesting! The DUP rules out water charges in this Assembly. It wants the devolution of Corporation Tax, focus on renewable energy and the agri-food business, automatic benefit payment to pensioners and others on benefits.

Sinn Fein policies: A levy of £400m on local banks, international accessibility to all British documents relating to collusion and deaths during the war, a new cancer unit for Derry, no water charges, regeneration of the Maze site, reinstate the 50/50 policy on police recruiting, no increase in the cap on tuition fees and a referendum on a United Ireland.

Gerry Adams has called for a 32-county referendum on unity, which he knows damn well will not happen. But *Margaret Ritchie* has called for a 6-county referendum which could easily happen—at the stroke of the Secretary of State's pen—and especially now when there is, just, the chance of a Unionist majority. But what would happen if there was a nationalist victory? The British Government certainly wouldn't force unity. The Protestants would oppose it, by armed force if necessary, no matter how many poppies Ritchie wears. And one thing the Protestants are not short of is guns.

SDLP policies include re-introducing prescription charges, more private finance in the provision of social housing, devolution of tax-varying powers, cutting the number of MLAs and a vast range of pious wishes.

Alliance Party and Greens want to bring in water charges. The Greens also want to reduce the number of MLAs from 108 to 80, a moratorium on road building (which would come as relief to the South which seems to pay for most of it), and a crash home insulation programme employing 15,000 people. Alliance wants 20% of children in integrated schools by 2020, less tolerance for illegally erected flags and emblems, Stormont Departments down from 12 to 8, like the Greens, MLAs down from 108 to 80, minimum pricing of alcohol, and holding down student fees.

An Election Debate was held on UTV on April 20th. The consensus among the Belfast newspapers was that Robinson and McGuinness gave a very good account of themselves, while Elliott, Ritchie, and especially Ford, did quite badly.

The Ulster Farmers' Union has submitted a manifesto to all parties. At the core of this is the retention and non-dilution of the Common Agricultural Policy. Other issues include land eligibility, the future of less favoured areas, a Department Of Agriculture and Rural Development budget for 2011-14, groceries code adjudicator, animal/plant health, better regulation, and climate change.

"It has been estimated that with proper support and investment the Northern Ireland agri-food business could grow its sales by 40% over the next 10 years and create up to 15,000 new jobs over that period." Including peripheral jobs, the UFU estimates that the

industry already employs 90,000 people. The UFU supports a British House of Commons report on the CAP. Its President, John Thompson, said:

"We are particularly pleased that it concludes that the first objective of the CAP, should be to maintain and enhance the EU's capacity to produce food with a significant degree of self sufficiency... the UK should press for the EU to argue more strongly for recognition of environmental and animal welfare standards within trade agreements otherwise when consumers buy cheap food imports produced to lower standards, the EU is effectively exporting the adverse environmental impacts which it wants to avoid."

The Conservative Party position on the May elections to Stormont is wierd. Here is Lord Feldman at a recent Tory dinner in the Province:

"The truth is that we all want to see a politics which is more relevant and responsive to the needs of people in Northern Ireland, and we all want to see a politics which is more credible, more constructive, and more long-term. So today, let us make this pledge to Northern Ireland: our party will offer that new politics... by working together, we can make sure that more and more people in Northern Ireland go into the polling booth and vote Conservative." (Newsletter, 6 April)

The Conservative Party is *not* contesting the Stormont election!!!

Ann Cooper was a candidate for the Traditional Unionist Voice in a by-election last year in Castlereagh. A case arose when Revenue and Customs staff were caught withholding payment of benefits to people from ethnic minorities. Ann sent the culprits a message: "Well done lads. Sorry you got caught. You deserve a medal. We need more like you."

She has now switched parties and is standing for the *British National Party* in East Belfast. We seem to remember the UDA leader, Jackie McDonald, announcing at the time of attacks on Roma people in South Belfast that there would be hell to pay if the fascist BNP tried organisind in Belfast. Now we'll see if he was serious. (According to the *Belfast Telegraph*, 13th April, The BNP has 39 members in the North.)

Health Policy has caused a spat between unionists. *Michael McGimpsey*, UUP Minister for Health, got into trouble for cancelling a planned radiography unit at Altnegelvin Hospital in Derry. (He now says he has changed his mind and may revive the plan by 2016.) He said he did not get enough money. *Pater Robinson*, DUP leader, said there was a constant increase in the health budget, which there is, and that he was going to see that the unit was opened.

In an otherwise meaningless debate organised by the so-called voluntary sector, DUP health spokesman said that the last four years have been characterised by record levels of investment: "They have also been marked by a failure to deliver on much needed reforms by the minister". The possible nature of such reforms? "*Sinn Fein's Caral Ní Chuilín* called for

consultants' salaries and bonuses to be capped to allow monies to be redistributed in the health service." [Belfast Telegraph, 8th April]

A recent investigation in the South found that money was being poured into the health service, only to be sucked out again by consultants, managers and others such as lawyers leeching off the service. The same is true, though to a much lesser extent, in the North, though there has yet been no proper investigation. There have, however, been several investigations showing Health Executives and Consultants swanning around the world on huge expenses, with photographs showing their lavish homes and lifestyles.

Care for the elderly has been taken up by Peter Robinson. He complains that 50% of such care in the North is provided publicly, compared to only 20% in Great Britain. Though he congratulates the South Eastern Health Board for matching the British figures. He goes on: "*Opening up social care to proper tendering and allowing the most cost-effective provision is clearly essential.*" Either Mr. Robinson has never seen private care facilities at first hand or he has shares in granny farms.

Local Government Elections

There will be contests in the existing 26 Councils. There were proposals to reduce these, firstly to 7, and then to 11, with wonderful titles like North North East and such like. There was no question of creating Councils on the basis of areas that people could identify with—such as the six Counties plus city Councils for Belfast and Derry. But, it was objected, Fermanagh has a much smaller population than Antrim.

So What? This doesn't affect the workings of areas in, say, Germany or Spain. But the North seems to have picked up the anally retentive attitudes of England where, a good few years ago, local authorities were "evened up", and places like Huntingdonshire, with which people could identify, were abolished.

Constable Kerr

Ronan Kerr, a Catholic member of the PSNI, was killed by an under-car bomb near Omagh on 2nd April. There has been much talk about avoiding a "return to the past". But there has been already one "return to the past". This is in the hysterical and mindless competition among politicians, media pundits and others, to see who can sound most publicly "outraged". In the past the Alliance Party always won this competition hands down. Sinn Fein also condemned the killing of Constable Kerr and, apart from the dissident wing of Unionism, this was accepted as sincere. But Sinn Fein refused to feed the down-market media feeding frenzy and were measured and constructive about the whole thing. The *Irish News* devoted its first 13 pages (4th April) to the incident, the *Belfast Telegraph*, 9 pages. To be fair, the *Telegraph* carried a couple of reasonable articles about possible dialogue with the "dissidents".

Margaret 'Poppy' Ritchie, announcing the postponement of the SDLPs election press conference, said: "*Now is not the time for party politicking or electioneering*". Which was, of course, itself a fine bit of party politicking and electioneering. It was designed to put down Sinn Fein's decision to go ahead with its press conference on the grounds that the incident should not be allowed to interfere with the democratic process.

Alex Maskey, Sinn Fein Leader, has protested about the length of time the suspects in the Ronan Kerr killing have been held without charge for questioning. One since April 2nd, another since April 5th, and the third since April 8th. As this is being written the police have applied for a further 6 days in all cases. The police thinking is clear. After one week, most people will crack and confess to anything. If they don't, then they must be really "hard men" and need to be detained for longer. (Two of the prisoners held over the Kerr killing have, as we go to press, been released "unconditionally". No surprise there. It was a mixture of the usual fishing expedition and intimidation.)

Catholics are now stated to number 30% of the PSNI. Whatever one's view of the killing of Constable Kerr, it is ridiculous to portray him, and other Catholic PSNI members, as some kind of exceptional heroes. Some may well be, others are not. Pay for police officers is among the highest in the North. It is the standing down of the Provisional IRA plus a very high salary that has been attracting most Catholic recruits and only seldom some sense of social duty.

Cardinal Brady, head of the Catholic Church in Ireland, said: "*I'm calling on Catholic parents and teachers to encourage their children to consider this [joining the PSNI] as their vocation in life. I'm also calling on people if they have any information about this crime to report it.*"

Bishop of Derry, Seamus Hegarty, said: "*This crime against a man who served and protected the public, is a crime against all in our society... I reiterate my support, both personally and as the Bishop of the Diocese of Derry, for those who serve the community as police officers and the right of young men and women to join the police.*" Interestingly these comments appeared only in the *Belfast News Letter*. By and large the two Protestant papers have been relatively measured. The *Catholic Irish News* has lost the head altogether.

Ulster GAA President, Aogán Ó Fearghail, said: "*We believe that any civilised society needs a police force and we are committed to seeing that people who come from a nationalist background would remain and be committed to a policing service*". Baragh GAA Club Chairman, Gearóid Ó Treasaigh, stated: "*Ronan Kerr was a Catholic and a Gael, who joined the PSNI because he wanted to play his part in making our society a better place. Many members of our club were aware of Ronan's career path and supported on his choice.*" (Ronan Kerr had played for Baragh as a teenager.)

The Irish News (7th April) announced the 1,000 people had gathered in front of Belfast City Hall the previous day to protest against the killing of Ronan Kerr. The *Dublin Evening Herald* said there were 7,000 people. Both were wrong. The protest at the City Hall was a Trade Union protest against cuts in education and the banner on the platform clearly labeled it as such. At the beginning, protesters were read a tribute to Constable Kerr and the *Belfast Telegraph* distributed posters based on its front page among several people which it then proceeded to photograph. It is perfectly possible that most or all of those present sympathised with Ronan Kerr. No one can tell.

Attendance at Mass for Constable Kerr by Orange Order and UUP leaders, Tom Elliot and Danny Kennedy, is to be overlooked by the Orange Order, according to all the Belfast paper, at least this once. Overlooked but not condoned. (This writer has not yet been able to find out whether Elliot actually went to mass or merely attended the funeral.) The official position of the Order states: "*you should not countenance by your presence or otherwise any act or ceremony of Popish worship*".

Orange Reformation is a group within the Order standing for traditional values and against such notions as an Orangefest on the 12th July. It has proposed that Elliot and Kennedy be expelled for attending Constable Kerr's funeral: "*We believe the Roman Catholic mass is blasphemous and an affront to the once-and-for-all sacrifice of Christ on the cross. No Protestant should ever attend Roman Catholic worship. We call for these members to be expelled from the Orange institution, along with others who have recently met with the Parades Commission, contrary to Grand Lodge policy. Rules are rules and they must be upheld.*"

Peter Robinson, who attended, is not an Orangeman. But he has received criticism from the Free Presbyterian Church. The Rev. Ian Paisley, however, has refused to comment on Robinson's attendance.

Free Presbyterian Minister in Lurgan, Rev. David Creane says: "*The sight of Protestant church leaders, politicians and Orangemen standing shoulder to shoulder with IRA/Sinn Fein at the requiem mass in Beragh last week was deeply saddening.*" His colleague, Rev. John Greer of Ballymena, added: "*They were present for an act of idolatry and therefore they were guilty*". Though not a member of the FPC, the TUV's leader, Jim Allister, is a regular attendee at the Rev. Greer's service.

Martin McGuinness has been criticised by opponents for claiming that Ronan Kerr was a Sinn Fein voter on the grounds that he was using the man's death, and the sympathy it engendered, for electoral purposes. McGuinness said: "*I don't think I was politicising his death. It has never been contested that he was an Irishman, that he was nationalist-minded, that he was republican-minded, that he was a supporter of the GAA.*" Not quite proof that he was a Sinn Fein voter, though.

On Peter Hart And Other Matters

I ask if I may reply in the first instance to Brendan Clifford's article *Hard On Hart* which responded to my letter in the November 2010 issue of the *Irish Political Review*, and largely leave Niall Meehan's challenge on the Dunmanway massacre to another time?

Brendan Clifford is surprised at me writing I was not "aware of the level of violence inflicted on southern Protestants in the 1916-23 period".

The key word is "level". I was aware in 1969 (the time of awareness he refers to) that southern Protestants had experienced violence, indeed that their population had been decimated, particularly in the border areas. I did not know the details although this was only 45 years previously, hardly a greater distance in time than the late 1960s are to the present!

My reading then would have included Paul Blanshard's book *The Irish And Catholic Power*, so I knew much more about the difficulties southern Protestants faced after partition. Events before were 'history' to me as dead as were the events in Belfast of the 1920s.

Since then, books like Alan Parkinson's, *Belfast's Unholy War: The Troubles of the 1920s* (2004), have opened up that period. Gerard Murphy's book *The Year Of Disappearances* has now done the same for Cork. Despite inevitable criticism for certain speculative conclusions, he provides a wealth of shocking detail.

The scale and intensity of the killings in both cities is disturbing, and the fact that they went largely unrecorded in a narrative or historical sense is surprising. Andy Boyd's *Holy War In Belfast* was almost a set text in 1969, yet it only dealt with 19th century violence.

Brendan Clifford points out that BICO wisely warned the student revolutionaries of People's Democracy in 1969 saying, "the factual circumstances would if they succeeded in unsettling the situation lead to Protestant/Catholic conflict and not to socialist revolution".

Student revolutionaries do not think of consequences, especially when they are not historically minded. This is true of most young people. They do anger instead.

BICO unquestionably provided an intellectual and actual refuge for many such radicals and revolutionaries, both Catholic and Protestant. They were recognising that their protests, especially the insistence on the right to march through Protestant areas, had not just aroused sectarianism, but had helped to generate a war.

With *The Economics Of Partition*, and most importantly for me, the ICO pamphlet arguing the Two Nations Theory against Michael Farrell, a convincing case was made against Irish nationalism's core analysis. The pamphlets' persuasive arguments created a reasoned way out for me. Mental breakdown was another route. I could name a couple of dozen people who were spared by those writings and several who went the breakdown route.

I honestly believe as a consequence of Athol Street's efforts, many lives were saved because of the Provisional IRA and its Trotskyite allies not having a monopoly of left wing views in Ireland or any radical Protestant support. The effectiveness of their efforts was significantly reduced and their efforts were legion.

The fact that the Two Nations Theory became so popular in Belfast amongst young radicals from both Catholic and Protestant backgrounds—perhaps a third of the PD adherents adopted the position—was hugely significant, if largely unnoticed or commented upon since.

It was, as stated, but rarely grasped, still a theory. The Ulster Protestants had the potential to be a separate Irish nation, it was argued, but had not then chosen to so become. They remained British.

The Provisionals thus failed to prosper to the degree they might have. The pity is that re-assessment of one-nation certainties never occurred in the broader nationalist community to any extent (and particularly not amongst trade unionists and the controlling Communist Party of Northern Ireland (CPNI)).

We had a very long war, as a result and partly because London effectively conceded to the politics of the IRA and nationalism, despite never being able to concede militarily. That concession dates back to partition for all British parties, and to Gladstone for the Liberals and the successor Labour Party.

It was the CPNI's iron grip on the unions that ultimately blocked the attempt of the Campaign for Labour Representation to make the necessary headway. With no Labour Party, there was no alternative outlet for politically-minded working class activists.

In relation to Niall Meehan in his Spinwatch article (and related one in the IPR) pointing out my error of transposing Peter Hart's book title, *The IRA And Its Enemies* with that of his *The IRA At War*, I plead guilty.

However the phrase of Hart's I quoted, "what might be termed ethnic cleansing", was in the latter book, also appearing, as Niall states, in Hart's replica chapter in *Unionism In Modern Ireland*.

On page 246 of *The IRA At War*, Hart did definitively declare "what happened in southern Ireland did not constitute ethnic cleansing" and then explains why.

So there is no doubt of his view on such cleansing. Indeed he adds the conflict in the north also failed his ethnic cleansing test.

Talking however of errors, Niall Meehan writes of "just one veteran of the ambush, Ned Young" being alive in 1998, while the *Southern Star* carries a picture of Young in a December 1989 article and describes him as "Ned Young, Dunmanway, one of the few surviving veterans".

Ned Young, who it is said could not have been interviewed by Hart as he was incapacitated or later dead, passed away in November 1989.

Saying of the Dunmanway killings that "there is not a shred of evidence that they were done by the IRA" is like saying the Northern Bank robbery was not the modern IRA's work.

No-one else in Cork in that time except the IRA, operating as the IRA, or as unofficial sectarian killers, had the organisation and discipline to kill ten Protestants in a couple of nights and it is silly to pretend otherwise.

The question here is not who killed them but were they cruel sectarian murders designed to avenge and to terrorise. And why is the oft-quoted list of informers inaccessible to modern researchers?

They were certainly successful in the terrorising case. Just as the student revolutionaries were culpable for unwittingly starting a sectarian war, so were Republicans and their allies, whose fight for Irish independence led, down the military food chain, to sectarian violence and population shift, despite their diet of Wolfe Tone's uniting of Catholic, Protestant and Dissenter.

The reduction in the Protestant population in Northern Ireland is the greatest achievement of Gerry Adams and the IRA. And perhaps also from 1919-23 in the south, except for the installation of an entirely new ruling class which has only this year been consigned to history, like Redmond's Irish Party. We are in many ways returning to 1911.

Did Peter Hart "look for facts to hang a pre-conceived view on"? Perhaps. Most historians and commentators seem to. However that is not to say that he ignored details that took away from any expected or hoped-for conclusion.

Facts do "matter" but errors are inevitable. Single disputed facts like the "dead" witness are rarely enough to base an argument against a book on, and that is my criticism of those who rely on complaining about so few errors.

Cllr. Sean Twomey at a meeting of Macroom Urban District Council, that was reported in the *Southern Star* on 20th November 1971, suggested of Unionists that "these people were not Irish and were in the wrong country. They should be

repatriated the same as happened to the French in Algeria. France was a bigger and stronger country today for doing."

If this was the view in 1971, it is plain it was a view held to a greater degree in the same area in 1921.

The decline in the Protestant population in Cork between the censuses of 1911 and 1926 was some 49% in Cork City and 40% in the county. This massive fall is indicative of a near-complete loss of confidence by that community, especially on the part of less well-off Protestants.

It did not end then, as there was a recrudescence of anti-Protestant action in 1935 when Dunmanway featured again. (Read the *Sunday Independent* article by Tim Fanning of 22 February 2009).

There is much more I could write but I wish first to prove I am not shirking a charge of avoiding challenges.

Jeff Dudgeon

(DU Seanad candidate). 7 April 2011

Reply

A Unionist Going South

Nostalgia about forty years ago has little relevance for today. It might be that what I wrote then had some effect in enabling some Ulster Protestants to remain blinkered Unionists when they might otherwise have suffered nervous breakdowns. Martin Mansergh has laid it against me that I saved Ulster Unionism when it was on the verge of collapse. Perhaps some specks of middle class froth on the surface were in danger of being blown away and they were saved and restored to Unionist communalism by what I wrote. It seems that that is what happened to Jeffrey Dudgeon. But I had little concern with the sense of well-being of finicky elements in Unionism.

If Ulster Unionism had been on the verge of collapse, I would have let it collapse.

What I was concerned about was a situation, not one of the elements that constituted the situation. I did my best to describe the situation, so that those engaged in it might take reasonable account of elements of it about which they had very mistaken ideas.

What I wrote was obviously written by a Republican—somebody who was a product of the Republican culture of the Munster countryside, but who in accordance with the spirit of that culture felt there was nothing he could not do if he had a mind to do it. (*An Craoibhin Aoibhinn*, a Protestant gentleman, imbibed the spirit of that culture from the Connacht peasants: "*Ni raibh rud ar bith so domhan nach dearfhein mar ba mhaith liom e*"*). So I wrote an impartial, objective account of the situation—but one in which the lang-

uage bore traces of where it had come from, because that is in the nature of language.

What I wrote was found to be readable by three sides of the four-sided situation. There was a phase in which Whitehall could not do without it. The minds that were tightly closed against it were Jack Lynch's Government and the Opposition that had it on the run. But where it had some practical effect was in the Northern Catholic community. And it would have had considerably greater effect there if it had had any real effect in the Protestant community. Maybe it did ward off some nervous breakdowns, but I was not a therapist. A mere handful of Protestants got a practical political grasp of the situation.

I went on to unearth the political culture of the Ulster Plantation and its Antrim/Down precursor. I did this for my own benefit, and I got a lot from Steel Dickson and John Paul. Contemporary Protestant Ulster took no more interest in this than did nationalist Ireland. I got to understand why this was so. Protestant Ulster remade itself in the most thorough religious event that ever happened in Ireland: the 1859 Revival. Its living literature all related in one way or another to that event. All that went before—the burden of the history of a century and a half, which included Enlightenment, Volunteering, United Irishmen, Orange Opposition to the Union, the foundation of a Belfast University by self-help, the campaign for Catholic Emancipation, the traumatic entry into Parliamentary politics after 1832—all that was sloughed off in the amazing religious event of 1859. I found out this at the Evangelical bookshop facing the Academical Institution. The Institution is a collapsed University, constructed by the United Irish generation in the process of its decline. The 'Athens of the North' was a flash in the pan of history. It gave way to the Ulster of the Bible and the Empire, as displayed in one of the Orange banner on the Twelfth. And now the Empire is gone.

Anybody who is not at ease with the Bible and the Empire is a lost soul in post-1859 Ulster. A handful of middle-class Presbyterian families stood apart, fastidiously, from the vulgar spirit that has driven Ulster in the past century and a half, and they were lost souls. A.T.Q. Stewart was one of them. I have known others.

Dudgeon says that it was significant that the 'Two Nations Theory' became popular with young Catholic and Protestant radicals, but remained a theory:

"The Ulster Protestants had the potential to be a separate Irish nation, it was argued, but had not chosen so to become. They remained British. The Provisionals thus failed to prosper to the degree they might have. The pity is that re-assessment

of one-nation certainties never occurred in the broader nationalist community."

The Provos failed to prosper!!

The Ulster Protestants remained British!!!

The 'Two Nations Theory' remained a theory!!!!

The Provos destroyed the Northern Ireland system in 1972. They established at least consultative rights for the Dublin Government in Northern Ireland affairs in 1985. And they gained a devolved system in Northern Ireland in which the majority does not rule, and established a substantial presence in 26 County politics when the 26 County parties wanted to have done with all-Ireland politics.

Two Nations only a 'theory'? With the new Northern Ireland system structured on the assumption that it states a fact! And with the Constitutional nationalists, who declared in 1970 that the Ulster Protestants were part of an Irish nation, and that it would bring out the Irish nationalism in them, having failed to gain a single recruit that I heard of.

If Dudgeon means that the Ulster Protestants did not declare UDI [Unilateral Declaration of Independence]—then in 1974 I used up whatever credibility I had gained with them in 1969 to deter them from that course of action when the Secretary of State was encouraging them towards it. My pamphlet *Against Ulster Nationalism*, had a wide circulation in 1974.

(Around 1975 I spoke at a London Conference on Northern Ireland organised by the Greater London Council and was asked what I thought of the prospects for Ulster nationalism. I said I had done my best to destroy them and I thought the danger was past. In the course of discussion, it turned out that the term was being used in two entirely different senses. The questioner meant Ulster Protestants becoming Irish nationalists, while I meant the Ulsterish nationalism that was being promoted by the Northern Ireland Office (or Whitehall) amongst the Protestant paramilitaries. Merlyn Rees, disgruntled by his failure to break the Ulster Workers' Council Strike, and begin the process of establishing a United Ireland, sought to persuade Loyalists that Britain intended to ditch the Six Counties and they had better begin to make their own arrangements for an Ulster State. With the backing of Whitehall, there seemed to be some possibility of a serious Loyalist development on those lines. The possibility of Ulster Protestants becoming Irish nationalists was, as ever, nil.)

What might the Northern Catholics have done if they had discarded 'one nation certainties'? What else was there for them to be than Anti-Partitionists? That was something Ulster Unionists never grasped—not even Dudgeon, apparently, for all

* There wasn't anything in the world that I couldn't do if I liked.

that he hung around Athol St. for many years.

So there are two nations. So what! That was a reasonable question. In the first instance I hoped that Dublin would take on board the fact of actual national division, discard the sovereignty claim, and begin a process of *rapprochement* on different terms. Lynch rejected that proposal on the instant, supported by Fine Gael and Labour, and continued to stir up Anti-Partition sentiment on the ground of "one nation certainties", while deploring violence of course. I then proposed that the North should be properly governed within the democracy of the State that held it.

The twenty years I spent on the effort to do that were not entirely wasted. Thanks mainly to David Morrison, that issue became the main discussion point on Northern radio for about two years (1986-8) and a political agitation was got up in support of it that angered John Hume, and Dick Spring (Irish Labour). It failed because Protestant Ulster would not have it. But, in the course of failing, it established that Ulster was *not* British. So it was not time wasted.

The Six Counties were excluded from the political life of the British State, when the British State set them up as Northern Ireland in 1921. The Ulster Unionists did not like being separated from Britain by their own little Home Rule set-up, but the British Unionists persuaded them to operate a system that they knew was bad, lest something worse was done to them by Britain. And then they were excluded from British political life. We established seventy years later that they had become addicted to their own wee system—even though they had lost it in 1972—and that they had become incapable of British politics.

When twenty years of effort began to achieve a noticeable degree of success, and to infringe on the comfort zone of Protestant communalism, the Unionist community exerted itself to crush it. The breaking up of the Campaign for Labour Representation and the Campaign for Equal Citizenship had nothing to do with nationalist opposition. It had to do entirely with Unionist opposition, especially by Unionists who had taken it up as a bright idea but were disturbed by the prospect of its realisation. Whether the disturbance was induced by communal pressure or arose spontaneously within each individual, I do not know.

The CLR was wrecked by Kate Hoey MP, its President and its most eminent supporter in Britain, and by Alan Johnson, subsequently a Home Secretary and Foreign Secretary. The CEC was wrecked by Robert McCartney, its President, actively assisted by Jeffrey Dudgeon.

At a critical point McCartney organised a big meeting in Ulster Hall and made a speech which put off a number of Catholics who had come along to see for themselves that there really was a new departure in which they might take part. This was the first speech he made in that context that was not written for him, at least in outline, by David Morrison or myself. A mild criticism of it was made in *Workers' Weekly*. McCartney was indignant. He was not going to be dictated to by BICO. He had asserted his freedom. David and myself resigned from the CEC. McCartney denounced us both at a CEC members' meeting as agents of a sinister organisation. He asked why had not been asked to join that organisation. It was because he was free and incorruptible. BICO, Athol Street, (whichever), then decided that people who belonged both to it and the CEC would have to leave one or the other. That left the CEC entirely free of sinister Athol St. influence. It promptly went into rapid decline and within months was a ghost of itself.

I drew up a response to McCartney's denunciation and sent it to the CEC Executive, suggesting that it be circulated it to the membership and saying that I would publish it if it wasn't. And I asked for a private meeting with a couple of officers of the CEC to answer to them McCartney's question of why he had not been invited to join BICO. Because of the rapid collapse of the CEC I didn't bother publishing the document. But maybe its time has come.

Some years before this, in the early seventies, BICO had set up an organisation called the *Workers' Association For The Settlement Of The National Conflict In Ireland* to agitate on the Two Nations view. It was free to take on a life of its own, if it was able to. We hoped that it was. Dudgeon complained that the real power was in BICO, not in the WA. The only real power was the power of thought. Athol Street had a printing machine which printed a magazine for the WA without taking any part in the editing. But, since Dudgeon complained about not being in BICO—which he had never asked to join—it was put to him that he should join. He refused, on the grounds that he was not a Stalinist. It was put to him that Athol Street was full of people who were not Stalinists, including actual Tories; and that he would be free to demolish whatever he could find in the way of Stalinism, But he still refused.

The WA magazine was conducted by Lord-to-be Bew and Professor-to-be Patterson. They complained at a WA meeting that the BICO position was not sufficiently "*nuanced*". They were free to 'nuance' it to their heart's desire in the magazine. But they didn't. They wanted BICO to 'nuance' it for them—at the same

time as they regarded BICO as crudely dogmatic because it did not follow the most recent fashion in Marxism-Leninism, invented by Louis Althusser. I had no time either for Althusser or for the 'nuancing' of a stark situation.

Lord Bew and Professor Patterson then tried to recruit a group of academics in order to do 'entryism' in Athol Street. It was a strange idea. Nothing came of it. They kept their distance and joined the Stickies instead. Which was certainly a better career move.

Dudgeon played an active part in the destruction of both the CEC and the CLR. By destruction I mean reduction to a Unionist Family context, which was achieved through separation from BICO. (In the case of the CLR Hoey, assisted by Dudgeon, did this by informal personal appeals to Protestants, and siphoned most of them off, but misjudged some. She set up in its place a merely Unionist body, which was lavishly funded and soon collapsed. It was called Democracy Now!)

I understand that Dudgeon was for a time a paid worker in the Robert McCartney United Kingdom Unionist Party. I don't know what happened there. I took no interest in those who retreated to the Unionist Family from the attempt to democratise within the British State. They opted *de facto* for communal attrition. And I accepted around 1991 that communal attrition was all that was possible in the North, while seeing that Sinn Fein was the only party that stood for something beyond that.

And now Dudgeon, as a Protestant ethnicist, follows Gerry Adams into the politics of the Republic. My attempt at British democratisation failed. Republican tenacity is working.

What political baggage is he taking South with him? A denial of the relevance of fact to belief, as advocated by ex-Senator Harris, who denounced me as an Imperialist/Orange stooge before becoming adviser to diehard communal Unionism. Dudgeon says that the IRA must have done the Dunmanway killings and the Northern Bank robbery, though there is not a shred of evidence that they did either, because—well, just because they must. And the last time I spoke to Lord Bew he said he had no problem believing that the IRA switched off the cameras at Castlereagh high-security barracks, walked in, went straight to the files they wanted, and walked out again, in broad daylight, without leaving a trace. Well, there are believers everywhere, but I incline towards the attitude of Doubting Thomas in such things.

Regarding what Sean Twomey said in 1971: somebody is feeding Dudgeon tit-bits. And it's easy to guess who. Much more influential people than Sean Twomey said things like that in 1971. I know. I

went around the Republic disputing the matter, when Dudgeon's nominator for the Senate denounced me for it.

As evidence that it was the IRA that did Dunmanway in 1921 (and it is the only evidence he adduces), it is absurd. It was not 1921, but 1922. And, if the past is a different country, then so was 1921 in 1922. And in 1922 there *was* another body in the area which might have done the killings, and done them without leaving a trace within Republicanism in the form of accusations when the three-way split among Republicans over accepting the 'Treaty' was manipulated into 'Civil War' by Britain a few months later, when no holds were barred. Why did none of these rival forces amongst Republicans not point the finger at one another as the 'guilty party'?

Then the decline in the Protestant population since 1911 is adduced as evidence. I apologise for harping on facts to a disbeliever in them, but it was the case that the Protestant population, with few exceptions, lived a life apart from the people. Its status was undermined by the 1903 Land Act. The movement which brought about the Land Act, thereby knocking down the supports of the Ascendancy stratum, appealed to the Protestants—who clearly could no longer live as they had lived for two centuries—to engage with the life of the people. For that purpose it broke with Redmond's Home Rule Party, in which the Catholic Hibernians had become the organising agent, and appealed to the Protestants to join them in a few departure. It fought the 1910 Elections on the issue of Redmondite sectarianism and took all but one of the Cork seats. But the Protestants on the whole did not respond.

In my area the campaign against Redmondite sectarianism was particularly vehement and successful. The Redmondites did not even contest the second 1910 Election there. I know of no evidence that twelve years later they were rapid anti-Protestant bigots. Moylan had the tacit support of many Protestants in his area, and when he said *Loyalist* he was not understood to mean *Protestant*. And, thirty years after 1922, I was out of joint on the score of religion with the community where I lived and would have been happy to carp. All I recall was indifference in the matter of an attitude towards Protestants. And it was my own attitude. The local Protestant presence was small, and wished to keep to itself. It was off putting.

I saw the fall of the last Protestant Big House in my part of Slieve Luacra. It was bought by a peasant. All the locals helped with the first threshing, in order to be amazed by the relics of Ascendancy life-style kept up in it until the end. It then became a farm-house.

About ten years ago Hubert Butler's little Ascendancy house was opened to the

public during a Butler Conference in Kilkenny. I went along to it with Pat Muldowney, who had been very active in the attempt to democratise the North as part of the British State. His father was Butler's neighbour, and was as industrious and forward-looking a farmer as one could wish, but had never seen the inside of the Butler House. It reminded me of the threshing in Stakehill over forty years earlier.

The spirit of Ascendancy long outlived the fall of landlordism.

Canon Sheehan appealed to the former landlords to play the part of Protestant country gentlemen to the peasantry. They refused. From what I know of the North Cork peasantry—and I know something about them because they produced me and I lived as one of them into my twenties—I would say that, if the Protestants had responded to Canon Sheehan's appeal, the peasants would have appreciated it very much, and would have eased them into the part.

Going by my own experience, and by what I have found out, I have to say that I do not think it can be said that the Protestants were excluded in any meaningful sense. As a body they refused to play. The individuals who played got on very well. (There was not a possible counterpart of that for Catholics in the North.)

When I went North I tried to get to know something before I spoofed. And I spoofed against my own side on the basis of ascertainable fact. Dudgeon is going South as an ethnicist Know-Nothing who takes up Gerard Murphy when even Professor Fitzpatrick, his ultimate inspirer, disowns him. (And *a propos* Fitzpatrick: I find that he is the younger brother of Sheila Fitzpatrick, an Australian academic specialising in the Soviet Union, who realised that the reality of things could not be as depicted in Cold War ideology. And, when he was embarking on an academic career, she advised him not to go in for a big subject where the competition was tough. Ireland would suit him.)

Finally. I notice that Dudgeon blames the failure of the CLR on "*the CPNI's iron grip on the unions*". We had broken the "*iron grip*" of the Communist Party (which was suffering from the end of the Cold War and the break-up of the Soviet Union), and the CLR pressure on the Labour Party was increasing fast, when Kate Hoey decided to break up the CLR on a sectarian basis and take the Protestants up a *cul-de-sac*. Has would-be Senator Dudgeon really forgotten the parts he played in that and in the RMcUKUP?

Oh, bother those facts!

Brendan Clifford

Available from Athol Books:

**Against Ulster Nationalism. €10, £7.
The Economics Of Partition. €10, £7.**

Fintan O'Toole Reflects

Fintan O'Toole, the bright boy from the bottom who is paid a vast sum by the top people to be an angry guru for the native elite, has been railing against the corruption of the native system for as long as anyone can remember. The meaning of 'corruption' to the *Irish Times* was anything that fell short of completely individualistic meritocracy—a thing that cannot exist and is impossible to measure.

On April 11th he turned his anger on the victims of the crisis of Finance Capitalism. The victims are not the 'poor'—"*they are used to having their dignity insulted*": they expect nothing else and therefore they are socially inert.

The victims are the middle classes who expected better and should be enraged when things got worse for them. They "*should be out on the streets*", but they aren't—

"the thwarted generation has so far kept its rage and despair firmly behind the front doors of its massively overpriced houses".

But who should the thwarted generation be out on the streets raging against? The scapegoat has been slain. The Fianna Fail demon has been put away. Who is there for the thwarted generation to rage against, unless it just bays at the moon, except itself? Whose business was it, in such a thorough democracy as Ireland has, to see that the State was run well? Not the poor: "*most of those who suffer poverty are ground down by it*". And what else was there but the middle class?

O'Toole's article is an inarticulate plea for a ruling class. But we can't have one. We never had one. The English ruling class that we had for centuries was not part of the society—any more than its remnant, the *Irish Times*, is now. In England itself the ruling class, which ruled for centuries, engineered a deferential democratic successor to itself, and it still exerts a degree of influence. But we have nobody to supervise us—except the mysteriously-financed, mischief-making *Irish Times*.

So we must cope as best we can with ourselves alone, without rulers, with ignorant plutocrats, and without those restrictive, corrupting, obscurantist traditions that we discarded a generation ago.

The free middle class—how was it not free?—failed in what was supposed to be its historic function. And its angry guru is left baying for the moon.

Or is for De Valera's Ireland that he is baying? The Ireland he was active in wiping out?

He is now unhappy about "*the rise of neo-liberalism*" and wonders whether he is not a ridiculous person. At least he says: "*You have to wonder whether the 1960s and its culture of protest were entirely ridiculous*".

And he begins to see merit in consensus and collective action, i.e., in curbing the individualist will in social affairs. Work that out, and what you get is what he was railing against as corruption only the other day. ■

A Question Of Jewish Identity

I found the article: *The Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, Some Context* (*Irish Political Review*, April 2011) going some way in opening up the question: why did the Soviet Union back the establishment of a Jewish homeland on what was Palestinian land, resulting in murderous ethnic cleansing on a massive scale. Are the Jews a race or are they only called Jews because of their faith Judaism?

It wasn't an issue in the Communist Party of Northern Ireland (CPNI) because we were isolated from the small Jewish community of mostly small business men and women whom we tended to think of as a foreign element who voted Unionist. The only Jew I had ever met as a teenager was a joiner in the Belfast shipyards. He was said to have been an instructor of unarmed combat in the RUC, before returning to his trade. His background was Yugoslavian, being a deaf-mute he was difficult to get to know.

The situation was very different in England. The Soviet act brought the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) and the Young Communist League (YCL) unknowingly into the Zionist sphere. If we thought about it at all, we would naively conclude the Soviets, being the first to liberate the death camps, would make sure the Jews had a homeland with the ability to defend themselves. Of course we forget that the Jews already had a homeland in the shape of Birobidjan, the Jewish Autonomous Oblast (region) in the Soviet Far East. The size of Switzerland, and on the Chinese border, it was first conceived as an idea in 1928 by the Bolshevik Government. It still exists and is expanding with twenty-five new Yiddish-speaking schools built. They made a film about their region in 2002 with the title: *L'Chayim, Comrade Stalin*. It was open, and is still open, to any Jew from around the world to settle in. Those who went there during the 1930s obviously survived Nazism. Birobidjan is under continual attack today from Zionist propaganda, who say it was first conceived as a Soviet *gulag*. A number of rabbis from Israel are now resident there and claim to have started a religious revival, with a greater emphasis on the teaching of Hebrew.

Back in the 1920s during negotiations for the establishment of a Jewish homeland one of the Jewish leaders asked for the Crimea. He was told there were people there. His answer:

'How many?'

'It's full up', said a Soviet Government official.

Early Zionists had thought of the British colony of Uganda as a homeland. The Soviet Government would have been aware of this. So why did they agree to Palestine being yet another homeland for the Jews?

The Soviets during WW2 topped the list with a the biggest death-roll of up to 25 million, so, would they be all that concerned about another's people's loss even if it was substantial? (German losses were to eventually top Jewish losses) If the Soviets, and Russia today, put out as much PR about their dead as Zionism I expect they could have blackmailed the entire world emotionally, especially Britain.

In a number of the CP branches we had Polish Jews who had been taken to areas in Siberia for their own safety as the Nazis rampaged through Poland. These Poles were grateful to the Soviet Union for their survival. They spoke of working in the forests and fishing on the lakes and of their friendships with the Siberian people. Many went on to join the Red Army. Others preferred the British Army. The Soviets didn't stand in their way and saw to it they got safe passage by way of Iran.

Then there were those left-wing Jews who had been in the RAF during WW2 and had gone on to fly aircraft, supplied by Czechoslovakia, in the 1948 drive against the Palestinians and their Arab neighbours. So we had these discussions in the CP branches and on social occasions during the mid 1950s. They were our friends and some of us married into Jewish communist families.

The Jews made dynamic left-wingers and they were always prepared to go that extra mile in militancy. The only match they had were the Irish and Scottish Trade Unionists in the CP. We saw the Jews as living in England but not being English. We saw them as being friends of the Irish and Ireland. There was no doubt in our minds that they were a race. If you thought otherwise you were corrected immediately. A Jewish CP member once introduced me to a friend of his saying: *'Jew meets Irishman'*. My reply was: *'Should it not be: 'Jew meets Catholic?'*

A discussion followed in which I admitted to being an atheist. They said they also were atheists: *'If an Irishman can be an atheist then why can't a Jew be one as well?'*

On my visit to Israel in the 1970s I was to have this discussion again. In Jerusalem I was in a restaurant which had the religious code that meat and milk can't mix. You had your main meal in one section of the restaurant and if you ordered coffee with milk then you moved to the other section. Beside this restaurant was the main bus garage. In walks a mechanic in overalls and orders a meal and also orders a coffee with milk which he wants to put on the same tray. He is told by the staff he can't do this. There is an argument which draws the attention of two orthodox Jews. They promptly push him out of the restaurant. He is a Yorkshire man and he is shouting that he is a Jew as much as they and protests that these two professional religious men should get a proper job like him. He managed to hold on to his tray and sat down on the pavement outside. I was curious enough to talk to him even though he was still in a temper.

He said he had no religion, even back in Sheffield. He said no one in his garage had any as well. I began to wonder if Judaism was a mainly middle-class faith. I didn't think the building workers and the others doing working-class jobs had much time for religion. It's doubtful they approved of the quite sizable section of the population being full-time religious to such an extent that many are living on Government benefits to survive.

I have read Shlomo Sand's: *The Invention of the Jewish People*, which delves into the enormous amount of proselytising that went on all over Europe for centuries up until the founding of Israel in 1948. My own personal look at Israel made me see a mini United States, multi-racial, excluding Palestinians.

You go into a German-Jewish café and they sit a tankard of beer in front of you almost automatically. In an Austrian-Jewish patisserie it had to be the finest Austrian cakes. French Jews look French. Dublin Jews, some I met, were just Dubliners. But, when pushed, they were Jews-as-a-race, with or without religion. One of the problems Israel had was the influx of Jews when Communism was declared null and void by Gorbachev in the Soviet Union. Most of these Soviet Jews had never practised religion yet they declared themselves to be Jews.

Getting back to 1950s London and their membership of the CPGB and the YCL: Sometime in the late 1950s the kissing stopped. A more harsh version of Zionism became overt in the CPGB. This movement was led by the late Dr Max Joffe, a psychiatrist and very active member of the Party. He had fled South Africa where

he had been involved in the anti-apartheid movement. He had also been a member of the South African Communist Party. He mainly lectured at the YCL branches around Golders Green, Swiss Cottage, Hendon and Finchley which had a majority of young Jews.

For whatever reason I don't know I began reading the *Jewish Chronicle*. In it was an article on anti-Semitism. It was quite extreme in its message that, if you weren't Jewish, you were bound to be anti-Semitic. It couldn't be helped, that's how you were born. Maybe it was genetic or maybe it had something to do with Western culture over the centuries.

It seemed that the unfortunate Rosenbergs were not only sent to the chair for supposedly supplying atomic secrets to the Soviet Union but they were also a human sacrifice the anti-Semites demanded each generation.

Articles of this nature appeared frequently in the *Jewish Chronicle* written by a 'Dr. Millar'. One week his photograph appeared. It was Dr Max Joffe. The next time at a meeting of my Party branch I told him I had read his articles in the JC. He said: '*YOU reading the Jewish Chronicle!*' and walked away. I sure got a dose of his sudden middle-class snobbery and disdain.

I informed the EC of the Party about what I had learnt. But alarm bells were already ringing there. I was asked to transfer to a branch of the CP which had a majority of Jewish members. From there I was able to attend some YCL meetings in the same area. Israel was the main discussion. They were no longer branches that had anything to do with Communism. One branch had decided that the Irish were all fascist and they were arranging to leaflet Camden Town, an Irish area at that time, in order to bring them to their senses. All the EC could do was close some of these branches down.

The Jews I was now meeting at Party meetings were hostile, anti-Irish and supporters of the then existing British Empire. The cheery, generous, working-class Jews had disappeared to be replaced by stern young middle-class men with briefcases.

Amazingly Dr Max Joffe continued his Zionist work, unhindered, in the CPGB, and continued to write his obnoxious articles for the *JC*. He couldn't rope in all Communist Jews to his programme though he also moved in the circles of exiled American Communists like Bernard Vorhaus, a former Hollywood Director and Producer. Nor was he able to bring in Larry Adler, the musician, nor a few Jewish American actors. I was a self-employed carpenter at the time and, being a CPGB

member, I was trusted by the American exiles to do work in their homes. I got to know them all. None of them ever visited Israel. They stuck to their Communist ideas until they died. They were forever grateful to the Soviet Union. At a couple of their funerals it was a left-wing affair without religion.

In the meantime, within the CPGB, the Trade Unionists continued to organise in factories and building sites. I don't think the Industrial Section of the Party were aware of what the intellectual side of the Party was doing to their movement. The CP just didn't know how to deal with the Zionists. Mostly they did nothing, for they didn't want to drive out these mostly middle-class elements who would have accused them of anti-Semitism. Anyway, the revolutionary path had disappeared and the whole terminology of the CP was watered down. The days of discussing the Dictatorship of the Proletariat were long gone. The young slick Party Zionists were also gone, leaving to join outright Zionist organisations and to sign up for military duty in Israel.

Are the Jews a race or a religion? The Jews, like the Irish, like to find out which prominent people are Jewish, or Irish. One actor, Leslie Howard, known for his role in the film *Gone With The Wind*, was killed during WW2 when his plane was shot down over the Bay of Biscay by a

German fighter. Actors in the British film industry usually kept their Jewish identity hidden from the general public. Howard was very successful in covering up to be the quintessential Englishman. His true identity was still being discussed many years later at social gathering of Jews. There was a certain pride in Jews knowing that some successful people were of their group. This is in spite of the blatant Zionist propaganda that Jews are already special. I found that quite a few Jews in everyday life feel insecure. The discussion then turned to the then Catholic Archbishop of Paris. In my eyes he had once been a Jew who had converted to Catholicism. But most secular Jews were seeing a Jew who had managed to become the Catholic Archbishop of Paris, and remain a Jew. This was Jean-Marie Lustiger.

He was made a Cardinal in 1983 by Pope John Paul. His mother died in Auschwitz-Birkenau. On a visit to Poland he described himself on Polish TV as a priest, a Christian, and a Jew. He reminded his audience that as well as three million Jews dying in Poland there were also three million Catholics dead in Poland, something the Polish authorities had been asking the Zionist organisation to acknowledge for years. Obviously a lot more discussion is required on this subject.

Wilson John Haire
10th of April, 2011

Bolshevism From Larkin To Lozovsky

Part 2

In the July 2010 issue of *Irish Political Review* I described the British Intelligence campaign of character assassination against the outstanding union leader Jack James Larkin Jones—launched in the immediate aftermath of his death in April 2009—as a case of the 1920 New York trial of Big Jim Larkin being repeated in history as farce. This was indeed the most appropriate categorisation, because—both immediately and later comprehensively—it proved so easy to refute the MI5 slanders against Jack Jones. But I further mentioned that there were a number of other candidates for regarding Larkin's New York trial as having been also repeated in history as tragedy. Foremost among them was the 1952 Moscow trial and execution of Solomon Lozovsky—a man little known to Irish audiences, if at all, beyond the fact that during the 1920s he had been the principal protagonist of Big Jim Larkin

himself in the Profintern—the Red International of Labour Unions.

In Part One I have already cited the transcript of that 1952 trial of the Jewish Ant-Fascist Committee (JAC), and the introduction by its Editor, Joshua Rubinstein, to its 2005 abridged edition. In that introduction, which had been previously published in *The New Republic* on 25th August 1997, Rubinstein highlighted the key role played by Lozovsky:

"Once the trial got underway, the indictment and Fefer's testimony were demolished by several defendants, in particular by Solomon Lozovsky. Lozovsky, too, had signed a confession after eight nights of non-stop interrogation. As he explained to the court, he understood it was hopeless to resist and decided to wait until his trial when he hoped to speak his mind to a broad public audience or at least to party leaders. In this he was disappointed, for Lozovsky's only

listeners were three judges, his fellow defendants, and a stenographer. Lozovsky's testimony lasted for six days and was the emotional high point of the trial. His words deserve to be remembered, especially his opening statement."

Lozovsky had proclaimed:

"As you know, my family name is Dridzo. This name cannot be translated into any language. When we asked our father what it meant he told us that, according to a story passed down from father to son, a distant ancestor of ours was among the 800,000 Jews who fled from Spain in 1492 when the chief inquisitor, Tomás de Torquemada, issued a decree compelling Jews either to convert to Catholicism or leave the country within two months. I became Lozovsky in 1905 at the Bolshevik Congress in Tammerfors (Finland), where I met Comrade Lenin and also Comrade Stalin for the first time. My father was a Hebrew teacher. He knew the Talmud; he knew Hebrew very well and wrote poetry in ancient Hebrew. My mother was illiterate. My father taught Hebrew grammar, prayers, and Russian grammar. The fact that a Hebrew teacher taught his son the Russian language shows he was not a fanatic. I was religious until the age of about thirteen."

Rubinstein observed that:

"Lozovsky, in other words, after three and a half years of complete isolation, subjected to brutal threats and interrogation, preserved his dignity and had the presence of mind to compare this Soviet military tribunal to the Spanish Inquisition and make clear that his judges were no better than Torquemada".

Rubinstein continued:

"Lozovsky then proceeded to take apart the indictment as no defendant in a Soviet political case had ever done before. Could the JAC hand over the Crimea to American imperialism? Lozovsky reminded the judges that in 1945 'Roosevelt flew into the Crimea [for the Yalta conference] with a large group of spies in numerous airplanes. He did not come here to see either Fefer or Mikhoels, or to worry about settling Jews in the Crimea, but for far more serious matters... What could Hofshtein, Ostrovskaya, or Zuskin... pass along to him?' As for charges of espionage, Lozovsky made clear that copies of all correspondence were saved by the committee. 'What kinds of spies make copies of their dealings?' he asked the judges."

Rubinstein provided a further character reference:

"Lozovsky was not afraid to speak his mind. He was actually expelled from the party twice, in 1914 and then again in 1918-1919 on Lenin's personal orders for saying that the dictatorship of the proletariat was a foolish idea. Lenin, however, soon regained confidence in him."

Lenin's words of expulsion in January 1918 had, indeed, been particularly harsh:

"that membership of the Party by a person who holds an important post in the trade union movement and is debauching that movement with shoddy bourgeois ideas, not only compromises the Party and demoralises all organisational work among the proletariat, but causes enormous practical harm to the urgent task of organizing socialist production by the trade unions; that joint work in the ranks of a single Party is impossible with a person who does not understand the necessity for the dictatorship of the proletariat."

During World War Two Lozovsky became Vice-Chairman of Sovinformburo, tasked with handling all information from the Soviet battlefronts for dissemination to the foreign press. In 1941, upon being told of foreign news reports that German soldiers could see Moscow with their binoculars, Lozovsky famously retorted that *"the Germans would undoubtedly see Moscow, but as prisoners of war"*. In actual fact, Lozovsky and Nazi propaganda chief Joseph Goebbels were constantly monitoring each other's statements. Goebbels repeatedly made note of Lozovsky in his wartime diaries. At the height of the German offensive on Moscow in October 1941, Goebbels remarked how *"the Jew Solomon Lozovsky exerts every conceivable effort, to save psychologically, that which, on the whole, is not to be saved"*.

Here is but a small flavour of some of Lozovsky's own testimony from the 436 page abridged transcript of the trial itself:

"I plead guilty to nothing. Allow me to explain in detail... I turned 74 years of age at the end of March. This is not a mitigating circumstance, but rather an aggravating one. That is item number one. The second aggravating circumstance is that in politics allowances must not be made on account of age, contrary to what Bergelson believes..."

"On November 14, 1917, the Decree on Workers' Control was published with our amendments. As executive secretary of the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions, I started preparing for the first All-Russian Congress of Trade Unions. And here I had serious differences with the party line about bringing the trade unions under the control of the state. Comrade Lenin felt that the trade unions were very important as a link in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as a school of Communism. At the time, I feared that the trade unions would be turned into a department or ministry of labour and would lose the opportunity to choose their leaders and build their organization from the bottom up, so I opposed state control of the trade unions."

Later I realised that I had been mistaken. I was expelled from the party for my errors in December 1917."

The Presiding Officer interrupted to point out that during the investigation Lozovsky had testified as follows:

"In December 1917 I was expelled from the Russian Communist Party for the second time because of my opposition to party policy during the October Revolution and on trade union issues. Zinoviev announced the decision to expel me from the party, adding, as he read out the resolution, *'Promise that you will renounce your views as I have done, and you can continue to carry out the same line as you did before, and the party will retain you.'*..."

Lozovsky: "Absolutely correct. Zinoviev really did say this to me, but his advice was monstrous to me. I didn't understand how a person could stay in the party and continue working underground against it. I said that I would not do that. I believe that what it says in the indictment about my expulsion from the party for double-dealing is wrong both politically and legally. What does double-dealing mean? It means to remain a party member and conduct subversive underground activity against the party. But if a person speaks out openly, can you really say that he has been removed for double-dealing? There is a difference between being removed for double-dealing and being removed for wrong behaviour, for openly stating one's opposition to the party line. So this language has nothing to do with me. I have never been a double-dealer. In January 1918 the First Trade Union Congress was convened, and as the secretary of the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions, I announced the start of the Congress... In my talk about the tasks facing the labour unions, I proposed the notion of independent trade unions, which was a political error and could not withstand the slightest criticism, but this was my point of view. Is this really double-dealing if I said in print myself that I talked about this and if the party knew about it?"

Turning to the principal charges against him, Lozovsky pointed out:

"Do you know what the situation was at that time (June 1941)? The secretary of the Central Committee would give me instructions to put together a radio broadcast immediately in Yiddish for propaganda in America. We had to arouse millions of people against the Hitlerites because of their brutality. And here you're saying that there was a nationalistic rally, and Lozovsky did it all. It's like some kind of fairy tale—there was no Central Committee, no government, just Lozovsky and a couple of Jews who did everything. It's astonishing. I organised a rally according to party directives. Every speaker received instruction from the Central Committee. I read every speech,

as did (party leaders) Alexandrov and Shcherbakov. Is it really possible to imagine that the radio committee, which was not subordinate to me, would broadcast appeals and speeches on the air without Central Committee approval? So the rally took place. Tell me, is the writer Ehrenburg a subordinate of mine? Do they speak according to my instructions? Recall the list of speakers. Ehrenburg says that his mother's name is Hannah, throwing that in the fascists' faces. And suddenly someone says that this means a return to being Jewish. My mother's name was Hannah, too. Am I supposed to be ashamed of that? What kind of strange psychology is this? Why is this considered nationalism? Our task was to show the whole world that we were robust and confident in battle. In September 1941 that response made its way around the world. I laughed at Goebbels, and this went round the world in hundreds of millions of copies thanks to the capitalist newspapers. Goebbels wrote that when he reached Moscow, he would skin me alive... "

"In the testimony that I signed (I will explain later why I signed it), it says that I knew about Lina Shtern's bourgeois views. That's not true. I slandered her, and I would like to take the opportunity here to apologise to her. I cannot look her in the eye because of the slander, which was coerced out of me. I didn't know her at all. I knew that there was such a person as Academician Lina Shtern, but I didn't know her personally... "

"I haven't read Yiddish in sixty years. Can I really bear responsibility for the fact that a newspaper that came out under the direct control of the Department of Agitation and Propaganda of the Central Committee printed nationalistic articles? I am stating here nothing that was written in *Eynikayt* had anything to do with me directly or indirectly. When I was told that they needed a Yiddish writer, I would help them, and that was it. To write for a Yiddish newspaper, a writer had to write in Yiddish. But when Bergelson suddenly says that if someone writes in Yiddish, that is nationalism; that means that what is on trial here is the Yiddish language. This is beyond my capacity to grasp. Write in the language of the Negroes if that's what you want. That's your business. The point is not what language someone writes in, but how they write. There are times when national feelings shift to nationalistic feelings, and a communist ought to know that... "

"I cannot say who was involved in drafting the letter about the Crimea. I know that three people came to see me about it: Mikhoels, Epshteyn, and Fefer. I told them at the time that this matter looked very difficult to me from the practical standpoint because Jews were all urbanites, and the Crimea had to be settled in two to three years, which could mean transferring entire collective farms there. It would take fifty to sixty years to settle Jews in the Crimea, which would

not do the Soviet Union any good. But because I had no objection in principle to settling Jews in the Crimea or elsewhere, I looked at their draft, and all I said was, 'Why do you write about the sufferings of the Jews? That's well known. Why are you padding the letter? Cut the poetry and leave in your arguments about re-settlement.' On the whole, I had my doubts how this would be carried out in a practical sense, but I had no political doubts about it. I saw no nationalism in it, and no plans against the Soviet Union. Besides, I told them that they didn't have the right to write on behalf of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, because the question raised went beyond the committee's jurisdiction and its mission. But as Soviet citizens, they were free to send their proposal to the Soviet Government on their own behalf. It says rather naively in the indictment that 'they demanded of the Soviet Union that the Crimea be handed over to the Jews'. This is hard even to read. In actual fact, what they did was to apply to the Soviet government, as advised by Comrade Molotov, with a proposal that was rejected, based on what considerations I do not know. I repeat that I did not see in this any far-reaching hostile plan or anything like that... "

Presiding Officer: "Defendant Lozovsky ... Both Fefer and Bergelson confirm that you formed the Anti-Fascist Committee with nationalistic goals in mind and were the ideological leader of all the committee's subsequent anti-Soviet activity."

Lozovsky: "As to Bergelson, I think that the court's awareness and his own are getting mixed up here, and it is even hard to understand all that he has said. So, a person writes in Yiddish that the October Revolution gave the Jews equal rights! What is nationalistic about that? As regards the creation of the committee for nationalistic purposes, I have to say that the Slavic committee was created for Slavic purposes, (etc, etc)... If you look at the question this way, then everything that was done was sheer nationalism. I categorically assert that the statement that the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee was created for nationalistic purposes is a total fabrication. The committee was created not by me, but by the Central Committee of the party. There was not one committee, but five. In this case I should be held responsible for the other committees as well. Why make an allowance for the other committees? Once again I assert that the committee was created in order to rouse people against fascism. There were slogans that went like this: '*Jews of the world united against fascism*' ... These slogans came from the Central Committee of the party... It was a great slogan for exposing fascist sympathisers. I assert that Bergelson is getting things mixed up. I think the court can see that he is. Fefer's testimony about how I became concerned ..."

Presiding Officer interrupts Lozovsky:

"At the beginning he testified that in

1942 he had a conversation with you about anti-fascist organisations coming into existence in the United States and about contacts with rich Jews."

Lozovsky: "I declare all of this to be poetic fabrication. An organisation came into being that raised funds for the Soviet Union. This was a positive event... Russian Relief raised 93 million dollars for the USSR. Even Fefer says that I set the goal: to raise funds to assist the USSR. Not for Jews, not for the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, but for the Red Army aid fund. What is nationalistic about a proposal to raise money? Was I delighted? I don't know. I am not the sort of person who goes into raptures, and in general, it is not recommended for a diplomat to go into raptures. I am a restrained person, though a passionate orator. And here every word is being transformed into evidence of nationalistic, criminal behaviour... I have already said that I was pleased with the fact that in the United States, thanks to our propaganda campaign, an anti-fascist committee of artists, writers and scientists and a Jewish committee, part of the America-wide organisation Russia Relief, had come into being. The head of the committee of artists, writers and scientists was the world-renowned scientist Einstein. He was a convinced Zionist, but, like many academics, he was more engaged in mathematical problems than in political ones..."

"It needs to be said that there are millions of Jews in the United States who are of Russian origin. The bourgeois elements among them were well disposed toward the Soviet Union, not because they sympathised with communism, but because the Soviet army was saving millions of Jews from Hitler, and this made a tremendous impression on all Jews. This was why they raised funds to help Russia, and they raised funds from absolutely everyone, wherever they could find them. The bourgeoisie made a business out of this, but there were hundreds of thousands of ordinary people who sympathised with the USSR and gave help from the depths of their souls. So the delegates from the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee went to see those people who wanted to do something to help in the struggle against fascism..."

"The (court's) expert commission drew conclusions based on the analysis of 122 documents. It is clear that some of these documents are from (the Soviet Yiddish newspaper) *Eynikayt*, which was run by someone else and they have nothing to do with me. 40 to 50 articles, at any rate, went through the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, and some of them were sent abroad when the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee was no longer part of the Sovinformburo system. Were these articles nationalistic? Yes, they definitely were. I have read some excerpts. Their absurdity would jump out at any Soviet reader. There are excerpts from Markish's nationalistic poems and Fefer's works,

and articles that are socialist in form but nationalistic in content. I answer politically or criminally for the fact that the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee let such nationalistic articles through while it was part of the Sovinformburo system. But I state with full responsibility that these articles were not examined by me. The question may arise: Why did we allow through, at Soviet expense, the articles of Imam Hodzhi, who preached the struggle against fascism based on the Koran? But it was necessary, and we did it..."

"When I read the third volume of Fefer's 'collected works' {Itzik Fefer's 'accusations' against his co-defendants—MOR} I understood what it was all about. Fefer's testimony touches on about a hundred people unknown to me and whom he keeps on slandering, but he says not a word about himself. In my testimony I slandered myself and two women. What I said about these two women was untrue. I am referring to Lina Shtern and Polina Zhemchuzhina Molotova {the imprisoned Jewish wife of Foreign Minister Molotov—MOR}. Fefer clearly slandered a lot of people, and I have information about this. For example, Marshak asked to translate Fefer's poem, and in this statement Marshak is also vilified. Fefer testified about Ehrenburg, who was never involved in specifically Jewish matters, yet Ehrenburg was vilified too. What is the political significance of all this? I will be completely candid. There is a very carefully thought-out criminal intention here to draw as many people as possible into the ranks of the accused and then go out with a bang, to draw in as many people as possible, so that it leaks out abroad through the Israeli Embassy or Mission... I declare that Fefer is doing all of this in order to launch a campaign abroad against the Soviet government through the agency of Israeli Missions vis-à-vis the closure of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee and *Eynikayt*. That is the political meaning of all this."

In other words, Lozovsky charged that Fefer—the one male defendant who had not been subjected to any form of torture whatsoever, not even sleep deprivation—had now graduated from the role of Soviet secret police informer to that of Zionist *provocateur*, on the basis that the more Soviet Jewish victims the merrier for the purposes of an Israeli anti-Soviet campaign. The Presiding Officer then asked Lozovsky: "*What did you sign the interrogation record for?*"

Lozovsky: "Let me explain why I signed it. Because over the course of eight nocturnal interrogations Col. Komarov kept telling me over and over again that Jews are low, dirty people, and all Jews are lousy bastards, and all opposition to the party consisted of Jews, that Jews over the Soviet Union are conducting an anti-Soviet whispering

campaign, and that the Jews want to annihilate all of the Russians. This is what Col. Komarov told me. I ask you, what sort of language is this? Is this fitting language for a Soviet person, a Soviet functionary? ... I was completely stunned by Komarov's statement that Jews want to wipe out all the Russians. Further on he said that I should confess to all the accusations; otherwise he would hand me over to his investigators... They would leave me to rot in a dark, cold cell and beat me with rubber nightsticks so badly that I wouldn't be able to sit down. Then I said that death would be better than such torture, to which they answered that they would not let me die right away, that I would die slowly... Then I decided that it would be better for me to say something incriminating about myself and sign everything that they put in the record and then tell in court how the deputy director of the investigative division for especially important cases, Col. Komarov, was conducting the investigation, and what sort of un-Soviet actions he was permitting. That is why I signed such a record. You say that this is inconsistent. It is very consistent; I had no other choice... I wanted to live until the court convened and inform the court about everything... I had no other way to survive until the court proceedings except to sign that testimony... I had the right to incriminate myself, but I felt that it was morally unacceptable to incriminate other people. I have told you everything, Citizen Judges, and you will of course determine what is correct in these accusations and what are lies. By the nature of the work I did, by the nature of my activities, through my duties at the Central Committee, I was involved with bourgeois circles and bourgeois newspapers all over the world: Yiddish ones, American ones, English ones, French ones. Why are you singling out the Yiddish newspapers and dealing with them separately?"

Presiding Officer: "Because you are accused of being a Jewish nationalist and maintaining ties with bourgeois Jewish reactionaries and not American or British ones. You were involved in hiring non-party staffers at the Sovinformburo. Tell us what percentage of them were Jews and what their ratio was to the total number of employees."

Lozovsky: "I did not do that kind of calculation. I never felt drawn to Jews and never denied that I was a Jew. A person who denies his nationality is a bastard."

This unexpected use of what might be called 'bad language' on Lozovsky's own behalf only adds to my appreciation of his strength of character, considering the vehemence of its expression by a man whose self-control was so evident throughout his trials and tribulations. And it here provides an excuse for some momentary light relief to recall a 1927 anecdote. In the mid-1930s, my father had been recruit-

ed as a teenage IRA activist into the Communist Party of Ireland by Seán (Johnny) Nolan, whom some readers will recall as the sphinx-like manager of the Party bookshop from its opening in 1942 until his death in 1988. My father related to me how in later years Johnny Nolan told him of his one short-lived defiance of Moscow. The first CPI had been founded in 1921 by James Connolly's son, Roddy, but when Big Jim Larkin returned to Ireland from his New York imprisonment, he showed nothing but disdain for the fledgling party, whose dissolution the Communist International insisted upon in 1924. Instead, Comintern boss Grigori Zinoviev threw his weight behind Larkin's "Irish Worker" League, as well as placing him on the International's own Executive, which led Big Jim to proclaim, with a characteristic lack of false modesty, that he had been "*elected by the working classes of 32 countries of the world as one of the 25 Commissars to rule and govern the earth*".

As far back as 13th September 1912, James Connolly had written to William O'Brien to complain of Larkin in the following terms: "*I begin to fear that our friend Jim has arrived at his highest elevation, and that he will pull us all down with him in his fall. He does not seem to want a democratic Labour movement; he seems to want a Larkinite movement only.*" More than a decade later, the latter construction still remained Big Jim's preference. It became increasingly clear that Larkin had not the slightest intention of ever allowing the IWL to develop from a Larkinite fan club into an effective Communist Party. In 1927 a frustrated Roddy Connolly, aided and abetted by a young Johnny Nolan, set up a Revolutionary Workers' Party, but this defiance of the Comintern lasted barely two months, before the RWP also knuckled under and dissolved itself.

Nolan was to relate to my father the 'dialogue' that had taken place in Moscow between Connolly and Lozovsky, and while I did not doubt the political truth of that historical anecdote, I did feel that the direct quotation had been linguistically embellished in the re-telling. But now I am inclined to the conclusion that—even in "*the way he tells 'em*" sense—it contains far more literal historical truth than not. When Roddy Connolly protested that Big Jim was impossible to work with, Lozovsky is said to have told him in no uncertain terms, according to Nolan's account: "*I know Larkin's a bastard! But he's the only bloody bastard we've got in Ireland!*"

But to return to his own 1952 trial, after

his declaration that "a person who denies his nationality is a bastard", Lozovsky further proclaimed in his final statement to the court:

"The only document that is the primary battering ram of the accusation is the letter to Comrades Molotov and Stalin about settling Jews in the Crimea. This letter contains hints of nationalism in it, but since it was not written for publication, I did not believe that it required careful editing... I think the Americans would have been willing to pay dearly for an agent such as myself, but they won't live so long, and neither will those who are slandering me now... I have said everything and request no favours. I need either complete rehabilitation or death. I have given my entire life for the cause of the party and do not wish to be a parasite. If the court finds me guilty of anything at all, then I would ask for the opportunity to appeal to the government to substitute execution for punishment. But should anything come to light indicating that I was innocent, then I ask that I be posthumously readmitted to the ranks of the party and that the information about my rehabilitation be published in the newspapers."

Solomon Lozovsky, a Stalinist casualty of the Leninist regime—was executed on 12th August 1952. The guilty verdict against him was posthumously annulled on 22nd November 1955 without, of course, any hope of resurrection from the dead. More significantly, there has never been any campaign mounted to have his good name restored. Perhaps it is because Lozovsky took his stand as an impressively courageous and unrepentant Bolshevik to the very end, defiantly staring death in the face. Unlike Itzik Fefer, it can indeed be truly said of Lozovsky that he was neither an outstanding Yiddish poet, nor a long-standing Soviet secret police informer and *provocateur*, nor a martyred, if belated, Zionist. Lozovsky both lived his life to the full—and finally yielded it up—as a proud Soviet Communist, as he would also die a proud Russian Jew. Joshua Rubinstein was spot-on when he astutely observed:

"Only the martyred Yiddish writers are mentioned at August 12 commemorations. The other defendants who lost their lives are rarely, if ever, mentioned, perhaps because their careers as loyal Soviet citizens do not fit comfortably into an easy category for Westerners to honour."

I have no such inhibitions about that life-long Red. I accordingly salute the memory of Big Jim Larkin's old Prointern protagonist—that proud and courageous Jewish Bolshevik, Solomon Abramovich Lozovsky.

Manus O'Riordan

Naval Warfare

Part Ten

It appears from the memoir of M. Drouin de Lhuys, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs at the time of the Declaration of Paris that a main object of Britain was to put an end to the practice of belligerents issuing *Letters of Marque* and *Reprisals* to the subjects of neutral States:

"What influenced especially the English Government was the fear of America inclining against us, and lending to our enemies the cooperation of her hardy volunteers. The Maritime population of the United States, their enterprising marine, might furnish to Russia the elements of a fleet of privateers, which attached to its service by Letters of Marque and covering the seas with a network would harass and pursue our commerce even in the most remote waters. To prevent such a danger the Cabinet of London held it of importance to conciliate the favourable disposition of the Federal Government. It had conceived the idea of proposing to it at the same time as to the French Government and to all the Maritime States, the conclusion of an arrangement, having for its object the suppression of privateering, and permitting to be treated as a Pirate every one, who in time of war should be found furnished with Letters of Marque. This project, which was in the end abandoned, is evidence of the disquiet felt by England. We thought, as they did, respecting privateering, a barbarous practice which marked too often, under an appearance of patriotic devotion, violence excited by the allurements of lucre. At former epochs, justified by the fury of war, it was able in the midst of numerous iniquities, to give rise to some heroic action, to transmit even to history some glorious names. But we considered it to be incompatible henceforth with the usages of civilized nations, which cannot allow private persons to be armed with the rights of war, and which reserve their terrible application to the public power of Established States..." (Sir Travers Twiss DCL, FRS, *Belligerent Right on the High Seas, Since the Declaration of Paris* (1856), p.10).

Dispatches reveal that Britain feared Russian issuing of *Letters of Marque* and *Reprisal* to Americans who would harass British merchant shipping in the absence of the Royal Navy, and take English trade as a consequence.

The most notable State to refuse to sign the Declaration of Paris was the United States. States were invited to join it on the condition that they sign up to all of its provisions and commit themselves to making no subsequent arrangements in the event of war. The Declaration was

adopted by England, France, Russia, Prussia, Austria and Turkey as a mutual Treaty and many other States subsequently followed.

The US had not developed a functional naval defence force for its commerce at this time. It feared that the Royal Navy would have been free to capture US vessels without fear of reprisal if it gave up the threat of using privateers. It saw the use of privateering as its best defence against naval aggression and the threat of blockade by granting *Letters of Marque* and *Reprisal* to privateers to carry out raids against British shipping in the event of war.

Letters of Marque were Government licenses authorizing a private vessel to attack and capture enemy vessels, and bring them before Admiralty Courts for condemnation and sale. They were first used in England, but *Article I* of the US Constitution lists issuing *Letters of Marque* and *Reprisal* in Section VIII as one of the enumerated powers of Congress alongside the power to declare War. (Because the United States has never renounced privateering by treaty, in theory it could still issue *Letters of Marque* today. After the September 11th attacks the *Marque and Reprisal Act of 2001* was introduced in Congress which would have granted the President the authority to use *Letters of Marque* and *Reprisal* against specific targets. Congressman Ron Paul has recently advocated the use of *Letters of Marque* to deal with pirates operating in the Gulf of Aden.)

The Americans made a distinction between privateering and piracy (or buccaneering), a distinction which the British either never made or had forgotten. (Captain Kidd was hanged as a pirate at Wapping despite having a *Letter of Marque* from King William of Orange when his Whig backers refused to continue to support him as a privateer.) The Royal Navy had, of course, been the innovators and greatest exponents of piracy and privateering in establishing the British Empire against the Spanish and Portuguese during the Elizabethan period. That had been called the 'heroic age' of Drake, Frobisher and Hawkins in Britain and it was in this time that England laid the foundations of her future supremacy by means of brigandage, theft and maritime terrorism.

For the US there was a distinction—privateering could be described as State-sponsored private naval warfare, whereas

piracy was a form of naval activity engaged in by private individuals for personal gain. But this distinction was rather blurred by the English innovators and exponents who combined privateering with piracy by allowing naval commanders to personally keep their booty as reward for their naval terrorism. And even in the time of Nelson this remained a vital form of encouragement for Royal Navy commanders and their crews as prize served as a form of pension when they returned to life on land.

The United States offered to sign up to the Declaration of Paris on condition that another Article be included forbidding the molestation of all private property at sea (aside from 'contraband' of war). Whilst most countries were favourable to this addition to the Declaration Britain steadfastly refused to add it.

In the 1870s Sir Henry Maine called for Britain to accept this American addition because, he argued, England had the most to gain from it as it would protect its food supply from its enemies. Maine argued that, because Britain was the foremost maritime trading nation and now depended on its population being fed by the system of Free Trade it had established, it was greatly to its advantage that it should agree to the United States proposals.

The argument was that England was the great carrier of the world, and it was in her capacity as a carrying nation that she would be disadvantaged in a war. By exempting mercantile ships from capture England would be able to carry on her trade, as securely in war as in peace, and be able to bear the strain of a war without financial distress to her merchants.

But by 1870 the tide had begun to turn on Manchester Capitalism and a new more vigorous Imperialism had started to emerge in Britain that had further call on the war-making potential of the Royal Navy.

Pat Walsh

The following letter, submitted to *Irish Times* on 9th April, failed to be published

History Howler

I opened my *Irish Times* today (Saturday 9 April) expecting to see letters, if not from the usual revisionist suspects, at least from the main parties in the Oireachtas, from Irish National Ex-Servicemen, the Irish Military History Society, and from some of those charged with the teaching of history in Irish Schools and Universities.

They cannot all have been so overcome with joy at the revelation of details of Queen Elizabeth's proposed itinerary, that, like yourself, they failed to recognise, an historical howler on page 7 on Friday April 8th.

I quote—"On Bloody Sunday, November 21st, 31

1981

1
Bobby Sands (27) died 5th May, 1981.
Adversarial politics. No one won?
66 days without food.
But Whitehall sniggers, imbued.
They built more walls
since you died,
more walls than you ever had,
to improve apartheid.

2
Francis Hughes (25) died 12th May, 1981.
More than spiders have spun,
since your day was done.
59 days without food.
A sunk and corroding ship
gets more gratitude.
Titanic Quarter.
They hope to renew Belfast
with this loss.
But you gave no quarter.
Your loss is our gain,
your memory on our hearts
embossed.

3
Raymond McCreech (24) died 21st May, 1981.
Out of politics they took the gun,
your gun.
61 days without food.
And peace into servitude.
They dismiss your times,
these bureaucrats,
on their upward climb.

4
Patsy O'Hara (23) died 21st May, 1981.
The peacemakers became rotund.
61 days without food.
War tourism accrues
though the blood never dried,
and like a silent horror film
there is no thought,
no sound.

5
Joe McDonnell (30) died 8th July, 1981.
Ay, the building is soon begun.
61 days without food.
The wind on Belfast Lough
blew in the entrepreneurial hood
to build expensive flats, yacht basins,
while around the waterfront
the homeless chastened.

6
Martin Hurson (29) died 13th July, 1981.
From coastal Holywood to Bangor

there is wealth to stun.

46 days without food.
This 'Gold Coast' was built
on your dying solitude.
Safe now, no bother,
the others
conquered Malone,
but not your grave, now home.

7
Kevin Lynch (25) died 1st August, 1981.
It had to come to this,
political-prisoner status shunned.
71 days without food,
in this loose protectorate
of Xerox magnitude,
bereft of British or Irish symmetry,
more a planned
asymmetry.

8
Kevin Doherty (25) died 2nd August, 1981.
A scenario that will run and run.
73 days without food.
How many more wars,
how many more ceasefires
as a prelude.
The empty dumps gape
as nestlings greeting the mother,
hustle for the take.

9
Thomas McElwee (23) died 8th August, 1981.
This territory was not constructed for peace,
it is moribund.
62 days without food.
Back to Whitehall
and its belligerent attitude.
It knows it's doing wrong,
but doing right,
rehearsing
for a Southern swansong.

10
Michael Devine (27) died 20th August, 1981.
A heart-rending sacrifice,
and what was won.
60 days without food.
Perfidiously they slew.
Can something deliberately broken
lead to evolution,
something glued back
with the enemy's solution.

Wilson John Haire

20 October-13 November 2010

Note: Malone – once a Protestant middle-class stronghold, now mainly Catholic middle-class

people were killed—14 British civilians, 14 Irish civilians ,3 Republican prisoners—when British forces opened fire on crowds attending the Dublin-Tipperary football match".

I doubt your correspondent meant to convey the false impression that British forces killed 14 British civilians that day.

But it seems to me plain that he or she was determined to assert that as many British as Irish civilians were killed that day.

So, let's clear any misunderstandings out of the way.

Earlier in November 1920, in London's Mansion House, the British Prime Minister had boasted that his forces "were getting the right men" and virtually gloating how they were burning down Irish creameries.

Under the direction of Ireland's Minister for Defence, Cathal Brugha, and her Army's Chief of Staff, Richard Mulcahy, and Director of Intelligence Michael Collins, the Dublin Brigade and other soldiers of Irish democracy, shot dead members a British murder gang. They were not civilians but were on the military, or paramilitary RIC payroll.

Amongst their surnames were Dowling, Woodcock, Price, Keenlyside, Montgomery, McLean, Newbury, Ames, Bagalley, Bennett, FitzGerald, McCormack and Wilde.

I really think Ireland urgently needs a Campaign for Real History, and an anti-Poppycock League, to alert a cheated citizenry to the dangers of infection from Tommyrot.

Donal Kennedy

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

THE LAW

The very fact that the legal profession and journalists refer to 'The Law' as meaning barristers, the Courts and the Garda Síochána shows us that the laws of the State are "*honoured more in the breach than in the observance*". If it were otherwise, The Law would be the law of the State and of the society we live in. The new Fine Gael/Labour Coalition Government may do something about the enormous and non-productive cost of dealing with breaches of our laws. But don't hold your breath. The lawyers know very well what works for them. They know that the muddle and inefficiency and the, mostly intentional, finagling and woolliness of what goes on among lawyers is to wind up the clients and therefore the lawyers' fees.

Take as an example the day the Special Criminal Court sat for the last time in Green Street Courthouse on Friday, 18th December 2009. This was the courthouse in which Robert Emmet was tried and it was in this courthouse that since 1972 the Special Criminal Court tried Mr. Martin Ferris, Mr. Peter Robinson, Mr. Dominic and Mrs. Mary McGlinchey, Mr. Dessie O'Hare and many more. Nicky Kelly was tried there and he and his co-accused were convicted on false confessions beaten out of them by The Law. The Court said they must have beaten themselves.

Photographers were allowed to photograph the judges for the first time in Green Street on 18th December 2009 and in the photo we see the three judges robed and bewigged, the judges' usher helping Mr. Justice Butler to sit on his chair, a man and a woman presumably court officers and the backs of bewigged heads of some barristers. All eight of these people and probably many more not in the photo were earning their living there on that day. And what did they do? They did nothing. Absolutely nothing. There was in fact work which they could have done but in the time-honoured way of all court lawyers they intentionally dodged the work. The work available on that day was to deal with five cases before the Court. All five matters were adjourned until the New Year. It was December and December for The Law is a month for celebrating dinners and conviviality. Too bad for defendants whose cases may already have been adjourned on previous occasions and very likely would be adjourned again in the

New Year in the new Criminal Courts Complex in Parkgate Street. The reader is expected to guess the city in which Green Street and Parkgate Street are because my information is gleaned from that paper of mis-record *The Irish Times* which is published in Dublin which gives you a clue to what is intended.

Another example of the sort of thing that goes on every day in the courts is the case of Patrick Kissane in Killarney District Court on 19th April 2011. Mr. Kissane is accused of setting up a Facebook page insulting Travellers. The Facebook entry which has since been deleted said: "Promote the use of knacker babies as bait", and some other racist remarks. The charge is brought under the Prohibition of Incitement to Hatred Act 1989 which makes it an offence "to publish or distribute written material... likely to stir up hatred. Publishing online is treated the same as in the print media. A conviction in the District Court carries a maximum fine of €1,270 and/or six months in gaol. Surprise! Surprise! On the day set for the trial, the lawyers agreed to ask for the case to be heard on a later date and the Judge (surprise!) agreed and adjourned it to 19th July 2011—three months more of suspense after already waiting six and a half months since the alleged offence on 1st October 2010. The prosecutor told the judge in court: "*This is a rather unusual charge and we'd like to get the DPP's views on the whole thing*".

Now either an offence was committed or not. That is for the court judge to decide. What is so complicated about it that all the lawyers involved do not know what to do without making work for another lot of lawyers in the (Director of Public Prosecutions) DPP's office and then coming back into court on 19th July 2011 when it could very probably be adjourned again on the grounds that it is a "*very unusual case*"? When are the judges going to stop this adjournment stuff? It is appalling anti-social behaviour and is defrauding the people for the benefit of lawyers. The Minister for Justice, Mr. Alan Shatter TD, is himself a lawyer. Will he put a stop to this running sore of "*adjournments*"? Many cases are adjourned multiple times. It seems the adjournments go on and on for as long as the lawyers and judges think they'll get away with it. I was involved as a witness in a case which was adjourned twenty times and the two barristers and two solicitors each billed fees for the twenty adjournments.

A Night At The Inns And Other Stories by Henry Murphy, published by Blackhall Publishing in 2008, gives a taste of what

being a barrister is about. It is intended as a funny book and perhaps it is for a barrister but it tastes sour to anyone who has been involved in the perimeter of The Law.

VIOLENCE AND THE LAW

How is it that Irish society readily tolerates and even approves the clubbing and beating, with bloody results of protesters—be they students protesting in Dublin or citizens protesting in Mayo against the Shell pipeline? These protesters are innocent people. Protesting is not a crime or an offence—yet—in our society. We can see on TV and on print media, innocent people being clubbed and injured and the rest of us are to think "*that's alright, we agree that people should be beaten-up officially in this circumstance*". And yet there is no way society will tolerate the beating of proven criminals or the parental chastisement of unruly children. A householder has by law to be very careful how he/she defends themselves from an attacker—"proportional force" the law says. That is when you are attacked in your home, you must calm down and carefully assess the attacker's conduct and, because "*proportional force*" implies proportional to the force used by the attacker, you must allow the attacker to strike first and then you can respond with proportional force and until the attacker wounds you, you are not legally allowed to wound the attacker. Is that it? Isn't this why robbers enter houses with impunity? Isn't this why whole neighbourhoods are terrorised and destroyed? Because no one is allowed to shout Stop. If the smaller infringements were stopped and stamped out, there would be no bigger stuff. The whole concept of policing needs to be changed. Police should be arranged so that two by two patrol an area on bicycles which move silently. And then there should be squads of six or seven parked unobtrusively at intervals in cities and towns ready to swoop onto crime scenes and, yes, the Garda should be given proper powers to use their batons whenever a criminal activity is in progress. And, yes, persons in their home should be immune from guilt and from prosecution where they are resisting an intruder whether or not the intruder is violent. Any person must be allowed to eject an intruder from the person's home and property. To do so is a basic human right without which society descends into chaos.

MARRIAGE

The US recession has coincided with a fall in the divorce rate. Does this stack up? Love or money?

Michael Stack ©

PILSUDSKI continued

have fought for their country if the whole world had opposed them." p125.

"I went straight to the War Office {London} to see General Ironside, who had succeeded Lord Gort as C.I.G.S.

"I was met with the remark: 'Well! Your Poles haven't done much.' I felt that the remark was premature, and replied: 'Let us see what others will do, sir.'" p125.

LLOYD GEORGE AND HENRY WILSON 1920

"I arrived in Paris in time to have dinner with Mr. Lloyd George and Sir Henry Wilson and I gave them my report verbally during dinner. p81.

"It was the first time that I had met Mr. Lloyd George, and I felt that he listened to my tale with rather a superficial interest, but he was very agreeable and told Sir Henry that I was to have everything that I had asked for.

"Sir Henry Wilson was a delightful man, with all the Irishman's love of politics as well as his love of fighting, and he was about our only high-ranking soldier capable of competing in the same field as the politicians or 'Frocks,' as he always called them. He loved to describe himself as purely a simple soldier, but he could play all the political games as well as the best of them, and he served our country well in his dual role. He was a great personal friend of Marshal Foch, and England and France owed much to their close relationship.

"The next day Sir Henry took me to see Marshal Foch, and Foch asked me if the Poles, had asked for any particular general. Before leaving for Paris I had discussed the matter with Paderewski, and knew that they wanted General Gouraud who, as a very heroic figure, would have appealed to the fighting qualities of the Poles. The Marshal regretted that General Gouraud could not be spared, but told me to return later, when, having given the matter his close attention, he would have decided on the appointment. On my return Foch told me that he had appointed General Henrys, and he added that I could go back to Warsaw *'et faites son plus grand elege'*, for he had proved himself a most successful commander. Coming from the Marshal, this was praise indeed.

"General Henrys was a comparatively young man, of a smart military appearance, but he was a failure in Poland. His task was a difficult one, and made more difficult by Pilsudski's dislike of the French. The French Mission consisted of some fifteen hundred French officers, who were responsible for the training, equipment and general needs of the Polish Army. They were under the direct orders of Henrys and needed close supervision and very firm handling, which they did not get. Instead they indulged themselves

in easy and pleasant living not at all conducive to successful military training, and found plenty of time and opportunity to meddle in trade on a big scale, but failed to further the Polish cause." p82.

"The political situation was far more complicated, but I was finding out fast that in Poland there is always a political crisis on tap. I have a great love and admiration for the Poles, but I cannot deny that they thrive on crises and produce them with unflinching punctuality and without any provocation!" p79.

"Pilsudski was a Lithuanian by birth and obstinacy is one of their most marked traits. One day I was trying, quite ineffectively, to persuade him to some action, when he volunteered the remark: 'I'm Lithuanian and we are an obstinate people.' My answer to that was, 'So I see!' and we both laughed, but I have often wondered since if there has been a great man who was not obstinate." p78.

"The war against the Czechs proceeded equably, and more or less on a domestic basis. The Poles have a natural aversion to the Czechs, partly because they are neighbours and therefore prone to quarrelling, and partly because the Poles look down on the Czechs, for being, like the British, 'a nation of shopkeepers'. To the agrarian Pole, commerce is a despised occupation to be left to the Jew, and they had great contempt for the Czechs who thought otherwise. Their chief bones of contention were the coal mines at Teschen, but there was never any serious fighting between the two nations, and we could cross the Czech line more or less at will." p89.

"Poles are very vivacious and gay, especially the women, but they all seemed possessed by a racial sadness that knows little of joy or even contentment. Though they have humour, they are apt to take themselves too seriously, and are naturally indignant when the rest of the world does not follow suit. Their strength is their courage, their faith, their loyalty and their patriotism, and from the highest to the lowest, with or without education, they can sacrifice themselves to an idea—and that idea was always Poland, even when it existed only in their imagination." p100.

De Wiart refers to *zakuska* which consisted "of an infinite variety of exotic dishes washed down by smooth gulps of vodka with a feel of satin fire. Vodka burns delightfully when it arrives at its destination, and makes conversation very easy. Perhaps that explains why the Poles are such brilliant talkers." p99.

~~~~~  
**"I am not going to dictate to you what you write about my life and work. I only ask that you not make me out to be a 'whiner and sentimentalist.' Pilsudski**  
~~~~~

DEATH

By 1935, the great man, Pilsudski himself, unbeknown to the public, had for

several years been in declining health. On 12th May 1935, he died of liver cancer at Warsaw's Belweder Palace.

His death took place exactly 19 years from the day James Connolly was executed at Kilmainham Jail in Dublin.

The Polish Communist Party immediately attacked Pilsudski as a fascist and capitalist, despite the fact that fascists themselves did not see him this way.

Mainstream organisations of ethnic minorities expressed their support for his policies of ethnic tolerance, though he was criticized by, in addition to the Polish communists, the Jewish Labour Bund, and by Ukrainian, German and Lithuanian nationalists.

On the international scene, Pope Pius XI held a special ceremony May 18th in the Holy See, a commemoration was conducted at League of Nations Geneva headquarters, and dozens of messages of condolence arrived in Poland from heads of state across the world, including Germany's Adolf Hitler, the Soviet Union's Joseph Stalin, Italy's Benito Mussolini and King Victor Emmanuel III, France's Albert Lebrun and Pierre-Étienne Flandin, Austria's Wilhelm Miklas, Japan's Emperor Hirohito, and Britain's King George V.

After a two-year display at St. Leonard's Crypt in Kraków's Wawel Cathedral, Pilsudski's body was laid to rest in the Cathedral's Crypt under the Silver Bells, except for his brain, which he had willed for study to Stefan Batory University, and his heart, which was interred in his mother's grave at Vilnius' Rasos Cemetery, where it remains.

The 1937 relocation of his remains, made by his long-standing adversary Adam Sapieha, then Archbishop of Krakow, incited widespread protests that included calls for Sapieha's removal.

In July, 1899, Pilsudski married a political activist, Maria Juszkiewicz in the Evangelic-Augsburg Confession Church at Paproc Duza in the province of Lomza. Maria was a divorcee, so therefore could not be married in the Catholic church, so Pilsudski converted to Protestantism.

Since May 1906 Pilsudski had known Aleksandra Szczerbinska (Comrade Ola), a determined and energetic activist. She was fifteen years younger than Pilsudski. Maria Pilsudski would not agree to a divorce. The situation lasted until her death in 1921.

He married Aleksandra in October 1921 having already returned to the Catholic Church in 1916.

A revolutionary, a great soldier without formal training, a man of rare audacity and will power as well as of great insight into European politics—that was Jozef Pilsudski.

It is easy to understand how Connolly appreciated these traits—all of them could be attributed to James Connolly himself.

PILSUDSKI continued

"Early in my relations with Pilsudski he said to me that I could believe implicitly anything that he told me. On the other hand, he said that if he told me nothing I must not be surprised at anything that might happen. He stuck to his word, and only failed once to tell me his intentions. He warned me of his designs on Kieff, {Kiev}, telling me that he would take it with Ukrainian troops under Petlura. I went back to England to report, and on returning found that he had taken Kieff, but with Polish forces instead, as he had been unable to get the Ukrainians to attack in time.

"Pilsudski was a very superstitious man, and having taken Kieff he admitted to feeling uneasy, for he told me that every commander who had attempted to take the Ukraine had come to grief. Later, when he had been forced to retire from Kieff, I asked why he had attempted to take it against his superstitions. His answer was that he felt that his luck stood so high that he thought he could risk it, but he added: 'You see, I was wrong!'

BRITISH FRIENDSHIP

"He hated the Russians with intensity, and though he had no particular liking for the Germans, he felt it wiser to be on good terms with them, and during his lifetime relations remained good to all appearances. He had a great admiration for England and for all the British institutions, but at times he was justifiably bitter about our attitude towards Poland. Invariably we opposed Poland in each and every crisis, and there were many. Even Paderewski was moved to say to me: 'We cannot be wrong in every case.'" p77.

Early in 1920 there were signs of the Bolsheviks starting a new offensive against Poland, and in May or June a considerable force advanced from the north-east. This Bolshevik force was commanded by General Budienny and was largely composed of Cossacks.

"I was seeing Pilsudski daily, and once when I asked him what he thought of the situation, he shrugged his shoulders and said that it was in the hands of the Almighty. It was the only time I ever saw him shaken out of his almost oriental calmness, but he was not so shaken that he could not plan a masterly counter-attack, which brought him victory in three weeks." p85.

"The Bolshevik advance from the north-east continued steadily, until they were only fourteen miles from Warsaw, when the Poles counter-attacked. The Bolsheviks were exhausted, and as soon as they saw the Poles stand and prepare to fight, they retreated and continued to retreat until they sued for peace."

"The battle near Warsaw has been called 'The Miracle of the Vistula,' and

never was a miracle more timely, for the issues at stake were tremendous. Had Warsaw fallen, there can be no doubt that Poland, a great part of Germany and Czechoslovakia would have become Communist." p86.

"General Briggs, who had been my commanding officer in the Imperial Light Horse, came to see me in Warsaw. He was chief of the British Military Mission to Denikin who commanded the White Russian troops. Denikin had started a big offensive against the Bolsheviks, and he was advancing so fast that it looked as if he would reach Moscow. Briggs had been sent to ask me to persuade Pilsudski to join in the offensive. I took Briggs to see Pilsudski and explain the situation, and to ask him personally for his co-operation. During the interview I could see that Pilsudski was not in the least impressed by what Briggs was telling him, and when Briggs had left Pilsudski said that Denikin would fail to get to Moscow, and, worse still, that he would soon be back in the Black Sea. In view of Denikin's rapid advance this seemed a fantastic statement to make, but Pilsudski's judgement rarely failed, and I had such confidence in him that I reported this at once to the War Office." p94.

WINSTON CHURCHILL

"I returned home to report, and Mr. Winston Churchill, who was then at the War Office, asked me to lunch. Mrs. Winston Churchill and Jack Scott, his secretary, were the only other people at the lunch. It was the first time that I had met Mr. Churchill. I was immensely flattered by the idea of discussing with so great a man what was at that moment an important situation. {1919}. Mr. Churchill wished me to get the Poles to join in Denikin's offensive, but I repeated Pilsudski's warning, and I remember Mrs. Winston Churchill saying: 'You had much better listen to General de Wiart.' I hastened to point out that it was not my opinion that I was giving, but Pilsudski's, and that he had never put me wrong." p95.

"Within a very few weeks Pilsudski had proved a good prophet, for Denikin was back in the Black Sea.

"Pilsudski had only once kept silent with me. He had been planning to retake Vilna from the Lithuanians, and knowing that I should have to inform my Government, who would have done everything in their power to stop him from succeeding, he could not tell me of his plan.

"I cannot remember our Government agreeing with the Poles over any question, and there were many: Danzig, that first nail in Poland's coffin; Vilna; Eastern Galicia; Teschen; the demarcation of the Russian-Polish frontier; and Upper Silesia." p95.

"By 1924, the five wars that Poland had been engaged in had all ended, {the Germans, Bolsheviks, Ukrainians, Lithuanians, and the Czechs} leaving the

Poles with everything that they had set out to get. There was nothing more to keep a military mission occupied, and the work was taken over by Colonial Clayton, the Military Attache, who had been with me and had made a great success in his post." p96.

POLISH CULTURE

De Wiart's reflections on the Polish nation are interesting:

"The Polish landlords still lived in feudal splendour, in a luxury unsuspected by western Europeans, and quite unaffected by the growling of their eastern neighbours. There were no staff difficulties; servants came with the hope of serving their lifetime in the great houses, and were not concerned with their evenings off and labour-saving gadgets. Instead of Frigidaires, great blocks of ice were cut from the frozen rivers in winter and placed in the ice-house, which would then be flooded and the door left open. The whole mass would freeze into one block of solid ice which lasted a whole year.

"Polish culture is French by adoption, and in all the great houses one found French furniture, French pictures and tapestries, but with all their beautiful ornateness mixed with a delightful feeling of comfort, so rarely found in France.

"The Poles understand warmth, and guests are never found huddling round the one inadequate fire, which makes a visit to an English country house like a trip to Sparta. They are great gourmets, the food excellent, and the chef a most honoured and important member of the household." p99.

"Pilsudski had no liking for the French, and resented being in the French sphere and made to feel dependent. There was constant friction between him and the French military and diplomatic representatives. The French were hardly tactful and did not like any assistance to be given to Poland except through French channels, regarding any gesture from another country as a sign of meddling. Their attitude added considerably to our difficulties." p78.

GERMAN INVASION OF POLAND 1938

"My next stop was Paris. Our Military Attache took me to lunch at the Ritz, where I saw several French friends. They were all equally bitter and disgruntled with Britain for having stuck to her word to declare war on Germany if Poland was invaded. The French with their usual realism, failed to see why we consented to ally ourselves with the Poles when it was geographically impossible to help them. The French were labouring under the impression that if Britain had not declared war the Poles would not have fought. It was far from the truth, but the French psychologically had no understanding of the Polish mentality, or they would have known that the Poles would

continued on page 37

PILSUDSKI continued

" Causes, politics and ideologies are better left to historians." p15.

Despite this, we discover that his family in Belgium had immense political influence, and a progressive influence, at that.

His cousin, Henri Victor Marie Ghislain, Count Carton de Wiart, was the twenty-third Prime Minister of Belgium from 20th November 1920 to 6th May 1921 in a Government of national union (Christian-Democrats, Liberals and Socialists). He was from an aristocratic family.

Elected in 1896 to the Belgian House of Representatives as a member of the Catholic Party's reform-orientated left wing, he served as Minister of Justice (1911-18) and helped secure passage of child-welfare legislation (1912). In 1945 he reorganised the Catholic Party as the Social Christian Party. He remained a Member of Parliament until his death in 1951.

A member of the *Jeune Belgique* (Young Belgium), a nationalist literary movement, he wrote novels and treatises to depict a uniquely Belgian national spirit.

"In 1891, I was dispatched to the Oratory School at Edgbaston, near Birmingham. Cardinal Newman founded this school." p13.

"In 1897, it was decided to send me to Oxford, and in a rush of optimism I was put down for Balliol." p14.

"... war was in my blood. I was determined to fight and I didn't mind who or what. I didn't know why the war had started, and I didn't care on which side I was to fight. If the British didn't fancy me I would offer myself to the Boers ... Causes, politics and ideologies are better left to the historians." p15.

De Wiart fought in the Boer war in which he was twice wounded. He lost an eye in the East African campaign of 1914 and later one hand.

In the First World War, he was wounded eight times.

From 1918 to 1924 he lived in Poland as Commander of the British Military Mission.

De Wiart was posted to the Six Counties to the command of the British 61st Division in preparation for World War II.

He was Commander of the ill-fated Central Norwegian Expeditionary Force.

His one active command in World War II was not a success, but the blame could not be put on him in this cauldron of politics. As de Wiart said about the campaign, "...war and politics seem bad mixers, like port and champagne. But if it wasn't for politicians we wouldn't have wars, and I, for one, should have been done out what for me is a very agreeable life."

He spent two years in an Italian prison

after his plane crashed on the way to Yugoslavia.

In 1943, he was sent to China as Winston Churchill's personal representative to Chiang Kai-shek.

THE POLISH MISSION

At the end of the Great War, Carton de Wiart was sent to Poland as second in command of the British Military Mission under General Louis Botha. After a brief period, he replaced General Botha (First Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa). Poland desperately needed all the help it could get, as it was engaged with Bolshevik Russia (Polish-Soviet War), the Ukrainians (Polish-Ukrainian War), the Lithuanians (Polish-Lithuanian War) and the Czechs (Czech-Polish border conflicts). There he encountered Ignacy Jan Paderewski, the great pianist and premier, Marshal Józef Pilsudski, the Chief of State and military commander, and General Maxime Weygand, head of the French military mission in mid-1920. Charles de Gaulle was attached to the French military mission.

One of his tasks soon after his arrival was to attempt to make peace between the Poles and the Ukrainian nationalists under Simon Petlyura. The Ukrainians were besieging the city of Lwów (Lvov; Lemberg). He was unsuccessful and formed a negative view of Petlyura, especially after Ukrainian forces machine gunned his train, killing two Polish officers aboard.

PADEREWSKI

"We arrived in Warsaw on the night of February 12th, 1919, and were met by Paderewski, the Minister of Foreign Affairs ... Paderewski was an international figure of renown. He had found his way into people's hearts with his music, and remained there determinedly for his political ends." p75.

Ignace Jan Paderewski was a leading pianist of his time, remarkable for both his musical culture and his mind. With his fingers, Polish music, especially Chopin became an instrument of propaganda. He would speak at public meetings in America and then sit down at the piano on the platform and win the audience by his loveliest expression of eloquence in melody.

GENERAL PILSUDSKI

"The day after our arrival we went to pay our respects to the Chief of State, General Pilsudski. Since those days it has been my destiny to meet many of the great men of the world, but Pilsudski ranks high among them—in fact, for political sense, almost at the top. His appearance was striking to a degree, and his air that of the conspirator. He had

deep-set eyes of searching penetration, heavy brows and a drooping moustache which was peculiarly characteristic." p76.

Jozef Pilsudski was of Lithuanian descent, he was born at Zulov, in the province of Vilna, December 5, 1867.

According to the 1978 edition of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Pilsudski had a go at reading Karl Marx's *Kapital*, but its abstract argument got the better of him.

After the Russian Revolution was put down in 1905, a split occurred within the Polish Socialist Party: the Left wing wanted to delete from the party's programme the stipulation that its main aim was an independent Poland; they broke with Pilsudski's group, which insisted on that stipulation.

"Pilsudski had a remarkable career. As a young man his sympathies had leaned too much towards the left, and he had been deported to Siberia. Later he joined the newly-formed Polish Socialist Party {PPS}, whose chief object was to free Poland from its oppressor, Russia. Again he was imprisoned, but his partisans, with a high degree of courage and ingenuity, engineered his escape. They disguised themselves as Russian officers, went to the prison armed with forged papers and walked out with Pilsudski. Early in 1914 he was pledged to fight with his Legion on the side of Germany, but the Germans were afraid of him, thought he wielded too much power, and in their turn imprisoned him. In 1918, as the symbol and soul of Polish opposition, Pilsudski was appointed Chief of State, and inspired his friends and followers with blind faith and supreme confidence.

"I was lucky enough to make friends with Pilsudski straight away, which made my position very much easier, and I was one of the few foreigners to achieve such a relationship.

"There was great opposition to him from the Polish aristocracy, they staged a *coup d'etat* which he foiled, and it says much for his statesmanship that many of the aristocrats afterwards became his firmest supporters, realising that he was the only man fit to lead Poland." p77.

"Unfortunately, Pilsudski had the *defauts de ses qualites*, for he was a very jealous man, brooked no opposition, and when anyone rose higher than it suited him he got rid of him. His ruthless dismissal of Paderewski, Sikorski and Korfanty were instances of his jealousy, and he lost these three great patriots, two of whom, Paderewski and Sikorski, stood high in the eyes of the world.

"Meddling in politics taught me the bitter lesson that they invariably walk hand in hand with ingratitude, and when Paderewski was dismissed, although he had many friends and enemies, his friends let him go without a murmur. Their memories were fickle as well as short.

continued on page 38



Connolly and Pilsudski

Marxism-Leninism, of one kind or another, was the ideology of the 1970s into the mid-80s, its influence encompassing all but the eccentric right-wing fringe of the academic world.

For 10 or 15 years, the politically-correct view was that Lenin founded a system of socialist democracy which was perverted by Stalin, and that the future lay in a restoration of Leninist democracy. Over 10 years before the Soviet collapse, Brendan Clifford argued that '*Leninist democracy*' was a mirage. It was Lenin who founded the Soviet State as a system which could only be run from the centre by a party which monopolised power. Because Clifford dismissed the notion of Leninist democracy and argued that Stalin had handled Lenin's system in accordance with the principles inherent in it, he was classified as a Stalinist and denounced by believers in the mirage.

Clifford drew attention to the fact that in 1917, Stalin, who was the Bolshevik leader within Russia until the return of Lenin, had accepted the '*bourgeois democracy*' of the February Revolution as an adequate framework for socialist development, and had set the Bolshevik party on a course of socialist development within it. Lenin won him over to the project of socialist revolution by proletarian dictatorship when he got home, and once embarked on it, Stalin saw it through!

This is the international context in which Brendan Clifford relates James Connolly's views to Jozef Pilsudski and the Polish Socialist Party (PPS).

CONNOLLY AND PILSUDSKI

"I demonstrated that his international orientation as a practising socialist politician was towards the Polish Socialism of Joseph Pilsudski in the first instance, and towards the wing of the German Social Democratic Party that supported the German war effort from August 1914 to the end of his life. In 1898

he {Connolly} recognised Pilsudski's Polish Socialism as being of a kind with his own Irish Republican Socialism, and in his alignment with Germany in 1914-16 he was again in tune with Pilsudski." (*Connolly and German Socialism*, Brendan Clifford, Athol Books, p3, 2004).

"The Polish Socialist Party (PPS) was founded in 1892 on a programme of building socialism in a re-established Polish state." p21.

"Connolly, like Pilsudski, established a nationally based socialist organisation. Rosa Luxemburg and Lenin argued that socialist organisations should be based on states, and both condemned nationalist forms of socialist organisation.

"Connolly, like Pilsudski, combined nationalism and socialism ideologically, and deliberately set out to develop strong nationalist feelings in the socialist movement. Luxemburg and Lenin both condemned the advocacy of nationalism in the socialist movement, and they regarded the blending of nationalist and socialist ideology as a particularly reprehensible and vicious exercise. 'Social-patriot' was one of the worst terms of abuse in the Luxemburg-Lenin vocabulary. It was roughly equivalent to the term 'fascist' in the inter-war period. Pilsudski

was declared to be a social-patriot. If Luxemburg or Lenin had had occasion to characterise Connolly's politics during his lifetime, they would undoubtedly have bracketed them with Pilsudski's politics and called them social-patriotic." p22.

PILSUDSKI: THE MAN

So what was it about Pilsudski that so impressed James Connolly?

The present writer is grateful to Caoimhin de bHailis, a Cork scholar who passed on a 1955 Pan paperback titled: '*Happy Odyssey—The memoirs of Lieutenant-General Sir Adrian Carton de Wiart, VC, KBE, CB, CMG, DSO*', with the advice that '*all you ever wanted to know about Pilsudski is in here*'.

The writer was sceptical at first, but de Wiart, despite his Imperial attachments and dismissal of politicians of all hues, portrays a mighty objective view of Pilsudski, probably the honesty of one soldier towards another.

De Wiart's own story is a classic in itself but must be told elsewhere! The following is a bare outline of de Wiart's background.

Carton de Wiart:

"Lieutenant-General Sir Adrian Carton de Wiart VC, KBE, CB, CMG, DSO (5 May 1880 - 5 June 1963), was a British officer of Belgian and Irish descent. He is considered by many to be one of the most remarkable figures in British military history, renowned for bravery, his striking character and the sheer adventure of his long life. He is thought to be a model for the character of Brigadier Ben Ritchie Hook in Evelyn Waugh's trilogy *Sword of Honour*." (Wikipedia).

"I was born in Brussels, a Belgian, the son of a successful legal man, and with an Irish grandmother to produce a small quantity of British blood in my veins." p11. De Wiart was a Catholic.

"... I have no politics and am utterly uninterested as to what party is in power." p212.

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

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

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

PO Box 339, Belfast BT12 4GQ or

PO Box 6589, London, N7 6SG, or

Labour Comment,

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

Subscription by Post:

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

Electronic Subscription:

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

You can also order from:

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