

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

December 2012

Vol.27, No.12 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.26 No.12 ISSN 954-5891

Therapeutic Abortion

The death of Mrs. Savita Halappanavar as a result of medical shortcomings in connection with complications in a miscarriage is likely to bring about a much-needed reform of arrangements in such situations.

The only statute law governing abortion is the 19th century British-made *Offences Against The Person Act*. That is modified by the clause in the Irish Constitution that there is an equal right to life between an unborn and its mother, enacted by referendum. This provision came about as a result of a legal case, brought by an underage statutory rape victim. Her family was appealing an injunction brought by Attorney General Harold Whelehan to prevent the girl from leaving the country to obtain an abortion. Whelehan was over-ruled by the Supreme Court and the person concerned travelled to England for an abortion. Subsequently, referendums confirmed the Right to Information about Abortion to be made available in Ireland and the Right to Travel for Abortion.

The X-Case ruling was not overturned by referendum. It established that, where a conflict of interest existed between the two, the life of the mother was to take priority over that of the unborn. However, no legislation has been passed, to give effect to and elaborate this judge-made law. This has meant that individual doctors have been unsure of how to proceed in difficult cases. It has been left to the Medical Council to draw up regulations to govern medical practice. *Irish Political Review* has been given to understand that these are drawn up sufficiently loosely to allow medical practitioners considerable leeway. The effect of that has been that there is considerable variation in the approach to problem pregnancies around the country. In a small number of hospitals there has been a very restrictive approach to medical intervention indeed, as was the case at Galway University Hospital. Judging by press reports of the Halappanavar Case, the doctors in question denied the mother her rights to a legal termination under X-Case judge-made law. In the Dublin area, on the other hand, we understand that doctors routinely intervene to save the life of the mother where this is required. It is a pity that the variable medical practice in such situations has not come to light before this case, as such knowledge could have been of assistance to women with problem pregnancies. What the Halappanavar Case has made abundantly clear is that it can no longer be left

continued on page 2

Just what would we do if UK left EU?

This was the question posed by David McWilliams in a recent piece in the *Irish Independent* (22 November). However, he did not answer his own question. And while his logic leads to us leaving the Euro and joining Sterling that's a position that dare not speak its name for him. With this approach he becomes very eclectic as regards the country's options and it's difficult to see the worth of what he says.

For example he says that, if Britain left the EU, "*Ireland would be a total outlier in terms of economic integration, while culturally we would be in a club with which we share practically nothing*". This is weird reasoning. The economic integration on offer is with the Eurozone of which Britain is not part and obviously hostile to. It is the plans for this very integration that is forcing it to consider leaving the EU. So its exit from the scene will not hinder the development of what it is being trying to prevent.

Ireland on the other hand shows every sign of wanting to be part of this integration. The fundamental choice was made in the referendum on the Fiscal Pact. It will inevitably be physically an

continued on page 4

Gaza

At the conclusion of Zion's latest bloodbath in Gaza, an RTE commentator wearily referred to "*this conflict that has been going on for thousands of years*".

This is nonsense. Zionism was just another late 19th century European nationalist movement which gained ground among East European Jews in response to the official brutal anti-Semitism of Britain's greatest ally, Tsarist Russia. Where the national movement would locate itself was a matter for

discussion. Up to this point there was only a tiny Jewish population in Palestine, and it was initially not considered.

Zionism set out to find a "*national homeland*" for "*the Jews*" under the protection of an Imperialist power, and always favoured Britain for this latter role. The initial site discussed for the Homeland was Uganda, where there was plenty of fertile land and a people that could be easily dispensed with by imperial gunpowder. However, that fell through.

Palestine came under consideration. There was a large Jewish populations

around the Ottoman Empire. However, it was contented to stay where it was. The Zionist project had no support there. An approach by the Zionists to the Ottoman rulers to consider a European Jewish colonisation project in Palestine was rejected out of hand as only likely to produce dislocation and havoc far in excess of any economic benefits it might produce.

The Zionists then proposed the Palestine notion to Britain, and presented themselves to the masters of the British Empire as a potential classic white colonist

continued on page 4

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Therapeutic Abortion. Editorial	1
Just What Would We Do If UK Left EU? Jack Lane	1
Gaza. Philip O'Connor	1
Children's Referendum. Report	3
Readers' Letters: Who Is In Control? Ivor Kenna	5
Ceasefire Agreement Between Israel And Gaza's Palestinians. Report	5
Northern Ireland: Subversive Government. Editorial	6
P.A. Mag Louchlainn: An Obituary. Seán McGouran	7
Ethnicity Vs. Nationalism. Editorial (Prying Out Sectarianism, Part 2)	8
Dunmanway: A Reply To Jeffrey Dudgeon. Barry Keane (Letter)	11
Poems: A Prayer For Gaza; Caught In The Act. Wilson John Haire	12
Debt Crisis: Unemployment And Industrial Policy. Philip O'Connor (Austerity Report 1)	13
Shorts from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (The Public Finances; Consumption Boom; Gambling Debts; Cost Of Banking Crisis)	16
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (Trocaire & Israeli Boycott; Irish Affairs; Alastair Campbell; USA And The GAA; Monignor Hugh O'Flaherty)	18
An Irish Anti-Fascist RAF Volunteer And Some Other Soldiers. Manus O'Riordan (Part 4)	19
Index To Irish Political Review, 2012.	23
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Abortion Law; Public Interest Directors; Children's/Adoption Referendum; Terence McSwiney)	24

Labour Comment, edited by **Pat Maloney:**
Craft Guilds And The Government
(back page)

Trade Union Notes
(Pay; Tax; Membership)
(page 26)

to Medical Council guidelines and medical discretion to ensure a proper outcome in difficult pregnancies.

Politicians have shied away from giving statutory effect to judicial rulings in the X Case. Undoubtedly the fear has been that any liberalisation would bring about a liberal abortion regime, such as exists in Great Britain (but not in Northern Ireland). That fear is misplaced. Attitudes towards abortion are socially determined to a considerable extent. All around Europe restrictive abortion regimes are in place. Terminations are provided for on a limited basis. There is little controversy or attempt to widen the criteria under which they are permitted. Where women feel the need to go beyond what is allowed for in their own jurisdiction, they travel to obtain a termination and it is often to London that they go. It might be said that Britain has become the abortion centre for Europe.

The only way that Ireland could bounce from a total ban to total liberalisation is if no proper provisions for therapeutic

abortions are now set in place expeditiously.

Strictly speaking, a statute law should not be required to allow therapeutic abortions where there is a real and substantial risk to the life of the mother as legal authority for this already exists as a result of the X Case. In fact, if and when legislation is passed on the matter, it could still fall to the courts to flesh it out by interpretation.

As there is already legal authority for abortion in these circumstances, the only reason for introducing a statute law on the matter is that doctors are at present not fulfilling their obligations under the law, either because of pusillanimity or on misguided ethical grounds. It appears that, in such situations, the State may have to order medical interventions.

Praveen Halappanavar, the bereaved husband, has demanded a sworn, public enquiry into the death of his wife. There are two enquiries pending, both private and unsworn. These have been rejected by Mr. Halappanavar, who is seeking

ownership of his wife's medical records in an effort to thwart them.

Michael Farrell has written that,

"Irrespective of the views, opinion or wishes of the Minister for Health, the HSE [Health Services Executive], its chief executive or members, very shortly there will be an inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the death of the late Savita Halappanavar which will be open to the public, sworn, independent, with leave to appeal and which will neither seek to blame nor seek to exonerate and which will be presided over by a member of one of the most caring and sympathetic groups in Irish society—it's called an inquest" (Letter, Irish Times 24.11.12).

These observations seem very much to the point. For whatever reason, the Government—and the media—appear to have neglected this most basic of democratic institutions—the Coroner's Court.

There may be a problem with any inquiry that is held: Mrs. Halappanavar's body has been cremated. An autopsy was carried out two days after she died and it must be assumed that there are relevant medical samples stored to enable forensic evidence to be presented.

The European Court of Human Rights recently ruled, in a case brought by a woman with a problem pregnancy, that the State was remiss in not providing procedures to establish a woman's entitlement in such situations. The Government set up an expert group, chaired by Justice Sean Ryan, after that ruling. The *Sunday Independent* reports that the findings of this group favour the establishment of "effective and accessible" procedures to enable women to have an abortion in Ireland where there is a "legitimate entitlement" (See *State Is Told: 'Select Sites For Abortion'*, 25.11.12).

There can be little doubt that there is over-whelming public support for legislation providing for a generous approach to medical intervention where the life of the mother is at risk. Such legislation is in keeping with the judicial ruling in the X-Case and is long over-due.

Children's Rights: *A Political Agenda?*

It is a fact that Mrs. Halappanavar died on 28th October, seventeen days before the fact was publicised in a front-page lead story by the *Irish Times* on Wednesday, 14th November.

It is also a fact that voters went to the polls in the Children's Rights Referendum on Saturday, 10th November, two weeks after she died.

The effect of the Constitutional amendment was to enshrine *"the natural and imprescriptible rights of all children"*. It might be asked, what is wrong with that? But the Constitution already lays down that the Family is *"the natural and fundamental unit group of Society"*, with *"inalienable and imprescriptible rights"*. Regrettably, one right can only be established at the expense of another. Up to the present, children formed part of the Family and were protected as part of it. However, under the old provisions, the Constitution laid down that State was permitted to intervene only when the Family was failing to vindicate the rights of its child-members. Now Children are protected in their own right. This can only diminish the Family as the basic building block of social life. It will fall to the Supreme Court eventually to decide how much the Family is to be undermined by the new provision.

Every political party, the Irish Hierarchy, and the media supported these proposals.

The basic issues were not made clear to the electorate, which was very uncertain as how to vote. And the Supreme Court ruling, made public a couple of days before the voting, that the Government had acted improperly in using public money to put a one-sided case to the public about its proposed Constitutional amendments added to public uncertainty as how to vote. The ruling undoubtedly reduced support for the proposed change.

In these circumstances, did the *Irish Times* and others decide to hold back the Halappanavar story until after the referendum which they were so anxious to pass and which it was clear the public was uncertain about?

There are indications that this happened. It has been reported that pro-Choice groups were aware that a story about a maternal death was about to break several days before it did. The *Sunday Independent* reported that *"Members of the Indian community got in touch with pro-choice groups following Savita's death"* (*Pro-Choice Activists Got Tip-Off On Tragic Death*, 18.11.12). We do not know exactly when this was, but the paper went on to suggest that some groups knew of the case *"at least"* three days before the story broke. The same issue of the paper stated, *"The Irish Times had been working on the story for several days before it finally hit the front page on Wednesday morning"* (*From Pure Joy To Absolute Tragedy...*).

In the event there was a low turn-out for the vote, and a less than expected majority for the Constitutional amendment.

A legal challenge to the Referendum result has been brought to the Courts by Joanna Jordan and Nancy Kennelly, with the assistance of journalist and campaigner John Waters. One of the grounds for the challenge is that those who cast postal votes did so before the result became known of the Supreme Court decision, censuring the Government for putting out

one-sided information about the issues involved.

The Supreme Court has continually enlarged its political prerogatives since the 1960s. Up to now, legal power has been increased at the expense of that of the elected Legislature and Executive. Will the Supreme Court now over-rule the Democracy too? Certainly the way that the Irish Establishment has acted has given it grounds to do so.

Report

Children's Referendum

Voting

The result of the Referendum held on Saturday, 10th November was as follows:

Yes: 615,731 58.01%
 No: 445,863 41.99%
 Valid votes 1,061,594, 99.57%
 Invalid or blank votes 4,645, 0.43%
 Total votes: 1,066,239

Only 33.5% of those eligible to vote yesterday did so, which was the lowest turnout since the referendum on bail in 1996.

Three constituencies voted No: Donegal North East by 60%, Donegal South West by 56%, and Dublin North West by 50.4%, a margin of just 137 votes.

The margin in Cork North Central was even tighter, it voted Yes by just 47 votes.

The highest Yes vote was in Dublin South, with 73%, closely followed by Dublin South East and Dún Laoghaire.

Constitution

Thirty-First Amendment of the Constitution

[The fifth subsection of the following Article has been deleted by the Referendum:]

"Education. Article 42

...

5. In exceptional cases, where the parents for physical or moral reasons fail in their duty towards their children, the State as guardian of the common good, by appropriate means shall endeavour to supply the place of the parents, but always with due regard for the natural and imprescriptible rights of the child."

[It is to be replaced by the following:]

NEW ARTICLE 42A

1.1 The State recognises and affirms the natural and imprescriptible rights of all children and shall, as far as practicable, by its laws protect and vindicate those rights.

2.1 In exceptional cases, where the parents, regardless of their marital status, fail in their duty towards their children to such extent that the safety or welfare of any of their children is likely to be

prejudicially affected, the State as guardian of the common good shall, by proportionate means as provided by law, endeavour to supply the place of the parents, but always with due regard for the natural and imprescriptible rights of the child.

2.2 Provision shall be made by law for the adoption of any child where the parents have failed for such a period of time as may be prescribed by law in their duty towards the child and where the best interests of the child so require.

3 Provision shall be made by law for the voluntary placement for adoption and the adoption of any child.

4.1 Provision shall be made by law that in the resolution of all proceedings -

i brought by the State, as guardian of the common good, for the purpose of preventing the safety and welfare of any child from being prejudicially affected, or

ii concerning the adoption, guardianship or custody of, or access to, any child, the best interests of the child shall be the paramount consideration.

4.2 Provision shall be made by law for securing, as far as practicable, that in all proceedings referred to in subsection 1° of this section in respect of any child who is capable of forming his or her own views, the views of the child shall be ascertained and given due weight having regard to the age and maturity of the child.

[Article 41 deals with the family and has *not* been amended. The relevant subsection is:]

"The Family. Article 41

1.1 The State recognises the Family as the natural primary and fundamental unit group of Society, and as a moral institution possessing inalienable and imprescriptible rights, antecedent and superior to all positive law.

1.2 The State, therefore, guarantees to protect the Family in its constitution and authority, as the necessary basis of social order and as indispensable to the welfare of the Nation and the State...." ■

If Britain Left The EU continued

outlying member but that is almost immaterial to the essentials of an economically-integrated entity. There will be several outlying members but such an entity will be more than the sum of its parts.

His concept of culture is clearly very shallow. He says Britain "...is a neighbour with whom we share so much that it would be almost inconceivable to think of daily life without Britain, from the perspective of TV, newspapers, popular culture and sport". However, if these elements did constituted Irish culture, it would be a pretty meaningless affair and of little significance to anything.

But it is plain as a pikestaff that Ireland joined the EEC with glee 40 years ago and its consistent commitment ever since, despite all the difficulties involved, shows that a fundamental part of its culture wants identification with Europe—while the same 40 years has shown conclusively that English culture is at odds with all things European. This difference betrays a much deeper cultural alternative than anything that can be bridged by pop culture and its celebrities. And it will never be understood by them.

McWilliams, being an economist, sees trade flows and such things as the things that really matter and he quotes them profusely. But there would be no EEC or EU or United Germany if the existing trade flows were accepted as the arbiter of people's lives. No doubt he would have been opposed to the break with sterling as a hopeless attempt at the impossible—but it worked. Irish political independence itself went contrary to all existing trade flows—but it worked. It always made as much economic sense for Britain to be in the Euro as out of it, but economics never determined the matter and never will as any five minutes watching the House of Commons on anything European would demonstrate. Man does not live by bread alone.

He shows his eclecticism and naivety when explaining Britain's case against the EU budget increase. Bear in mind that Mr. McWilliams is one of the great fulminators against 'austerity', and he would normally be all for Governments expanding their budgets and thereby putting more money into their economies. But the argument disappears when it comes to Britain and the EU:

"Let's think about the latest row the Brits are having with the EU. The British want to freeze the EU budget, or at least

their contribution. In contrast, the EU institutions, backed by the politicians of other EU member states, want a 5% increase in the EU's institutions' budget. So what the Brits are actually looking for is austerity for the EU itself. What's so wrong with this? After all isn't the EU the main cheerleader for austerity as a policy? What is good for the goose is clearly not so good for the gander. It seems like a reasonable position to take and one in which it is supported by Germany, Finland and the Netherlands."

This assumes that Britain is arguing the case on its sheer economic merits alone, when in fact it is simply the latest stick to beat the EU with—and this is not the position that Germany, Finland and the Netherlands take. They argue their case on the merits of the budget itself. If McWilliams does not appreciate this distinction, he is naive and fit only for undergraduate debating.

Jack Lane

Gaza

continued

project to settle, civilise and secure the territory for them. "A land without people for a people without land!"

At a time when Britain was contemplating the destruction of the Ottoman Empire for its own strategic ends, the notion of creating a "loyal little Jewish Ulster in a sea of hostile Arabism" (Sir Andrew Storr) rapidly gained traction in the halls of Whitehall. The fact that it would entail the deportation of the existing population was taken in its stride (At the time Britain was also contemplating the replacement of the people of Mesopotamia with Indian settlers.) Churchill, a convinced anti-Semite, became a leading champion of the idea, seeing it (in 1922) as killing two birds with one stone—it would both wean "international Jewry" from its "evil" internationalist revolutionary predilections by giving it a national purpose, and simultaneously create a loyal white colony in the Middle East "in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire".

Now secure with the patronage of the greatest Empire the world had ever seen, and the then greatest military power in the world, Zionism honed its colonisation project on the basis of textual analysis of the Old Testament. The land to be settled (and emptied of its savages) ran from East of the Jordan River to the Mediterranean—coincidentally encompassing all the fertile land and water resources of the region.

'Moderate' and 'left-wing' Zionists are Israeli nationalists who baulk at the human costs of implementing the full programme, and are therefore prepared to settle for less. Within Zionism this is a morally (and currently also politically) very weak position. The State of Israel has never accepted the 1967 peace-line as its border. It is the only UN member state whose borders are not defined. When questioned a few years ago at the Joint Oireachtas Committee on Foreign Affairs, current Justice Minister (and former FG children's rights spokesman), Alan Shatter, an unrelenting supporter of the Zionist project, refused to divulge what the border of Israel should be. Zionist *realpolitik* is to achieve as much of the full programme as possible within the constraints of international politics. Hence the massive Settlements project in the West Bank.

Gaza is different. A textual analysis of the Old Testament apparently produces the result that it is not part of "Biblical Israel". Hence the removal by Israel of the deviant Jewish settlements there a number of years ago under the guise of a "concession" to the Palestinians. Gaza is a tiny area smaller than Co. Louth in which a population of 1.7m—mostly expelled people from the colonised territory—lives in the most congested urban space on the planet. For Israel this is a nuisance. So, what to do?

Eight years ago, the left-wing Israeli intellectual Tanya Reinhart produced a book in which she explained the "Gaza first" option in Zionist thinking. This involved the total separation of Gaza from the West Bank with the aim of the gradual depletion (depopulation) of the former. These two areas, together with East Jerusalem are, according to the UN, supposed to form the Palestinian State of the famous "Two State Solution". In 1988 the PLO signed up to this proposal thus, in an extraordinary act of generosity, agreeing to peacefully settle for 22% of their historic homeland. Israel even signed up to agreements allowing for extensive communication and transport links between Gaza and the West Bank (e.g. the Oslo Accords and the *Agreement on Movement and Access*). But it has ensured these agreements were never implemented and over the last decade has hermetically sealed the two areas from each other and encouraged the development of divergent polities in the two entities, one of whom it conveniently does not have to deal with (Hamas) because of its "terrorist" character.

Hermetically-sealed Gaza has since then been subjected to a blockade almost

mediaeval in conception—or perhaps worse. A report has emerged indicating that Israel measured the minimum amount of calories the Gaza people required for survival and then ensured that considerably less passed through its blockade.

Essentially daily life is made miserable and unbearable for the inhabitants through economic deprivation on such a scale as to bring society near to the point of collapse. Gazan society is further tormented by periodic massacres and massive destruction of property and infrastructure. A white secularised western people would have caved in long ago. Israel takes a particular perverse satisfaction in preventing the construction of sewage treatment facilities, and bombs those that begin to be built. Let them die in their dirt as we did in Warsaw! The aim is quite simply for the population to be driven by sheer desperation to 'leak' out and drain into Egypt.

Israel encourages misguided left-wingers in the West who berate Egypt for not opening its border with Gaza at the Raffah crossing to allow in "*humanitarian aid*" to deal with the devastation it itself has caused. George Galloway dutifully led a convoy across the desert to expose the Egyptian treachery, cheered on by assorted far left Palestine support groups, while Israel keeps its own border crossings with Gaza closed. On the other hand Israel condemns Egypt for not "*policing*" the tiny border, thus facilitating the smuggling of arms to the Hamas. It is never mentioned that the Sadat "*peace agreement*" with Israel restricts the number of security people Egypt can station in the Sinai to a tiny figure.

The periodic massacres casually inflicted by Israel on Gaza (with 85% public support for the latest one) always require a 'legal' pretext. This cover is needed by President Obama's Secretary of State Hillary Clinton—who is responsible for marshalling the US Jewish vote for the Democratic Party (or *vice versa*)—for her set pieces for the fools of the UN. And the pretext is always the same—the "*resumption*" by Hamas of rocket fire into Israel. And those "*resumptions*" are invariably triggered by Israel collapsing ceasefire agreements previously entered into with Hamas by carrying out "*targeted assassinations*". Israel has always "*reserved the right*" to carry out the murder of people it claims are "*planning acts of violence against Israel*". In the latest episode, the "*targeted assassination*" was of the Hamas defence force leader, Ahmed al-Jaabari, with whom Israel was actually in negotiation about a long-term ceasefire.

Who Is In Control?

I buy all your publications regularly at Housmans Bookshop, 5 Caledonian Road, London N1 (www.radicalbooksellers.co.uk).

I was very interested to read in the Long Fellow's column for November that "just 13 men" transferred from the Royal Irish Constabulary to the Garda Síochána. This was indeed a revolutionary change in personnel.

What I should like to learn from the *Irish Political Review* or its other readers is whether such a revolutionary change took place in the Civil Service and the Army and who decided on the money supply for the Irish Free State.

This has implications for Scotland, Wales, the 6 Counties, Cornwall and other places seeking independence inside or outside the United Kingdom in the future.

Ivor Kenna

The latest ceasefire agreement is a major victory for Hamas. It is novel in that it is in actual written form. It is also a victory for Hamas in that its brief terms exclude Israeli "*incursions and targeting of individuals*" (i.e. targeted assassinations) and includes the opening of crossings and the ending of Israeli enforcement of a no-go zone on the Gaza side of the border. Israel has negotiated, and signed an agreement, with the "*terrorist*" Hamas. After this, how can the US-EU maintain their despicable exclusion of Hamas from political engagement?

However, what force will enforce Israeli compliance? After all, the least bit of rocket fire by some dissident element in

Gaza (controlled by whomsoever) will be sufficient pretext for the next massacre, which is only a matter of time. As Zion Defence Minister, Ehud Barak, said in response to the publishing of the text of the agreement by the Egyptian Presidency: "*The right to self-defense trumps any piece of paper*" (Reuters, 22nd Nov.).

Nevertheless, to date the Muslim nature of Gazan society has prevented it from disintegrating into the savage and desperate rabble the Jewish policy has been aimed at achieving, with the purpose of precipitating its mass flight into Egypt, leaving a nice piece of unpopulated land for use by the Zionist state. This too is the achievement of Hamas.

REUTERS 21ST NOV, 2012:

TEXT: Ceasefire agreement between Israel and Gaza's Palestinians

Following is the verbatim English text of the ceasefire agreement between Israel and the Palestinians in Gaza that was reached on Wednesday with Egyptian mediation. The text was distributed by the Egyptian presidency.

1. (no title given for this section)
 - a. Israel should stop all hostilities in the Gaza Strip land, sea and air including incursions and targeting of individuals.
 - b. All Palestinian factions shall stop all hostilities from the Gaza Strip against Israel including rocket attacks and all attacks along the border.
 - c. Opening the crossings and facilitating the movements of people and transfer of goods and refraining from restricting residents' free movements and targeting residents in border areas and procedures of implementation shall be dealt with after 24 hours from the start of the ceasefire.
2. Implementation mechanisms:
 - a. Setting up the zero hour for the ceasefire understanding to enter into effect.
 - b. Egypt shall receive assurances from each party that the party commits to what was agreed upon.
 - c. Each party shall commit itself not to perform any acts that would breach this understanding. In case of any observations Egypt as the sponsor of this understanding shall be informed to follow up.

Northern Ireland:

Subversive Government

British Government policy on the Northern Ireland region of the British state has, for the past couple of years, been to subvert the local arrangements made under the Good Friday Agreement and to restore "normal" politics. In this project it has been actively supported by Fianna Fail leader Micheál Martin. The recent change of Secretary of State may indicate an end of that policy, but it is too soon to judge.

Owen Paterson, Secretary of State until 4th September, said that a political system which was not an adversarial conflict between Government and Opposition was democratically abnormal. But it was the normality of adversarial politics in the extremely artificial system set up in the Six Counties in 1921—entirely subordinate to the British State but excluded from its political system—that gave rise to a war that lasted for almost 30 years, which the British Army was unable to win. The war was brought to an end by a political settlement under which every party of any substance is in government as of right and there is no role for an Opposition.

It goes against the grain for Britain not to win, or at least appear to win. In 1998 it admitted its inability to win. And, by the settlement it agreed to it conceded, *de facto* at least, that the war waged against it by the Provos was legitimate. But the only sense that can be made of its policies in recent years is that it hoped to free itself from the concessions it had to make in order to end the war and restore a slightly modified version of the system it set up in 1921. In this project it has been supported verbally, not only by the Fianna Fail leader in the South, but by every party in the North except Sinn Fein. All of them—the Unionist Parties of course, but also the SDLP and Alliance—have made noises about the need for democratic opposition, and for the replacing of the 1998 system by some kind of voluntary opposition.

There was a time—in 1998 and for some years after—when the SDLP and the Ulster Unionist Party had the numbers to form a Coalition with a substantial majority of elected representatives. They refused to do so. They can plead that their constituents would have rejected them at the next Election if they did so. But that was not a certainty. And in any case it was only a debating point. The reason they made no effort to form a Coalition is that

the dynamic of communal antagonism, ingrained in them by the Northern Ireland system, always stifled the thought of Coalition before it ever gave rise to the slightest action towards its realisation.

These two 'moderate' parties of the centre were quickly relegated to the extremes by the working out of the Agreement, and they began sniping at the "extremist" parties, the Provos and the Paisleyites, which replaced them at the centre, and which made accommodations to each other—a thing which the moderates had not be able to do.

The dysfunctional 'moderates' began carping at the pragmatic 'extremists' and trying to unsettle them. But this was a mere expression of resentment at the loss of electoral support. They still could not bring themselves to act together. But Whitehall probably thought that something could be made of these resentments of the incompetent moderates to damage Sinn Fein.

The war is over but particular incidents in it are being raked over by an unholy alliance of Whitehall, the Unionist Parties, the SDLP, Fianna Fail and Republican dissidents of various kinds. At the time of the Agreement the idea was floated of a Truth And Reconciliation Commission on South African lines to consolidate it socially. That idea was shot down immediately in Westminster by Michael Mates on behalf of the British Establishment. There was no way the British State was going to make a good confession of what it had been up to during the War. The raking over was therefore a sneaky, one-sided affair designed to pin something on Gerry Adams. Central to it was the Boston College tapes, arranged, it is said, by Professor the Lord Bew from the Official IRA, whom it is realistic to regard as a Whitehall agent. A leading participant was Anthony McIntyre, a one-time Provo who condemned Adams for having got the War stopped before Ireland was united, and demanded that the Provos should admit they had lost. (McIntyre appears to have been given his "ideological formation" by Lord Bew.)

Many former Provos, who were unable to keep pace with the effective *realpolitik* of Adams and McGuinness, agreed to spill the beans to a tape-recorder, the tapes being held in Boston College until their death—not the death of all concerned, only their own death. The project was therefore political, not historical.

Whitehall (in the form of the PSNI) demanded access to the tapes—as if it did not know what was on them! The Ameri-

can Courts upheld the demand, but legal challenges are ongoing. And in Belfast McIntyre and Ed Moloney (an anti-Provo journalist from the Left who is heavily implicated in the affair) are trying by legal action in Belfast to stop the PSNI demand.

Then there is the subversion of the Patton changes in policing, which were intended to introduce a new culture into policing. Under these provisions large numbers of RUC personnel took golden handshakes, with half a billion pounds being disbursed. Disquiet arose, however, when it began to become apparent that the same people were being rehired under civilian contracts. Finally, a report of the Comptroller and Auditor General published in early October revealed that more than 1,000 former RUC personnel were rehired in a police service of just over 5,500.

One effect of this rehiring policy is the undermining of the Patten provision for a temporary 50/50 recruitment policy to correct the Protestant imbalance in the police force.

Another effect is that the RUC civilian contractors are not subject to civilian overview: even the Police Ombudsman cannot regulate their activities.

Jim Gibney, a Sinn Fein very supportive of the Peace Process who has a column in the *Irish News*, assesses the situation as follows:

"A 'fifth column RUC mentality' bent on frustrating the implementation of Patten's recommendations for reform was active inside the PSNI, pursuing a game plan of 'hollowing out' and undermining Patten.

"At no stage during this retiring and rehiring practice has the PSNI explained why it was started beyond claims that in the changeover from the RUC to the PSNI valuable skills were lost and that a violent threat from armed republicans existed.

"It has to be remembered that the context... was one of peace—republicans and loyalists were on ceasefire...

"The violent threat claim was a pretext..." (IN 11.10.12).

Gibney might also have mentioned that, since the GFA was signed, MI5 (responsible for some of the worst outrages of the Troubles) has established its headquarters in Northern Ireland. It may be assumed that it took on retiring RUC officers, particularly from Special Branch. These activities would not be regulated by the GFA.

Meanwhile the Secretary of State began to intern with one hand the Republican dissidents whom he was manipulating

against Sinn Fein with the other hand, presenting Sinn Fein with a dilemma, which it has dealt with effectively so far.

Then Pdraic Wilson was arrested because of IRA activities not covered by the 1998 Agreement because they happened after it. It took some time to find out what those activities were. It turned out that Wilson's offence was that he investigated the circumstances surrounding the killing of Robert McCartney—a thing which at the time it was widely demanded that the Republicans should do.

Wilson was being held without being granted bail—which is the current form of internment in a very slow-moving legal jurisdiction indeed. This went on until Sinn Fein leader Gerry Kelly led a street demonstration which was widely supported in the nationalist community, and Wilson was released on bail.

Others remain in jail, however.

Jim Gibney commented as follows on the State's unofficial internment policy:

"...Pdraic Wilson's arrest is a calculated strike at the leadership of Sinn Fein with the express intention of causing internal difficulties..."

"His arrest raises very fundamental questions about the failure of the leadership of the PSNI to tackle those it knows in its ranks that are using the police and the prosecution service as a battleground to block further change to PSNI and the justice system.

"...The question has to be asked has Matt Baggott lost his leadership of the PSNI?"

...The treatment of Mr. Wilson can only be understood in the context of the securocrats' strategy of attacking the peace process. Of equal concern is the pursuit of Marian Price—a sick and bed-bound patient in a Belfast hospital.

"A magistrate in a Derry court dismissed charges against Ms Price yet the prosecution service reinstated the dropped charges. There is also growing concern that a miscarriage of justice has occurred in the case of Brendan McConville and John Paul Wootton sentenced to life imprisonment earlier this year for the killing of police officer Stephen Carroll.

"It is believed the conviction is unsafe..." (IN 8.11.12; Baggott is the fundamentalist Christian Chief Constable brought in from England to head the PSNI. Gibney did not elaborate the *de facto* internment issue further in this piece, but there are many republicans who have been in jail for years, awaiting trial; it should be added that the stance of the recently-appointed DPP, Barra McGrory, is puzzling; his father, Paddy, was prominent in the Catholic response to the 1969 pogrom, defended Gerry Adams, and represented the families of the 'Gibraltar Three', killed by the SAS in 1988).

Another issue arose in connection with the appointment of official Advisers to Ministers A Republican Minister appointed somebody with a conviction for Republican activities. Jim Allister, leader of the Traditional Unionist Voice, put down a motion in the Assembly that people with convictions should be disqualified from advising Ministers (many of whom had convictions of the same kind). The SDLP signed that motion. The Assembly has little power over the members of the Executive. If this matter is pressed it would be subject to community voting—that is, it will be subject to two separate votes, Unionist and Nationalist, and must have a majority in each to be of any consequence at all. It could not be passed by the Nationalist bloc unless Sinn Fein votes against itself. So the whole affair is just a way of keeping bad feeling alive over an appointment system that would seem to be in accordance with the Agreement.

And then there is Eoghan Harris—hounder of Poppy sellers in the late 1960s, Godfather of the Official IRA in its war

waged in a medium of ideological fantasy, Marxist-Leninist leader of the Stickies when they came close to superseding the Communist Party in Moscow's favour, adviser to Lord Trimble when he was leader of the Unionist Party, writer of Trimble's Oslo speech accepting the Nobel Peace Prize for the Agreement which he had done his bet to prevent, scourge of the Provos in the Peace Process, etc. etc. He appears to have persuaded the Editor of the *Sunday Independent* (his ex-wife and a defender of Official IRA terrorism) to stop supporting the anti-Provo Republicans who are collaborating with the British Establishment in their efforts to damage Adams. When the Leninist system fell apart, Conor Cruise O'Brien became his guiding star. O'Brien, when his political career collapsed under Haughey's influence in 1977, fell into the grip of a liberal-fascist obsession that took him beyond the reach of commonsense-based reason. But it begins to seem that something in Harris survived the O'Brien cult—even if it is only the ability to see which way the weather-vane is pointing.

Obituary

P.A. Mag Lochlainn

I first encountered PA Mag Lochlainn at the door of Cathedral Building (opposite Belfast's St. Ann's Cathedral). He asked me if it was where "N. I. G. R. A." held its meetings. After momentary puzzlement at the set of initials, and the idea that anybody would actually want to attend, I said "Yes". PA (as he was known to all and sundry) was then a chunky man. He had had a 'near death' experience while yachting during the Summer. He was part of the crew on a racing yacht: some malicious people implied it was a Russian oligarch-type vessel.

I don't know if he was disappointed at the smallness of the event, but he returned on a regular weekly basis. As he was retired, due to the kidney infection that was to kill him at 67; a relatively early age for a man who had been a yachtsman and hill walker in his earlier days, PA was available for callers (journalists and other gay people) who needed help, or a 'quote'. PA (a garrulous man—with interesting things to say, I thought) proved to have a distinct knack for pithy sound-bites. He was a good interviewee too, able to turn things around, without making it obvious.

As PA was the spokesman, it was decided to make him President of the Association, which pleased him, and gave it an attractive public image. He was a

very likeable man. He was also a physically brave man, I have seen him surrounded by large, surly young men and facing them down. That knack had partly to do with the fact that he had been a secondary school teacher for nearly a quarter of a century. He was a founder-member (in Northern Ireland) of NAS/UWT (the National Association of Schoolmasters / Union of Women Teachers), on non-sectarian grounds. His first teaching job was in County Down, in a State school. The people he lodged with, and some of his colleagues, objected to the spelling of his name. He found a job in Omagh, a relatively short distance from his home town, Dungiven, with the Christian Brothers. (He didn't really like the Brothers).

He was trained to teach French, but taught 'Art'; his minor obsession with heraldry was useful in this capacity. PA was a genealogist, and very knowledgeable about Irish families, British aristos, and the Royal Houses of Europe—something that flew straight over the heads of most of the company he kept for the last twenty-odd years of his life. PA did not really take a holiday for most of his stay in Belfast (1991 to 2012) but he was knowledgeable about France, its cuisine, and its wine. He approached both with considerable gusto until his illness made it impossible.

He was rather modest about his linguistic capabilities. He said that he was 'trying' to learn Polish, but I heard him in

conversation with a Polish couple. And it wasn't a 'How d'you do?' chat—they were discussing Pan Tadeusz, the national epic novel.

PA (and his contemporary Éamonn McCann, of the Derry Labour Party, then of the SWP) went to St Columb's College. PA, the son of a well-off farmer may have been there because his family could afford the fees, but he may have been a scholarship boy. He didn't like the place and rarely talked about it. Dungiven is a short bus journey from Derry, but he was a boarder.

Due to his loyalty to the SDLP (which he always insisted was 'socialist' despite all the evidence to the contrary), PA was the object of some prejudice: the rise and rise of Sinn Féin put paid to that. But his amiable disposition meant that maintaining prejudice was hard work.

He was a good musician, and played big parts in Omagh's annual pantomimes: his sonorous voice was probably due to such efforts. He could do wicked impersonations of people who rubbed him up the wrong way. But—apart from the Brothers—he was not a malicious man.

He was a kind, and level-headed person, and gave people who asked for it sound advice. He gave good advice on other matters, too, when US-financed fundamentalists organised a *Stop the Parade Committee* (they were too prejudiced to use the phrase 'LGBT' or 'Gay'), he suggested to the Pride Committee that they take up their challenge to go before the Parades Committee. The latter deals with contentious parades and demonstrations. He suggested the Pride committee play along with any suggestions the Parades Committee suggested. The upshot was that the (cheerful, and popular) Pride demonstration's route was slightly curtailed. But the bigots had to come to terms with the fact that they too had to obey the law. They were (and still are) confined to a static protest immediately outside the City Hall. Thereby they annoy the public because a large part of the footpath is closed for several hours, even though the demo they are protesting takes about twenty minutes to pass. And the kids who mingle there every Saturday afternoon are irritated at being moved-on to make room for them.

It is fitting that PA's most obvious legacy to Belfast is the fact that Ulster's sour-faced fundies can no longer call the shots 'morally' or legally.

Sean McGouran

Ethnicity Vs. Nationalism

Ulster Unionism was once a component of the great Unionist Party—a conquering and reforming party that gave the *coup de grace* to the historic ruling class in Ireland under the regime of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 (the Protestant Ascendancy) by collaborating with the land agitator, William O'Brien, to abolish the landlord system, and that brought Britain to the brink of world dominance by the Boer War. In those times to be an Ulster Unionist was to be a participant in something grand.

What is it to be an Ulster Unionist today? It is to be a miserable hole-and-corner "*ethnicist*".

In the days of the great Irish land reform to be a Unionist was something like being an ancient Roman. The Unionist was a citizen of the world of which he was in large part the creator. Today the Ulster Unionist is not even a citizen of Britain, except in a Platonic sense.

In 1914 the Liberal Party—having become aggressively Imperialist on Free Trade grounds—launched the Empire into a World War through which it was expanded in the short-term but its foundations were undermined. In the midst of this War, which was siphoning off Irishmen by the tens of thousands for the battlefields, the nationalist Irish made war on Britain for the purpose of disengaging from the Empire. They were defeated in the first instance, but the national will that gave rise to the Insurrection then activated the populace for an electoral assertion of independence.

The Liberal Party shattered itself in its war effort. The Unionist Party took over the conduct of the War. In the aftermath of the War—a War that the United States had won for it—it was faced with the shameful prospect of the loss of Ireland.

Britain was no longer a free agent in world affairs. It would have been bankrupted if America had called in its war debts, and the Irish, sacrificed by the million by the British strategic policy carried out by economic means—called the Irish Famine—had become a serious element in American opinion. The Americans would not have stood for the putting down of the Irish by the customary method of genocide—even though America itself was of course a state founded on genocide. So Britain had to try to hang onto Ireland by other means.

One of those means was the sacrifice by the Unionist Party of Ulster Unionism for the purpose of creating divisions in Sinn Féin.

The Ulster Unionists were told they must have a little Home Rule set-up of their own so that a deal could be made with elements in Sinn Féin. These Sinn Feiners would accept the Crown, having been assured that if they did so the Ulster set-up would be made unviable. So Ulster Unionism made "*the supreme sacrifice*" of accepting semi-detachment from Britain and the Empire so that gullible elements in Sinn Féin might be bamboozled. 'Ulster' remained partly British; the Free State waited in vain for the promised unity and there was a resurgence of Republicanism; and the Unionist Party changed its name to the Conservative/Tory Party, leaving Ulster Unionism as a stranded fragment.

In its better days Protestant Ulster did not aspire to be a state. It was an active participant in the greatest state the world had ever seen, and what could be better than that? The Ulster Protestants were one of the foremost peoples of Greater Britain. *Greater Britain*, a term in regular use before the Great War, was the Empire and its powerful offspring, the USA. In effect the world was Greater Britain. But Britain undermined Greater Britain in the attempt to clinch its status by waging a war of destruction on Germany and Turkey. The process of unravelling began even while the expansion of the Empire was still going on. Extensive territories were added to the Empire in 1918, but the rot had set in with the Irish Insurrection in 1916 and the absolute dependence on America that began to be felt acutely the same year.

In 1919, as the waters receded after the Deluge, Churchill saw "*the dreary steeples of Tyrone and Fermanagh*" rising up again. It was a strange expectation that they might have been washed away by an event that had really had nothing to do with them.

The nationalist people of Tyrone and Fermanagh were held against their will on the British side of the Partition, but their will was not broken, or disconcerted. They continued to live vigorously in their own ideals. There was no other political life that might have distracted them. In British Ulster they were far beyond the range of British politics.

It was on Protestant Ulster that Partition (in the actual way it was constructed) had a destructive influence. British Ulster was saved from the clutches of Papish Bolshevism on the condition that in the political dimension of life it should cease to be British. The rest followed almost as a matter of course.

Ulster Unionism became a stranded fragment, and began to have notions of itself as a kind of state. Lords Craigavon and Brookeborough knew better but illusions grew in the middle classes. It was understandable, in the No-man's-land that was Northern Ireland, that those who were in command should mistake the situation. Northern Ireland was an instrument of British policy excluded from British politics. It would exist as long as British Governments found it useful. It is not surprising that those who had the business of running it took it to be more than that.

Ulster Unionism agreed to make the supreme sacrifice (i.e., accept 6 County Home Rule) so that Michael Collins and Arthur Griffith could be sold a pup. The Boundary Commission might have made changes to the Border that would transfer territory to the Free State that actually would have made Northern Ireland more secure. Newry might have gone to the South, and a stretch of South Armagh. (Derry could not be divided at the river because the gates that were closed against King James were on the wrong side!) But the Unionists said *Not An Inch*, and insisted on retaining South Armagh which became an impenetrable Republican base area in the war to which Northern Ireland was bound to give rise to sooner or later.

Incompatible certainties cannot co-exist indefinitely in a small space with no mediating medium. Crossmaglen always knew what it was. North Down seemed to do so but it's certainly crumbled.

Robert Ramsay was a senior civil servant in the old Stormont system. He was in Brian Faulkner's inner circle when Faulkner was the most competent Minister in the Unionist Government, and was its last Prime Minister. He was with Faulkner when Whitehall abolished elected government in Northern Ireland in 1972. Flying back to Belfast after a meeting in Downing St. at which that event was confirmed, he was overcome with "emotions of sadness and a strange feeling of betrayal". As he wrote:

"It is hard to describe what I mean by a feeling of betrayal. It goes without saying that I recognised that Her Majesty's Government, as the sovereign government, my national government, had every

right to do what it had done. But they had chosen not to support those who were, not just constitutionally but emotionally and politically, their fellow Brits. My sense of Britishness underwent a subtle mutation. The Union Jack would continue to be my flag, but from now on it would be, metaphorically, more a flag of convenience..." (Ramsay, *Ringside Seats: An Insider's View Of The Crisis In Northern Ireland*, Irish Academic Press, 2009, p16).

The Government of the state, whose sovereign authority in the Northern Ireland region of the state was never in doubt, had "experimented" with devolution in a region that was entirely unsuitable for it, and had done so by means which distanced the area politically from the state. The experiment led to a war against the state which was supported by the 40% minority in the region. The war, though waged against the state in the name of Anti-Partitionism, was caused by the functioning of the devolved system. It was fuelled by the antagonisms of devolved politics. The democratic politics of the rest of the state were not operative in the devolved region. John Hume, the leader of 'Constitutional nationalism', declared early in 1972 that it was now "*United Ireland or nothing!*" But that declaration was realistically understood to mean "*Stormont must go!*". A few weeks later Stormont went. The Government of the state became the Government of the Northern Ireland region of it. 'Ulster' had never been so British. The Nationalists were jubilant. The Unionists were despondent. And Ramsay, a sophisticated Ulster civil servant with experience of European politics, was disconcerted. Britishness somehow meant to him political separation from Britain in a devolved regime, whose political life had become alien to the political life of the state.

The *de facto* meaning of "*Ulster is British*" was "*Ulster is a British Protectorate*". When Britain dismissed the internal regime of the Protectorate in the interest of the state Ramsay felt less British.

The memoir continues:

"I was to suffer no parallel loss of *identity* as my European cultural and educational background more than adequately filled the gap. I am an Ulsterman and a European. I simply no longer *need* another layer of identity"

—That is a thoroughly un-British sentiment. A proper Brit does not find it enough to be European. England broke with Europe to set itself up as an absolutely sovereign Empire in the political event known as the religious Reformation. Its

relationship with Europe ever since has been manipulative. From the British viewpoint becoming European means surrendering.

Is it possible that Ramsay is in transition to a condition of loyalty to *Heimat*? Difficult to translate, this German cultural phenomenon describes a strong feeling of loyalty and belonging to a physical locality and its people.

Ramsay goes on:

"My feeling of betrayal that night, vague as it was, would have been extremely acute had I known that on board beside me was a colleague who, behind backs, over three months previously, had secretly urged the British government to take the step they had just taken..."

The colleague was Ken Bloomfield, who later became head of the Civil Service. Thirty-one years after that Downing St. meeting, Ramsay read in the *Sunday Tribune* of 2nd February 2003 that in mid-December 1971 Bloomfield had visited the British Liaison office in Belfast (in Cultra) with the advice that Faulkner would not succeed and that London should find a way of involving Dublin in the North. According to the report of the Liaison man (Howard Smith of the Foreign Office, later head of MI5), Bloomfield thought this—

"might lead in the end to the final question of unification; to reveal this intention fully at the outset would be to produce strong Protestant opposition, but... the proposals would eventually be accepted by Protestants if they were imposed without consultation..."

Ramsay phoned Bloomfield who said he had almost forgotten it, but also that it was true.

Ramsay tells this in a chapter titled 'The Fall Of Stormont: *et la Trahison d'un Clerc*'. (The French bit echoes a book about the failure of the intelligentsia by Jules Benda, *Le Trahison des Clercs*, 1927). And he makes some bitterly extravagant comments. Bloomfield's—

"only tearful defence was that it was such a long time ago he had almost forgotten about it; and that at the time he had thought he was acting for the best (Shades of the classic 'Eichmann defence'... but unlike him, Bloomfield could scarcely plead that he had only been obeying orders; *au contraire*)..."

He suggests that Bloomfield was Captain O'Neill's man; that he had always resented Faulkner and had "*taken an opportunity to bring him down*". And that it was a shrewd career move which got

Bloomfield made head of the Civil Service a few years later. He asks: "*What would become of our public service if every administrator took it into his head that he had the right to behave in such a way?*" Bloomfield had—

"usurped the authority of his political masters, and promoted a counter-policy to that of his government. That was administrative *hubris* on a grand scale..." (p107).

Was it? *Hubris* brings disaster. Bloomfield's action in giving a realistic opinion about Northern Ireland to the sovereign authority in the state brought him promotion. And the abolition of Stormont brought a feeling of positive relief to about half the population.

At a previous meeting in Downing Street, the real Prime Minister (Edward Heath) had assured Faulkner, Prime Minister of the Northern Ireland facade, that Whitehall would see the thing through with him—"that direct rule would not be introduced". But the duplicitous Heath went on to use Bloody Sunday as a "*public rationale for the imposition of direct rule*". In fact Heath proposed to remove control of security from Stormont. Faulkner would not accept that diminution of power, so Direct Rule resulted. But Ramsay thinks Whitehall would have abolished Stormont, even if Faulkner had agreed to relinquish control of security.

The Foreign Office man, Smith, was "*a cold fish*", who "*could suddenly become the life and soul of the party*" for a political purpose. "*I had always privately thought that he bore more than a passing resemblance the late unlamented Adolf*" (p85).

Ulster was British, but with diabolical duplicity Britain imposed British rule on it as a war measure, thereby diminishing its Britishness!

Of course the responsibility for Bloody Sunday lay directly with Whitehall. Stormont did not control the Army. The probability is that Bloody Sunday was an "*administrative massacre*" to test the will of the Nationalist community. As Britain is a well-conducted democracy, proof of that is not to be expected. When the massacre did not cow the Nationalist will, but strengthened it, Stormont was sacrificed to alleviate the situation. Stormont had made "*the supreme sacrifice*" in 1921 by agreeing to exist in semi-detachment from Britain, and the sacrifice made of it in 1972 was welcomed by those who had suffered from it.

Self-sacrifice is not a sensible practice in affairs of state. Ulster Unionism

sacrificed the vital part of its Britishness in 1921 to facilitate Imperial handling of the nationalist Irish, who against all reasonable expectations from precedent were taking their democratic decisions in earnest. The Ulster Unionists ceased to be a participant in British politics by agreeing to be an instrument of British policy against the Irish.

Ramsay's memoir ends with resigned acceptance of the probability of Irish unity, with Ulster Unionism declining into Ulster-Scot ethnicity.

Jeffrey Dudgeon MBE, who once aspired to overcome Ulster Unionism by bringing the Six Counties within the politics of Britain—or at least went along with people who were trying to do that—has also gone ethnic. At the same time he worries about the loss of Ulster Protestants/Unionists to nationalist Ireland—a small-scale but steady loss ever since the political lines were drawn between Irish nationalism and Ulster Unionism by the first Home Rule Bill in 1886. The loss has never been on a scale that could tilt the balance between Nationalists and Unionists in the North, but Dudgeon MBE sees menace in the fact that Nationalism in Ireland has never been without a component of Protestants, both Northern and Southern, while Ulster Unionism had no component of Catholics (and in fact did not want one).

An obvious explanation of this is that ethnicism is narrowing in politics, while nationalism is expansive. Irish nationalism sought to embrace all the ethnic strains on the island while the purpose of Ulster Unionism has been to reject that embrace.

Forty years ago an Ulster Catholic, Louis Boyle, tried to demonstrate that Catholics could be Unionist too. What he demonstrated was that Unionism wouldn't allow it. Ulster Unionism was Protestant and it did not want the matter confused by admitting Catholics who wanted to make it something else.

One can find flourishes by nationalist orators which can be presented as assertions of ethnicist fundamentalism, but the moving spirit of the nationalist movement has always been multi-ethnic. It became so in its origins in the Confederation of Kilkenny in the 1640s and in the Jacobite movement forty years later. Norman English and Irish were fused in Jacobitism. And many Cromwellian settlers who lost out in the turn of events in England became Irish. When the Home Rule Party under John Redmond's leadership made itself a mirror image of the Ulster Unionist Party

by placing a Catholic secret society, the AOH, at the heart of its organisation, there was a strong response against it which instantly lost Redmond a tenth of his MPs and set the party on the slippery slope. (It does not suit the purposes of the revisionist historians, who idolise Redmond for a political object, to record this indisputable fact.)

In his protest published last month Dudgeon wrote:

"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 People's Democracy adherents adopted the position—was hugely significant... 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 Two Nations view, as stated by BICO, carried no implication of Ulster separatism. When Ulster federalism, or separatism, asserted itself it was opposed by BICO.

The practical meaning of the description of the Ulster Protestant community as a nation was that it was fundamentalist in its rejection of Irish nationalism. It was hoped that the Dublin Establishment would accept this fact and recognise the distinct nationality of Protestant Ulster as a preliminary to establishing a new relationship with it. When that did not happen, BICO proposed the political integration of the 6 Counties into the British political system. Britain was a multi-national state with a party organisation which transcended nationality. The exclusion of the 6 Counties from this was a major cause of the pretty well absolute political separation of Protestants and Catholics. Ulster Unionism rejected that proposal, and Dudgeon MBE, having gone along with it for a while, was active in the sectarian disruption of it.

To describe this as Ulster Protestants "*choosing to remain British*" is mind-boggling. By following this course of action Ulster Unionism has become systematically less British every year. British politics is not a combination of ethnic components. People of all ethnic descriptions have been flooding into Britain during the last forty years and have been absorbed into the durable party-political structure of the British state, from which Northern Ireland is excluded, and which Ulster Unionism does not want to be part of.

Dudgeon quotes Wolfe tone about "*the common name of Irishman*" and comments: "*if the Ulster Protestants are not part of the Irish nation, Republicanism for them has to be sectarian and is in fact Hibernianism, recognisable or not*".

When Tone wrote, Official Ireland was a Protestant State. His project was to consolidate the State based on the Williamite conquest by extending its hegemonic influence over the Catholic majority. It was scarcely imaginable then (except to Mrs. M'Tier observing the wide horizons of the powerless Catholics in Chapel Lane, Belfast), that the powerful Protestant Ascendancy should dissolve, the Empire decline, and the natives come into their own again. If those whom Wolfe Tone addressed had heeded him, it is very unlikely that Ireland would today be anything like it is.

But Tone was not heeded. The Ascendancy preferred monopoly power to hegemonic influence. It pressed the situation to catastrophe. England abolished it and the Protestant ruling class was eroded by the growth of Catholic democracy under the Union. If Catholic conduct is to be described as sectarian, it was a sectarianism imposed by the Protestant state and the Protestant ruling class. And, if Protestants were led by a sense of human affinity to align themselves with the populace during the 19th century—which had the imposed Famine at its centre—that had nothing to do with anything Tone said in a bygone era.

The Protestant State in Ireland in the 18th century, and the Protestant ruling class under the British State in the 19th, frittered away their power because they acted in an attitude of frozen sectarianism which they took to be civilised because it was based on military conquest and continuing military dominance. In their era of dominance they could not bring themselves to do what was necessary to exercise hegemonic influence over the Irish, and in their decline they rejected pleas from the national movement that they should take part in it. They could not take part in it because it was Catholic. But what had made it assertively Catholic except the way Protestant power had governed it for two centuries?

All Protestants did not persist in that attitude to the bitter end, supporting military action against the Irish State until it eventually got established, and then retreating into a privileged cocoon within it. And in Dudgeon's eyes they were lost. And in a sense they *were* lost. They were

not representative of the elite that produced them. And they were disowned by that elite when they began to play a part in the national democracy.

Dudgeon comments on this:

"The problem always was that only a very few could afford to be simply Protestants and those who could showed a remarkable propensity to convert to Roman Catholicism, for whatever reason, or had a minority radical and Anglophobic outlook like F.J. Bigger, Bulmer Hobson, Casement and Douglas Hyde..."

To act outside the sectarian consensus of your own community is certainly radical. But is it only a mind diseased by Anglophobia that could see Ireland as having been governed extraordinarily badly by Britain after it conceived the passion of Imperial Protestantism in its politically opportunistic Reformation?

That Protestants who stepped out of line politically and joined the National movement tended to become Catholics was something we didn't know. We still don't. Of those listed by Dudgeon, only Casement did. But that was not for the purpose of making a career in nationalist politics as it was done on the eve of execution.

It was certainly possible for Protestants to play a part in nationalist public life and "*to be simply Protestant*". Many of them did so. But Dudgeon comes close to making Unionism part of Protestantism. And, if Protestantism is held to include Unionism, then we must admit that Protestants cannot be nationalist. But these are strange notions to be discussing with a representative of Liberal Unionism who aspired to be an Irish Senator. It is Liberal Unionism at the end of its tether.

Having retreated into ethnicism as a Unionist, Dudgeon is desperate to find that nationalist Ireland is ethnicist too. Unfortunately for Unionism, it isn't.

If it was conceded that the War of Independence was an ethnic conflict between Catholics and Protestants, and that Catholics in Dunmanway killed a number of Protestants in a fit of ethnic passion, it seems that that would satisfy Dudgeon. It would put Unionism and Nationalism on a par.

The *Irish Political Review* has given a lot of space to discussion of the Dunmanway killings but nobody has come up with anything that could be called evidence. We ourselves drew attention to the Inquest evidence that in one case the killer condemned the victim as a Free Stater, but all who think they know who the killers were ignore that evidence, which points to

anti-Treaty Republicans. Perhaps it is rightly ignored as it doesn't make political sense in its time and place, and it is hardly credible that the Free Staters should have failed to throw it at the Republicans a couple of months later when Whitehall made them start the 'Civil War'.

The killings might have been the work of unknown people with unknown lists, as John Borgonovo argues—in fact they almost certainly were, but that makes us no wiser until the unknown becomes known. They might have been the parting short of a British special unit, which would account for them being entirely unknown. They might have been the work of a 'maverick' IRA man, who was somehow able to remain unknown in an area where pretty well everything else was known. They might have been the work of a collaboration between all Republican tendencies, in which all were sworn to secrecy for evermore, which would account for why no accusations were made in the Civil War, but that would be something uncharacteristic and unprecedented in Irish nationalist affairs: in which things have a habit of coming out. The British might have negligently left behind a list of their spies when withdrawing from the region, and somebody might once have seen it, but until it is presented that cannot be taken account of.

Note

Irish Political Review is publishing another letter on the Dunmanway issue below. It does not provide any evidence and is loosely written. It is the last letter we will publish on the matter unless somebody discovers something that can be called evidence.

Dunmanway: A Reply To Jeffrey Dudgeon

Mr. Jeffrey Dudgeon's response to Michael O'Donoghue's Bureau of Military History statement merits comment. It is clear that he is one of the few people who understand the significance of this new information. However, I cannot decide whether his is a rushed initial reaction, or an ill-considered attempt to question the value of O'Donoghue's evidence.

If it is the second, I would not be able to decide whether I should laugh, cry, or be enraged at his pathetic distortion of my views published in *Protestant Cork Decline 1911-1926 Murders, Mistakes, Myths and Misinformation*. Any reasonable person would know that I view the

debate about Peter Hart's work as sterile and pointless as he deliberately distorted his evidence to support his theory about the Dunmanway murders. In my opinion Mr. Dudgeon's suggestion that I want discussion about the Dunmanway murders to end without getting to the truth is simply ignorant. As life is too short for anger I choose to laugh.

However, just in case Mr. Dudgeon's letter is in fact a rushed reaction I may offer him the following advice and observations

1. Read all of Michael O Donoghue's Statement from his arrival in Bandon to his capture by Free State forces in December 1922. Pay particular attention to his return to West Cork in May 1922 and his journey back to Donegal on 12th June.

2. Mr. Dudgeon might like to explain why he thinks O'Donoghue's evidence removes the validity of Dr. John Regan's Macroom Intelligence Officer theory and Jack Lane's Agent Provocateurs theory [Jack will no doubt violently disagree] but leaves Peter Hart's claim that 'In the end, however, the fact of the victims' religion is inescapable. These men were shot because they were Protestant' intact.

3. In relation to systematic ethnic cleansing in Northern Ireland read LAWLOR, P. (2009), *The burnings 1920, Cork, Mercier*. The book is meticulously researched and a detailed analysis of what happened in Banbridge, Dromore and Lisburn. House of Commons evidence from the time states that Catholic casualties were double those of Protestants. The source is Winston Churchill.

4. Mr. Dudgeon asks

"But why is the accusation of sectarianism so strenuously resisted by O'Donoghue, the *Irish Political Review* and most Irish nationalist writers in relation to these and other events? It would be remarkable if an ethnic or national war like that in Ireland over the last century did not involve a high degree of sectarianism."

I suggest O'Donoghue is attempting to correct the statements by nationalists in 1922 that there was a link to what was happening in Belfast. No leading participant in the West Cork IRA would deny that there was an element of sectarianism in the struggle. Neither, as far as I have read, do any of the 'nationalist' commentators. They are not stupid. What is not accepted is that there was neither a high degree of sectarianism nor an effort to exterminate and drive away Protestants by reason of their religion alone. Incidentally, most people in Cork at the time could tell the difference between someone's religion and their politics: the distinction was a fine but real one.

5. O'Donoghue claims that "These people were done to death as a savage, wholesale, murderous reprisal for the murder of Mick O'Neill". By calling them murders O'Donoghue understands that the members of the Bandon IRA who most likely committed them were utterly wrong. As a result they join the men who attached nine Anti-treaty prisoners to a mine at Ballyseedy in 1923, the men who shot 13 civilians in Derry in 1972 and the men who detonated a bomb at the Cenotaph in Enniskillen in 1987 in being bereft of any moral compass. If there was any justification for these events- if they were not murder- then the men who carried them out would have admitted them. They did not do so because they would have been tried by the Irish Government as murderers. That they did not have the courage to stand over their actions tells any reasonable person all they need to know.

If Mr. Dudgeon's response was simply rushed then he deserves forbearance.

If it is an attempt to cling to Hart's theory that these were random sectarian murders in the face O'Donoghue's blunt admission of IRA guilt and the reason for the victims targeting then in my opinion Mr. Dudgeon would be very foolish indeed. Even if it is shown that the Bandon IRA were entirely wrong in their suspicions- and there is enough evidence to suggest they were in fact wrong in some cases- it does not change the fact that these men were targeted.

Given what I regard as his misrepresentation of my work I fear this may be the case.

In the light of what I have said it is possible that Mr. Dudgeon might decide to change his views about what happened in Dunmanway and leave his increasingly difficult defence of Peter Hart behind.

May I apologise if the tone of this response may appear snide, but it is a little difficult not to be when I suspect that Mr. Dudgeon is not really engaging with the evidence. Beyond this I do not wish to comment.

Finally, may I note that among the media only the *West Cork News* and the *Irish Political Review* appear to have understood the significance of the O' Donoghue statement and they deserve credit for this? ©

Barry Keane

11 November 2012 11 am

Barry Keane is a Fine Gael Area Representative in Cork City and a Geography and History teacher. His great-grandfather was a Fenian. The views expressed here are his own. [Note supplied by Barry Keane.]

A PRAYER FOR GAZA

Give them F16 fighter-bombers, drones.
Give them warships, artillery and tanks
then they will face Israel with equal rank.
Give the kids rifles then they won't need
stones.

Give them Goebbels then they'll learn
how to lie.

Give them US support as a solution
then they can ignore UN resolutions
and world opposition to their tricks defy.
Give them friends like remorseful

Germany
who has a history of killing Jews
and now kills Muslims via simony.
Or that UK even-handedness ruse
between this Third World Strip and
hegemony.

Above all make petro-dollars their muse.

Wilson John Haire

17th November, 2012

CAUGHT IN THE ACT

Who was that lady I saw you with last
night,

I ask as your president.

That was no lady that was someone's wife,
it should be self-evident.

I relieve you of your post on the
grounds

of immorality,
though your CIA job being more one of
amorality
is the reality.

Basically you disagree with me on
withdrawal

from Afghanistan.

But I do agree about that young girl shot
by the

Pakistan Taliban,
that she be given the Nobel peace Prize,
like you have,
and Henry Kissinger.

How many of her sisters have died in our
drone attacks

when caught
in the terrorist lair.

I don't have the figures on me right now
for we never

go there.

You shall confess through the media
that you
did wrong.

I sang with that lady you saw me with
last night,

we sang
my swansong.

Wilson John Haire

11th November, 2012

Debt Crisis: *unemployment and industrial policy*

George Soros announced in June that Germany must save or leave the euro, and had three months to do it. Three months later, in September, he found that Germany had decided to save it, through the initiative for a banking and monetary union, with a common regulator. The euro crisis is effectively over, and only the fine details of that solution now need working out.

Apart from the rules for monetary and budgetary controls, the most important aspects of the new Eurozone architecture from the 'Social Europe' perspective will be progress with growth/stimulus and social measures to be 'bolted on' to the monetary union agreement. In other words, the 'social compact' sought by European Trade Unions.

MONETARY AND BANKING UNION

One of the regular complaints about the moves towards monetary union is the alleged refusal of Germany to countenance sharing or mutualisation of debt—i.e. a simple takeover of local bank debts by the European Central Bank or monetary structures. But this is untrue. As this journal pointed out last February, soon after the agreement on the Fiscal Compact in December 2011, German Finance Minister Wolfgang Schäuble stated that all such issues could be "on the table" once the disciplines of monetary union were in place. We also reported on Merkel's press conference following the abortive mini-summit with the UK's George Osborne at the start of June 2012 where, as reported by the *International Herald Tribune* (8th June 2012):

"Merkel clarified the other "measures" she envisaged in a "step by step" move to full "fiscal and political union"... implying, down the road—once the hard work of fiscal discipline and structural reform was well under way—a willingness to collectivize some debt and even to provide more German money to the poorer countries of Europe's periphery ... The package of measures the Union is working on for its summit meeting at the end of June are important but incremental, having mostly to do with more unified regulation of Europe's banks and a European wide system of bank deposit guarantees... The Germans are also working on a package of 'growth measures'—structural reforms to promote economic activity but without incurring new debt—to go along with the fiscal discipline embodied in the fiscal treaty... And Berlin supports the Commission and

French idea of shifting some European Union funds towards 'targeted investments' in key countries to produce growth, as well as pumping up the European Investment Bank and exploring 'project bonds' for private investment to create jobs..." *emphasis added*—PO'C).

Recently the *Irish Times* headed a report on a speech by Bundesbank President Jens Weidmann *Bailout urged to tackle bank debt*. The headline, which implied that Germany was insisting that states such as Ireland would need to seek another "bail-out" deal to fund the covering of its bank debts, is again at odds with what Weidmann actually said and which the report actually quotes:

"In his speech the Bundesbank President recalled how, initially, Europe was unequipped to deal with systemic dangers at that time, forcing banking risk to become state risk... Once agreed this {monetary and banking} union would open the door to financial solidarity, he said, but also to Brussels intervention in national budgets that breached agreed rules. This would reduce the danger {that} problems in {one country's} budget are passed on to taxpayers elsewhere. It would do the common currency a disservice if all a banking union did was to introduce joint liability by the back door and give states more opportunities to run up debt" (*Irish Times*, 20th November, *emphasis added*—PO'C).

So, the German leadership has repeatedly stated loud and clear that debt mutualisation will follow monetary/banking union, in a context of budgetary supervision by Brussels, and that it is also in favour of growth and investment stimulus programmes at European level.

It makes sense for the Irish State to bid for the best deal it can get within this framework and to keep pushing on the bank debt issue. But it did itself no favours by its clamour since June that gave the Irish public the impression that there could be a "deal" on bank debt separate from sovereign debt, and without reference to the budgetary and other controls which would be involved. It should embrace the comprehensive package of monetary union and seek its best options within that.

Another detail of the solution about which there is conflict is exactly which banks should be covered under the new common banking regulator. For Mc Williams, who is making a lucrative career

for himself as a professional Irish whinger, the notion that any of the 6,000 banks across Europe be excluded from its largesse is ludicrous, and a further example of German tight-fistedness. To be fair to McWilliams, this is understandable from an Irish perspective, where every bank globalised itself and engaged in global borrowing (apart from the Credit Unions, which have come through the crisis unscathed). But for Germans—and indeed many other euro states—there is a distinct line to be drawn between banks involved solely as business or social/savings banks on the domestic market and global lending/borrowing institutions. They are reluctant to see purely domestic business and savings banks being drawn into liability for international banking debts. The German position—as repeated by Weidmann—is for national state responsibility to remain in place "for banks without cross-border risks" with the Europe-wide regulator responsible for banks trading across borders only.

Weidmann—as quoted by the *Irish Times*—also favours the proposal from the German Social Democrats for a bank-financed rescue fund for banks in trouble, to do away with the need for state recapitalisation: "This could cover in large part the cost of a wind-up or restructuring", he said. "The taxpayers would only be drawn on if the fund risks being overwhelmed."

FISCAL UNION

Fiscal union is sometimes caricatured as the imposition of a single tax regime across the participating states. There is no reason that this should be the case and neither is there any evidence that this is what Germany, France or other 'strong' euro states are looking for—it is more about an agreed framework and "common assessment basis". The assumption by many Irish commentators that the Irish Corporation Tax rate must remain sacrosanct and that a Financial Transaction Tax (FTT) would injure Ireland's interests because of the special position of the IFSC [Irish Financial Services Centre] has been used as a lever to align Irish interests with those of Britain (i.e. the City of London). This is mistaken, and even the *Irish Times* has seen fit to repeatedly warn against the excessive influence of the IFSC lobby over Irish policy. The ICTU [Irish Congress of Trade Unions] for its part has firmly supported the proposals for FTT.

But one thing is clear, and that is that Germany regards fiscal union as a corollary of monetary union and essential to it

working. Weidmann in his speech expressed his frustration at the political deadlock on this: *"The crisis has expanded common liability considerably, distancing itself from the Maastricht framework... Simultaneously, there is little readiness to give up core competencies and the currency union is coming no closer to fiscal union."*

Merkel, however, is determined to aim precisely in such a direction, and made it clear at the mini-summit with Osborne that she saw the Fiscal Compact as only one piece of the jigsaw of monetary/political union. Buoyed by the success of the Fiscal Compact process, Germany now seems prepared to resolve other issues through the EU-26 grouping, by-passing the UK veto, and giving the Eurozone grouping even more feet outside the moribund EU structures. A test case will be the EU budget negotiations which are underway this month.

There can be no doubt that Merkel is determined to face the German electorate next September as the *"Saviour of Europe"*. Let us hope she does, and that her position wins.

UNEMPLOYMENT

David Begg, General Secretary of the ICTU, said in a statement on 21st November: *"We are five years into self-defeating austerity that has cost us 360,000 jobs so far"* (www.ictu.ie). One of the key arguments of David McWilliams, repeated *ad nauseum* in his columns in the *Irish Independent*, *Sunday Business Post* and elsewhere (mostly available at www.davidmcwilliams.ie), and assumed to be correct by very large numbers of people, is that *"austerity"* has led to large-scale and increasing levels of unemployment, and that the answer is to be found in default or write-off on public, private and every other type of debt, the burning of bond holders and possibly leaving the euro. In other words, he claims that *"rising unemployment"* proves that *"austerity is not working"* and that radical *monetary* policy action of the type advocated is the answer to unemployment. Is he right?

What an examination of the Irish unemployment figures (see box opposite page) in fact shows us is that:

1. Unemployment returned on a large scale as a direct result of the crash of construction and property employment in 2008-9. This was accompanied by a contraction in employment in the retail trades. All of this was well before the first Troika programme of November 2010, or even the first FF-Green *"austerity"* budget of 2008, took effect.
2. The numbers unemployed remained

static from 2009 to 2011 and has actually fallen in 2012, i.e. during the high point of the *"austerity"* programme. In other words, contrary to what McWilliams bases his whole argument on, high unemployment is not a *consequence* of what he calls *"austerity"* policies, but precedes them, has stabilised and even fallen since.

3. The two biggest categories among the unemployed are 1.) people from the construction and retail trades who lost their jobs in the crash and have not found re-employment (50%) and 2.) very long term unemployed who were unemployed even during the boom (25%).
4. Nearly 20% of all people on the Live Register are actually engaged in part-time or casual employment.
5. Not on the Live Register or in full-time jobs are 73,447 people on the greatly expanded—and very popular—labour market *"activation"* programmes, such as Community Employment, JobsBridge etc., many of whom are successfully in transition to full time jobs or self employment, often in new sectors.
6. Approximately 200,000 people—mostly from the former construction/property/retail trades need to be the target of specific employment/stimulus measures.
7. Tackling unemployment is within our means—once it is recognised that unemployment is not a factor of **monetary** policy about which little can be done, but of **industrial** policy.

INDUSTRIAL POLICY

The ICTU, in its pre-budget document *Shifting to Growth and Jobs* (www.ictu.ie), argues for a Government capital investment programme and the boosting of domestic consumption to solve the employment crisis. It has, however, little to say about industrial policy. But, as shown above, while creating economic activity beneficial to the construction and retail trades can help meet the needs of the main group of unemployed people, industrial policy is what holds the key to current and future growth and wellbeing.

Over the last year there have been good signs of a renewed growth in key sectors, notably manufacturing, traded services and agrifood business. The agrifood industry is a key to the future. According to the business lobby 'Food and Drink Industry Ireland' (FDII), the right Government policies would ensure the sector will deliver exports of €12 billion within the next eight years. One in eight jobs in Ireland—a total of 230,000—are currently linked to the sector, which spends almost €8 billion (or 76% of

its turnover) on goods and services in the domestic economy each year. The FDII spokesman concluded:

"... an increased focus on food will drive growth in the wider economy as well as in the sector itself. If we increase exports to €12 billion, the sector will potentially deliver in the region of 30,000 jobs across the whole economy due to the proportionate increase in spend by the sector" (*Irish Times*, 30th July 2012)n

Another area of industrial policy—which the ICTU report also highlights—is the great potential which an ambitious apprenticeship training programme could produce. Recently the Restaurants Association of Ireland (RAI) announced that, while the number of restaurants in rural towns had fallen by 20-25% in the recession, the trade had actually created 10,000 new jobs. But to fill skilled positions—such as the shortfall of 400 chefs—the industry had had to look abroad due to the lack of skilled personnel at home. In a move unusual for an Irish industrial grouping it called for a workplace-based apprenticeship training programme to be introduced to create 1,000 apprenticeship positions in the industry (www.rai.ie/news).

The European Economic and Social Committee (EESC)—the EU level Social Partnership body—unanimously adopted a position at its meeting in mid-November which recognised that, while *"employment policy cannot compensate for mismanagement of macroeconomic policy, it can make a real contribution to boosting competitiveness in knowledge-based societies, by strengthening innovation capacity, and achieving a better balance between demand for, and supply of, skills"*. It further called for the State to act as employer of last resort by greatly expanding the *"intermediate labour market"* (i.e. activation programmes) for long-term unemployed people, as well as growth and public investment programmes at state and EU levels to create employment.

CONCLUSION

If the diagnosis is wrong, then so too must be the cure. McWilliams blames large scale unemployment on the so-called *"austerity"* programmes, i.e. he claims that its source is monetary policy and that therefore a radically different monetary policy is its cure. But the current high rate of unemployment is not a consequence of the fiscal consolidation measures, but rather of the crash that preceded it. Indeed, unemployment since the Troika programme has been declining, and industrial—not monetary—policy is already demonstrably reducing it further. The answer is more Industrial Policy.

Philip O'Connor

IRISH UNEMPLOYMENT— WHAT THE FIGURES SAY

The official figures for the numbers claiming unemployment benefits and assistance from 2007 to 2011 are as follows (CSO, *Live Register October 2012*, www.cso.ie):

Dec. 2007	—	4.8%
Dec. 2008	—	8.9%
Dec. 2009	—	12.8%
Dec. 2010	—	14.4%
Dec. 2011	—	14.5%

On the face of it, McWilliams would seem to have a point with his claims that "*austerity is causing rising unemployment*".

But the large rise in the unemployment rate from 4.8% to 13% occurred in 2008-2010, i.e. before the "*austerity*" programme agreed with the Troika in November 2010 was even begun to be implemented. It also transpires that, due to the decline in the size of the overall labour force (= those in work plus those registered as unemployed), the *number* unemployed in December 2011 (14.5%)—about 430,000—is no higher than the *number* unemployed two years earlier, in December 2009 (12.8%)—430,000. So, the actual numbers unemployed stopped increasing even before the start of the first "*austerity*" programme of 2009, and remained static to the end of 2011. In other words, the great leap in the numbers of unemployed was a result not of austerity measures, but of the crash in the construction and retail industries, and this number has not increased since.

It also emerges from the latest CSO figures that the numbers unemployed has actually *fallen* in the last year, from 430,432 in October 2011 to 420,172 in October 2012. When a person becomes unemployed, they draw Jobseeker's Benefit for twelve months at a fixed rate of €188 plus allowances for dependents and entitlement to secondary benefits (e.g. rent allowance, mortgage interest allowance etc.). They then move to means-tested Jobseeker's Assistance of the same rate though adjusted downwards on the basis of other means. This can, theoretically, then be paid in perpetuity. What the *Live Register* figures show is a substantial drop in short-term payments (-17%) and a small increase in long-term payments (+1.4%). Of the 420,172 people on the Live Register, there are now 232,055 on short term benefit, a drop of 7.4% over 2011. What these figures mean is that the numbers of people becoming unemployed has fallen sharply and that of those who became unemployed in the last two years, only a small proportion became long term unemployed (i.e. remained unemployed for over a year). The vast majority of those unemployed (73%) have been unemployed for a year or more. In other words, most people unemployed have been unemployed since the crash and have not become so since (the present writer excepted), or those becoming unemployed are being cancelled out statistically by those securing new employment.

There is, of course, an overall fall in the labour force. From less than 1 million at the end of the 1980s, the boom generated by the Haughey Government's *Programme for Nat-*

ional Recovery (agreed with employers and Unions) and ancillary initiatives saw an unprecedented growth of this figure—in the order of 110%—to nearly 2.2 million at the height of the boom (2006). The bulk of the increase came from women entering the workforce in the 1990s, the subsequent influx of migrant workers, particularly from Eastern Europe (though also from the UK and elsewhere), and the absorption—from 2001—of most previously long-term unemployed people. But, since the crash of late 2008, according to the CSO, this labour force has declined by 360,000. Since then there has also been considerable outward migration, reaching a peak of 87,000 in 2011. Of this, according to Mc Williams himself (*Sunday Business Post* of 1st October), 50% were short-term immigrant workers moving to other labour markets. Also, 36,000 of all emigrants were 25 years old or younger. Many of those emigrating were not unemployed. In 2011, the number of Irish nationals who emigrated was just about double the number who had been emigrating anyway even at the height of the boom.

It is often forgotten that "*full employment*" (2.5% in 2005) was a feature of the property bubble years. In 1998 unemployment still stood at nearly 9%, of which half were long-term unemployed. Nearly 120,000 people remained long-term unemployed throughout the peak years of the boom, and tended to be concentrated in particular areas. This was about 0.8% of the workforce. This shows both that most long-term unemployed people who want to—and were able to—get back to work when it was available did so, but also that a sizeable group could remain unemployed even as the economy was crying out for labour of all kinds. The numbers of long-term unemployed now, at the height of the crisis, is 188,117, which is just 50,000 above the figure that persisted throughout the boom years.

It should be noted that of the 420,000 people on the Live Register, 85,663 (=20.4%) are not actually unemployed, but have part-time or casual employment. In addition, there is considerable turnover on the live register with people leaving it at a rate of 35,000 every month and new people signing on. This indicates a substantial level of job creation, with simultaneous job losses and the effects of people emigrating. But mainly it shows that many people becoming unemployed after 2009 remained unemployed for relatively short periods. It should also be remembered that 10,000 people are leaving the public services every year to voluntary retirement or voluntary redundancy under the terms of Croke Park, thus contributing to the decline in the numbers working.

The CSO figures also show that specific professional categories predominate among the unemployed: 23.2% 'craft and related', 17% 'machine operatives' and 13% 'sales'. As the numbers employed in non-construction related manufacturing have contracted only marginally since the crash, it can be taken that the first two groups are overwhelmingly people from the collapsed construction/property industry who have not been able to transfer to other sectors.

The people classified as 'sales' represents the shrinking of the retail trade following the crash (and the ending of the excessive retail consumption that characterised the boom).

Contrary to popular belief, the live register is not dominated by young people, though this should be considered against the proportion of young people among those emigrating. Nevertheless, the total proportion of those on the Live Register under 25 is just 16.6%, and falling (this 2012 figure represents a drop of 2% over 2011). Nevertheless, this represents 29% of 20-24 year olds on the labour market.

Finally, not all people who left the Live Register secured jobs on the open labour market. Places on Government-sponsored employment schemes ("*intermediate labour market*") have increased threefold since the crash, to a total of 73,447 formerly long term unemployed people. These are engaged as follows:

Back to Work Enterprise Scheme (self-employment)	21,974
Community Employment	21,243
Back to Work Allowance	12,142
FÁS training	8,346
JobBridge placements	4,892
Tús C&V sector job placement	4,432
Jobs Initiative	190

Some on the left decry these initiatives (apart from Community Employment and Jobs Initiative) as "*workfare*", or pointless activity designed to terrorise the unemployed or to "*massage*" the unemployment figures. Actual experience would cast doubt on this. According to the Minister for Social Protection, Joan Burton, over 50% of those finishing JobsBridge (where a full-time placement is accompanied by a Benefit-equivalent payment) moved to full-time work and 66% of those who left the scheme early did so to take up full time jobs (www.joanburton.ie/speeches/4921). In addition, as the current writer knows, there is huge demand for places under all of these schemes and a consequent backlog of people trying to avail of them. Mostly these schemes involve a ring-fenced Benefit-equivalent payment, plus some, and in some cases for a work placement of just 20 hours per week, with the right to secure other earnings in the other 20 hours (CE and Tús).

There are some obvious conclusions from all of this. First and foremost, theories that claim that "*austerity*" has caused mass and rising unemployment are demonstrably wrong. Large-scale unemployment was caused by the crash in the property market, with resultant job losses in the construction, conveyance and retail trades, and with unemployment remaining static since, or actually falling—under the so-called "*austerity*" allegedly imposed by the Troika programme. The important issue is then to establish where the thousands of new jobs people are taking up monthly come from. In the article opposite we establish that this is from growth areas being "*stimulated*" by State industrial policy, and that it is more of this that we need rather than the Armageddon monetary "solutions" being proposed by some.

Philip O'Connor

Shorts

from
the Long Fellow

THE PUBLIC FINANCES

The inauguration of the Euro facilitated the free movement of finance capital and resulted—through the banking system—in a massive stimulus to the economy from 2001 to 2007. The British Banks, such as Ulster Bank and Bank of Scotland, attempted to buy market share by dispensing cheap credit and the Irish banks responded. At the time financial journalists in this country welcomed this as a long overdue shake up of the Irish market. The expansion of credit caused a property bubble which in turn led to a consumption boom. People felt that they were wealthy because of the market value of their property. This encouraged them to spend at levels that were unsustainable.

The inflated property values and inflated salaries dramatically increased tax revenue. In retrospect the massive increase in tax revenue should have been seen as a windfall gain. Some of the money was put aside in the form of the National Pension Reserve Fund, but the Government with the active encouragement of the Opposition used most of the windfall to reduce the general level of taxation. When the crisis struck the public finances were transformed into a severe annual deficit amounting to 20 billion euro. The crisis in the public finances was exacerbated by the banking crisis. But even if there were no banking crisis there would have been a crisis in the public finances.

CONSUMPTION BOOM

The Banks do not exist in isolation from the rest of society. Credit is not created out of thin air. Our banks accessed funds from abroad (German savers) and dispensed them to borrowers in this country. The funds from abroad were not speculative. The holders of Senior Bonds received a low rate of interest and their loans had the same legal status as deposit holders.

As well as generating tax revenue for the State, these foreign funds gave a massive stimulus to the Irish economy. Was it all wasted? Perhaps some of it was. But in what sense can it be said that an increase in consumption is a waste? There is an old joke about an Irishman who was left penniless only a few years after

winning the Pools. When asked where the money went he replied that he spent most of it on women, drink and horses . . . and the rest was squandered. Years after the event it might seem that the consumption was a waste, but at the time it was very enjoyable.

But it wasn't all about consumption: during the much maligned Celtic Tiger era we achieved full employment. Many people from a very modest background could aspire and obtain jobs that their parents could only dream of acquiring. The infrastructure of the country improved dramatically, although sadly the metro north project was postponed.

GAMBLING DEBTS

The economic crisis consists in the fact that loans that the society received largely from abroad (through banking intermediaries) could not be repaid. The productive income generated from such funds was less than their initial value. That is what "*living beyond our means*" means.

The populists declare indignantly that the tax payer should not pay for the gambling debts of the banks. But if the tax payer is not to pay, who should? The Senior Bondholders did not gamble. Indeed they thought they were avoiding risk by buying the Senior Bonds of banks as distinct from shares.

The gamblers (i.e. the property developers) are in many instances not able to pay: they are bankrupt. However, the people who sold the land to the developers made massive profits. No serious attempt has been made to levy taxes on this group. Of course, there are constitutional impediments to imposing retrospective taxation, but constitutional impediments were overcome by referendum in the relatively trivial matter of judges' pay.

It is said that bankers and then the EU bounced Brian Lenihan into a decision on underwriting the banks' liabilities. But if Lenihan had more time to consider the matter, would he have acted differently? The evidence suggests otherwise. Unguaranteed Senior debt was repaid under both the Fianna Fáil led Government *and* the Fine Gael/Labour Coalition.

The judgement was that the consequences (in terms of the stability of the financial system and the wider economy) of not paying would have been worse than that of paying. At present, the Government is attempting to obtain concessions from Europe on the debt, arguing that the payment policy pursued by the current and previous Irish Government was also in the interests of the Euro zone economies.

THE COST OF THE BANKING CRISIS

The economist Pat McArdle had an interesting article on who has borne the cost of the banking crisis (*Irish Independent*, 1.11.12). He estimates that the total cost of the banking crisis is about 135 billion. The taxpayer will bear less than half of this.

Here is the breakdown of the costs in Euros:

- a) Shareholders in British banks and British Taxpayer: 42bn
- b) Shareholders in Irish banks and Irish Taxpayer: 93bn

The British banks lost disproportionately more (in terms of loans given) because they were the most aggressive in seeking market share.

It is not easy to calculate the breakdown of the 42 billion British loss between shareholders and British taxpayer because the distressed loans from Irish operations were consolidated with distressed British loans. However, since the British banks had a greater capacity to absorb losses, it is likely that most of the losses were borne by shareholders.

McArdle says that 30 billion of the total losses in the Irish banks was borne by shareholders while the remaining 64 billion was incurred by the taxpayer.

It should be said that the total bill to the Irish taxpayer may not amount to this 64 billion. Latest estimates of the cost of IBRC (Anglo Irish Bank and Irish Nationwide) suggest that the original estimate of 34 billion may be overstated by 9 billion.

Secondly, the financial costs of the 64 billion were relatively low. 21 billion came from the National Pension Reserve. 31 billion relating to the IBRC was in the form of Promissory Notes. The exchequer is obliged to raise 3.1 billion a year every year. The financial costs to the State of the Promissory Notes are only incurred when the 3 billion is raised. Only 12 billion of the 64 billion had to be raised from the exchequer immediately.

Thirdly, some of the 64bn is recoverable. McArdle estimates 16 billion of the 64 billion can be salvaged from the investment in the banks.

Finally, it should be noted that all of the State-financed bank debt of 43 billion (64 billion less the 21 billion from the NPRF) is included in the National Debt. This is a very conservative way of accounting for national debt since some of the liability is offset by assets; and not all of it is incurred immediately (i.e. the Promissory Notes). ■

es ahora *

TRÓCAIRE AND ISRAELI BOYCOTT

Justin Kilcullen, Director of aid agency Trócaire, responded to an attack by Fine Gael TD and party Chairman Charlie Flanagan who declared that its actions in Israel and the West Bank are "*biased and partisan*" and that people should be aware of this when putting money into Trócaire's boxes for Lent. Mr. Kilcullen dismissed the accusation and insisted the body will "*continue its work to promote a just peace that supports the God-given human dignity of the people of that region*". He added that—

"Israeli settlements are illegal under international law and violate the human rights of Palestinians living in the West Bank. The continued expansion of these settlements is making life a misery for ordinary Palestinians. Violations such as house demolitions, land confiscation and restrictions on movement are wrong and should not be tolerated. The EU labels the settlements as illegal and if the EU believes the settlements are illegal it should not trade with them."

Mr. Kilcullen further pointed out that, since its foundation, Trócaire had campaigned and raised awareness about human rights issues in the developing world. Of course since then Israel has gone to war on the Gaza settlement and killed well over a hundred people with a savagery that has shocked many people. Yet RTE, the national broadcaster, on its nightly broadcasts insists on a parity of strength between Gaza militants and the State of Israel.

This outright Israeli propaganda is replicated not only here but in the UK and France 24 news bulletins as well and the print media is equally complicit. It takes *Alive*, a Dominican paper, to disclose how Israel behaves. It quotes a booklet called *Breaking The Silence*, which is from an organisation of former Israeli soldiers of the same name. These are—

"seeking to publicise the ill-treatment of people, including children in the West Bank occupied territories. It describes how children caught throwing stones are subject to beatings, intimidation, humiliation, verbal abuse, night-time arrests and injury. One soldier told how a nine year old kid, had a loaded gun pointed at him and had to plead for mercy. Some of the children soil or wet their pants but the Israeli military are not bothered by this. In fact, human rights organisations such as 'Defence for Children International' claim that children are routinely arrested at night, handcuffed, blindfolded, mistreated and denied access to their parents or a lawyer..."

The Guardian has also published these details, so these abuses are widely known but our State seems to bury its head in the sand rather than engage with what is really happening. I suppose asking the Fine Gael Party Chairman and TD, Charlie Flanagan, to go on a fact-finding mission to Gaza and stay there for a week and acquaint himself with the reality on the ground would be too much to ask before he wades in to rather *sinisterly censure* Trócaire again! But then he follows the like of Tony Blair, who shiftily as ever stood by Israeli President Simon Peres while the latter labelled the militants in Gaza as starting the war. Maybe the old warmonger for Bush would be able to persuade the Flanagans of this world that 'black is white' and recognise *internally* that "*truth is the first casualty of war*". And "*power is might*" and therefore also "*right*" in the light of these buckaroos.

IRISH AFFAIRS

Now that there is going to be a challenge to the Children's Rights Constitutional Amendment—and this magazine was to the fore in arguing that the wording as drafted was so bad that inevitably it would be challenged—and this was before the McCrystal Supreme Court judgement—it now looks extremely unlikely that, with the tiny turnout and the huge "no" vote, the Amendment will be enacted at all. All the polls were so wide of what actually transpired that it does rather beg the question what really was happening behind all the headlines etc? As any political canvasser will know, one of the worst responses to knocking on doors looking for votes was not the profane language or anger towards one's political party but the equally angry refrain that there would be no-one voting in the house because "*ye are all the same*".

I see that the papers attribute the low turn-out to apathy but I would caution about adopting this answer. There is a lot of anger in this country against the Government and, while we are not given to marching in the streets, we are quite capable of striking through the ballot box by our absence just as sure as we are by our presence.

At the moment there seems to be widespread agitation over the terrible death of the Indian woman Savita Halappanavar in Galway. But, as no-one yet has the full facts and won't until the enquiry is held, the best thing to do is wait and see what actually happened. I have problems about the way that the tragic death is already being used by those in favour of abortion, but that will always be the way of some people. I also thought that interviewing the bereaved husband again and again was tasteless. But to my amazement—he very quickly started to demand that justice

for his wife lay in the changing of our laws and that he had the backing of the two hundred strong Indian community in Galway. Then it was reported that our Ambassador to India was called in for a dressing down by the New Delhi Government. I was gobsmacked by this (I still don't know if it is true) but the media are in full hunt mode. Well I would like to remind the Indian Government that their treatment of our Catholics/Christians is getting worse every year. The Hindu persecution of the former is up by 400% in the last ten years. There has been bombing and looting of Christian homes and Churches culminating with the murder of Protestant Pastor Michael Nayak in 2011. There also has been a huge increase in forced conversions, and beatings and stonings when this is resisted. So I would urge the Indian community in Galway not to get too carried away in their demands.

I would also urge the solicitors acting for Mr. Halappanavar to tread carefully because it seems to me that they are upping the *ante* to sue all concerned—which would include the obstetrician, the hospital, the HSE and the State. It goes without saying that such an outcome would not be in the common good. As the *Irish Daily Mail*, 3rd November 2012, recently reported, '*Explaining Differences in Hospital Expenditure Across OECD Countries: The Role of Price and Volume Measures*' contained alarming statistics for Ireland. "*Irish Hospitals have the highest cost level across the developed world*". We are more expensive than the US, Switzerland or even Norway. And more than double the UK level. Irish specialist physicians earn 131% more than the developed world average while our nurses earn 39% more." All thanks to the Croke Park Agreement—the gift that keeps on giving to the public sector.

ALASTAIR CAMPBELL

I was recently enquiring about what had become of Blair's foremost spin-master. I had been given a gift of a box-set of '*The Thick of It*', a political satire based on the Campbell/Blair era by the brilliant Armando Iannucci. Peter Capaldi plays the Campbell character and I have been hugely entertained by the BBC-made show. First I had to get over the absolutely obscene language but it undoubtedly is the best satirical political programme ever. I had bought the Campbell Diaries, but they were so heavily sanitised that I gave up quite quickly on reading them but truly this programme was Campbell with "*the lid off*", as Elizabeth Bowen might say.

Then a friend gave me the *Sunday Independent* 'Life' magazine of the 28th October 2012. It featured Alastair Campbell (in full colour) looking so thin and worn that I thought him to be ill. But the article was all about how he had tackled

the demon drink. He spoke about his alcoholism and depression but is sober and has been for a long time. He was in Ireland as he is an ambassador for the UK-based *Time to Change* campaign, "which aims to bring an end to the stigma of mental illness". He came here he said, "at the invitation of healthcare company Lundbeck Ireland" (which meant they were picking up the tab), "to talk to interest groups including the Royal College of Physicians about alcoholism and mental health issues". I have never heard of Lundbeck Ireland but Campbell wants the Irish as well as the British Governments "to get serious about policies that will lead to sensible drinking patterns and to the provision of effective mental-health programmes".

Then on the 9th November 2012 he was in Dublin again as reported by *The Irish Times*. This time it was the Institute of Advertising Practitioners in Ireland (IAPI) who were paying him. There was some guff about him being "not everybody's favourite media personality but he managed to sweet talk his way into the affections of Dublin's advertising community last night", according to the report in *The Irish Times*. It was reported that Tony Blair's former spin doctor told nominees at the Advertising Effectiveness (AsFx) awards that "some of the best people" he had worked with in his political life had been advertisers. "You only need to look at the eye-watering spend in the US elections to know that advertising really matters in campaigns", he observed. "Part of the answer for the economic recovery is going to come from the creative industries, and advertising is at the heart of that".

The happiest faces in the Mansion House included those behind campaigns for SuperValue, Cadbury, the ISPC and the HSE. The agency DDFH&B was awarded the Grand Prix for its work on the "Say Hallo to the new SuperValue Range" campaign. Tania Banotti (whose mother is Mary Banotti of Fine Gael) is the chief executive of IAPI which organised the biennial awards, said "all of the shortlisted campaigns reflected the creative strength of the Irish industry. The \approx 300 million Irish advertising sector directly employs 4,500 people".

USA AND THE GAA

The Irish Daily Mail, 19th November 2012 had a delightful picture of a local resident, John Kelly of the Irish-American community in New York's Breezy Point, holding up the Sam Maguire Cup (GAA All Ireland Football Final) in the foreground and in the background the awful devastation caused by Superstorm Sandy. The GAA players took time out of their All-Stars tour of the USA to help the locals with the clean-up. Likewise the *Irish Examiner*, 19th November 2012 also contained a set of pictures with the headline: *The GAA's Helping Hands*. It was

refreshing to see such a positive story coming out of such a disaster. One Irishman who is speeding up the process is Kerry native Donal O'Sullivan—whose company, Navillus Construction, is playing a leading role in the clean-up of the Belle Harbour neighbourhood in the badly-hit Rockaways region, which is heavily populated by Irish-Americans. Mr. O'Sullivan recruited more than 150 volunteers within 24 hours and has put—according to the *Irish Daily Mail*—his own crews into the area, clearing up to 200 houses in the process, while also setting up an emergency resource centre outside the local Church. "We really appreciate how supportive the Irish community has been to us", said Belle Harbour resident Brendan Armstrong. The editorial of that same day in the *Irish Daily Mail* had a heading: *Our Best Ambassadors*, and underneath was written:

"No other organisation better reflects the ancient Irish concept of the 'meitheal'—of neighbour helping out neighbour, of community working for community than the GAA.

"It is this generosity of spirit that has made the GAA such an integral part of the social fabric of every parish and makes it unique in sport. This weekend, America too got a taste of that special magic—and of that traditional Irish generosity of spirit the GAA exemplifies.

"Some of the current crop of All-Stars took time out from their US tour to join thousands of other volunteers in the clean-up of Superstorm Sandy. In a world in which so many sporting heroes sadly turn out to have feet of clay, our GAA stars have once again set an example we can all be proud of."

It is such a pity that more of our media could not reflect on this heart-warming story rather than the never-ending supposed shame for which we are to cower over a very tragic outcome in one of our hospitals.

MONSIGNOR HUGH O'FLAHERTY

The Irish Independent, 12th November 2012, ran a small article on this year's Hugh O'Flaherty Memorial Weekend, "the fifth annual celebration of the heroic cleric's life". It is doubtful that they would have bothered but for an exceptional guest who was also present—the British Ambassador Dominick Chilcott with the red poppy blazing on his chest. What was he doing there? It seems no body really knows but perhaps it is all part of the agenda of 'combining' our past with theirs into a shared whole, providing it is *positive* of the British part in it. It was *The Kerryman*, 14th November 2012, which provided a lot more news on the story. Under the heading: *Church and State united for heroic cleric's tribute*, we were told that Taoiseach Enda Kenny TD told those gathered that "it is time we honoured Hugh O'Flaherty". In his address the

Taoiseach said he hoped

"the State recognition would happen by 2014, the 75th anniversary of the outbreak of the Second World War. "It is time we recognise and honour our Irish World War 11 heroes and I hope that by 2014, this will be in place. What the Monsignor and people like him displayed is that it is possible and very important to care beyond ourselves"..."

That last sentence has a ring to it that is becoming increasingly familiar. Does it not suggest that those of our people who stayed at home to defend ourselves against the stated predatory nature of the British State that we were—well how shall I put it—selfish? Verily did the revisionists do their work and now the words spoken by our leader trip off his tongue, contributing to negating all a small nation's valiant struggle to maintain our neutrality? No wonder the British Ambassador smiled—indeed well he may—but he should perhaps pause and look at who was the recipient of the Hugh O'Flaherty International Award, which each year is conferred on a recipient whose dedication to alleviating the plight of the less fortunate or persecuted merits recognition.

This year's winner was Sr. Agnes Hunt, who was nominated by the Irish Council for Prisoners Overseas and was chosen for her commitment towards Irish Prisoners Overseas and families. Sr. Agnes was the first woman to be appointed to a chaplaincy in a male prison in the UK, when she began a placement at Wormwood Scrubs where she remained for 16 years. Joanne Joyce of the ICPO accepted the award from Mayor of Killarney, Séan O'Grady on her behalf. She informed the gathering that Sr. Agnes could not be present to personally collect her award as she was unwell. But thirty-four years after her first day in Wormwood Scrubs, Sr. Agnes remains committed to supporting prisoners.

Every week, Joanne said, she still comes into our Maynooth office to write to prisoners serving life sentences in the UK, many of whom she has known from her time at Wormwood Scrubs. For many of them the only contact they will have with the outside world will be the letter they receive from Sr. Agnes each week.

The Bishop of Kerry, Bill Murphy was present as was the Papal Nuncio Archbishop Charles Brown. Monsignor O'Flaherty's remarkable selfless acts in Nazi-occupied Rome saved the lives of almost 7,000 persecuted people, including Jews and Allied POWs. Killarney Town Council erected a plaque some time ago on his former Plunkett Street residence. Hugh O'Flaherty was born in Kiskeam, Co. Cork, but was raised in Killarney. Former Supreme Court judge, Mr. Justice Hugh O'Flaherty, a nephew of the Monsignor's, said he never spoke about his exploits during the war. "He was a genuinely very modest man".

Julianne Herlihy ©

An Irish Anti-Fascist RAF Volunteer And Some Other Soldiers

July 2012 saw the publication of T. Ryle Dwyer's latest book, *Michael Collins And The Civil War*. Page 152 contains the outrageous statement: "*Sectarian murders were no longer confined to Belfast. While Collins was arguing about the Irish Times' biased coverage of the events in Belfast, thirteen Protestants were killed at the other end of the island in the Dunmanway area of west Cork.*" Poor Peter Hart! Not only has his sectarian thesis been torn to shreds by an array of writers from Jack Lane to John M Regan, but now the inventor is no longer credited with his own creation. For Dwyer gives as his source, not Peter Hart himself, but Eoghan Harris in the *Sindo* funnies! But this is not a review of Dwyer, and so I will give credit where credit is due when his narrative provides some useful territorial scene-setting before proceeding to an examination of the politics of Saor Uladh (Free Ulster) and its Co. Tyrone and Derry City leadership (augmented by a Cork 'interloper', the Republican Communist RAF veteran of World War Two, Kevin Neville). Yet in one respect Dwyer's book is less informative than its *Irish Examiner* preview, for the references to de Valera's Dáil statement on 22nd August 1921 (p35) and Lloyd George's House of Commons statement on 14th December 1921 (p36) are severely curtailed in the book itself. So it is from the *Irish Examiner* of July 2 that I will first quote Dwyer:

"In January 1922, the partition issue began to figure more prominently as a political issue. This was ironic because it had been very much in the background throughout the 26 counties ever since the previous August when President Éamon de Valera warned members of the Dáil that they would have to accept a form of partition. *'The minority in Ulster had a right to have their sentiments considered to the utmost limit'*, de Valera told a private session of the Dáil on August 22, 1921. If the Republic was recognised he would be in favour of giving each county power to vote itself out of the Republic if it so wished. He wanted counties Fermanagh and Tyrone—which had Catholic nationalist majorities—to have the right to opt out of Northern Ireland. Attempting to force the majority in the rest of Northern Ireland into a united Ireland would, he warned, be the same mistake that the British had made with the Irish people as a whole... The 1921 Treaty had the potential of being even more favourable than the county option advocated by de Valera the previous August, because in addition to Fermanagh and Tyrone, the boundary commission could also transfer

other contiguous areas such as the city of Derry, and the southern portions of Armagh and Down... The boundary commission would likely transfer Fermanagh and Tyrone to the Irish Free State, Lloyd George told the House of Commons. *'There is no doubt, certainly since the Act of 1920, that the majority of the people of the two counties prefer being with their Southern neighbours to being in the Northern parliament'*, he said. *'What does that mean? If Ulster is to remain a separate community, you can only by means of coercion keep them there, and although I am against the coercion of Ulster, I do not believe in Ulster coercing other units.'*"

Dwyer's book continues:

"When the boundary commission finally met in 1925, Lloyd George was long gone from power. The commission essentially decided on only minimal changes to the boundary... Since such changes would add insult to the outrage that was likely to be provoked by the surprise failure to transfer Counties Fermanagh and Tyrone to the Free State, the London, Dublin and Belfast governments all agreed to scrap the findings. As a sweetener the British agreed to absolve the Free State from any responsibility to contribute towards the British national debt. De Valera was later able to claim that this absolved the Free State from having to pay land annuities to Britain, but the Cosgrave government did not realise this at the time... Fianna Fáil won more seats than any other party in the general election of 1932, with the result that de Valera was able to form a minority government with the help of the Labour Party... But Fine Gael tried to frustrate de Valera's efforts to dismantle the 1921 Treaty by using the stepping-stone approach to full freedom advocated by Collins. It was largely at the secret instigation of Cosgrave and his party that the British instigated the Economic War against the Irish Free State in 1932 over de Valera's refusal to pay land annuities to Britain. De Valera contended that the Free State did not owe the money. Chancellor of the Exchequer Neville Chamberlain admitted in March 1932 that de Valera had *'an arguable point'*, because the wording of the boundary commission agreement absolved the Dublin government *'from liability for the service of the Public Debt of the United Kingdom, and that the Irish annuities form part of the Public Debt'*. *The Irish people endorsed de Valera's stand in a snap general election in 1933 by returning Fianna Fáil with the first overall majority since the Treaty split. His government then systematically dismantled the*

objectionable aspects of the Treaty by abolishing the oath, introducing a new constitution, replacing the governor general with a popularly elected president, and securing both the handover of the Treaty ports and the abrogation of Britain's rights to Irish defence facilities in time of war. This paved the way for Ireland to stay out of the Second World War, which was the ultimate proof of independence" (pp289-292; my emphasis, MOR).

The Saor Uladh leadership would have concurred with much of this narrative: full recognition of the sovereignty achieved by de Valera for the 26 County Republic, with the running sore of Northern Ireland remaining to be resolved but—while its military actions were focused on the nationalist majority areas of Fermanagh, Tyrone and Derry City—it did not concede the right of any County to opt out in the UK direction. In that respect, the only difference of opinion that would have ever existed between the nationalism of Republican Communists Kevin Neville and my late father, Micheál O'Riordan, would have centred on the effectiveness of armed struggle in achieving their common objective of a sovereign united 32 County Republic. Yet on the first page of his 2005 *apologia pro vitam suam*—online at www.irishlabour.com and entitled *Miscellaneous Note on Republicanism and Socialism in Cork City 1954-69*—Jim Lane wrote:

"Michael 'Screwback' O'Riordan never forgot to pay attention to his native city of Cork for meetings with old comrades and potential recruits for either the IWL/IWP or CPI... At most of these meetings, attended by ... Gerry Higgins in the early days ... Gerry Higgins believed they did not have any policy on the national question, they just wished it would go away in the goodness of time."

None of this squares with my own experience. I found the CPI to be obsessed by the national question. When I joined the B&ICO in 1971, a year after my father had gone from being General Secretary of a 26 County IWP to becoming General Secretary of a reunited 32 County CPI, the most heated bone of political contention between us centred on the national question and my espousal of the B&ICO's 'two nations' analysis. In direct contradiction of the Gerry Higgins caricature of my father's politics, one of the polemical salvos that my father fired at me in that year was that *"You can't get away from the national question because it won't get away from you!"* This remark, of course, was itself a caricature of the B&ICO position which, on the contrary, sought to grasp the nettle of the full complexity of the national question. This is why the

B&ICO's first policy statement, *Connolly And Partition*, had challenged the ideological *cul-de-sac* of James Connolly's 'one nation' dogmatism, a political myopia that affected Micheál O'Riordan and Jim Lane alike.

A fundamental difference between the two, however, was that, when a critical juncture came, my father could break free from such ideological shackles—at least in practice if not quite fully in theory. His reading of Connolly had been unduly influenced by the Connolly Association's Desmond Greaves. Besides Connolly, my father's other great hero was Father Michael O'Flanagan, a Vice-President of Sinn Féin during the War of Independence, who would become its President in 1933. Because of his political activities, O'Flanagan was frequently 'silenced' as a priest by the Catholic Hierarchy. He nonetheless had been given the honour of reciting the invocation at the very first meeting of Dáil Éireann in January 1919, and was described by Cathal Brugha as "*the staunchest priest who ever lived in Ireland*". (See <http://free-magazines.atholbooks.org/> to download the July 2006 issue of *Irish Political Review* for my refutation of an academically ham-fisted slander of O'Flanagan by University College Dublin History Professor Diarmaid Ferriter).

Moreover—and uniquely among Irish Catholic priests—O'Flanagan had supported the Spanish Republic, and in 1938 he came out in the midst of a Dublin downpour to both publicly and personally welcome my father and other Connolly Column International Brigade volunteers back to Ireland in the aftermath of surviving the horrendous battle of the Ebro. A cherished possession of my father's, therefore, was Desmond Greaves's 1954 pamphlet, *Father Michael O'Flanagan, Republican Priest—the Story of his Life, with Extracts from his Speeches*. But Greaves was being too clever by half when he suppressed making the slightest reference at all to the intense controversy on the Ulster question that had raged for months—from June to October 1916, to be precise—between O'Flanagan and Redmondism. A 1993 biography by Denis Carroll, however, was to quote O'Flanagan's 'two nations' analysis quite extensively, as exemplified by the following statements:

"The island of Ireland and the national unit of Ireland simply do not coincide... Geography has worked hard to make one nation out of Ireland; history has worked against it... The Unionists of Ulster have never transferred their love and allegiance to Ireland... We claim the right to decide what is to be our nation. We refuse them the same right... After 300 years, England has begun to despair of compelling us to

love her by force. And so we are anxious to start where England left off and are going to compel Antrim and Down to love us by force... If anyone wishes to know another's nationality, the answer is: Ask him... The only sense in which I am a partitionist is that I claim the right of the people of East Ulster to decide whether they are to throw in their lot with the Irish Nation or not" (*They Have Fooled You Again—Michael O'Flanagan, Priest, Republican, Social Critic*, pp44-50).

On that occasion in 1993 I would have briefly made a point-scoring remark to my father about O'Flanagan being a 'two nationalist' and—getting no response—I left it at that. Which is why what next happened, less than a year later, came as a great but pleasant surprise to me. January 1994 marked the 75th anniversary of that First Dáil of 1919, which had been opened by O'Flanagan. I decided to mark the occasion by sending to the press an open letter in which I appealed to the leadership of the Republican Movement to seize the new opportunities that had been opened up by what had been secured by Taoiseach Albert Reynolds in the Downing Street Declaration; arguing that such an achievement should lead the IRA to call a ceasefire and enable Sinn Féin to pursue Tone's objective of uniting Protestants, Catholics and Dissenters by peaceful means. I then quoted some of what Father O'Flanagan had to say about the North in 1916, pointing out how he would become both a Vice-President and President of Sinn Féin. Since my purpose was to persuade rather than dispute with Sinn Féin, I refrained from quoting O'Flanagan's more explicit 'two nations' language in his unity-by-consent Republican analysis which I shared. But I did quote the following statement from O'Flanagan's 1916 polemic against Redmondite Hibernianism:

"We have to come to an agreement with the Ulster Covenanters, even though it be only an agreement to differ. We have to begin to treat them as fellow men. If we go a little further along the road, we may find that after time they will be willing to treat us as fellow countrymen."

Every single 'national' daily newspaper in the Republic—the *Irish Times*, *Irish Independent*, *Irish Examiner* and the not-yet-dead *Irish Press*—refused to publish my letter. Both the Unionist *Belfast Newsletter* and the Hibernian *Irish News* also refused to do so. The *Derry Journal*—in Martin McGuinness's home town—was the honourable exception that proved the rule, in being the sole newspaper prepared to let it see the light of day. I passed on a copy to my father for his own information, and thought no more of it. But, a few days later, he was to surprise me with the question: Would I not consider also submitting my letter to the CPI's Belfast weekly, *Unity*? Would it be published?—was my sceptical response. He assured me

that it would be, which indeed it was, and in full.

My father knew full well that the underlying assumption of what I had quoted as the basis for a peace process was O'Flanagan's 'two nations' analysis, even if I had left such explicit language unspoken on this occasion. But, given the agreement between us on essentials, any repetition of my 'two nations' point-scoring would have been gratuitous and self-indulgent pedantry on my part. And, eighteen years later, Sinn Féin's Martin McGuinness—Northern Ireland's Deputy First Minister, a former IRA Chief-of-Staff and also that Party's former Vice-President—addressed its most recent Ard-Fheis this past May in language that was indeed reminiscent of what I had quoted from Father O'Flanagan in my *Derry Journal* letter. McGuinness declared:

"I recognise there are one million people on this island who are British and let me state here and now that as a proud Irish Republican I not only recognise the Unionist and British identity, I respect it and in return all I seek is for my Irish identity and tradition to be respected as well. People who think that a new Ireland, a united Ireland, can be built without Unionist participation, involvement and leadership are deluded."

Martin McGuinness had come a long way. Yet a war had to be fought for over a quarter of a century, followed by a further decade and a half of intense political struggle, in order to achieve all that he had achieved. As he also told that same Sinn Féin Ard-Fheis:

"It was acceptable (for Irish governments) to abandon nationalists in the north to the whims of a unionist regime and the reality of second class citizenship. That was a political reality that I could never accept as normal. Through forty years of struggle and our involvement in peace negotiations we have managed to dismantle one party rule in the north and brought second class citizenship to an end. We have replaced this with equality, partnership and power sharing."

But partition was not the cause of that war; and a war could never end partition, which is why for Martin McGuinness "*the war is over*". The cause of the war was not partition as such, but the territorial extent of it, compounded by the character of the devolved Stormont regime imposed by the British State on that Six County entity. The latter issue has been incisively analysed by Brendan Clifford in *Northern Ireland: What Is It?* (July 2011), and I fully agree with the following statement of his:

"I did not encourage the resort to force in 1969. I did what I could to discourage it by advocating a different course of action—democratisation of the mode of government in the political life of the State, meaning Britain... The war was

fought. It had the pragmatic sanction of being a fact; and of succeeding in terms of what I took to be its cause and therefore its substantive object—which was to do away with the intolerable provocation of the 'Unionist state'. Its success was to establish parity between Unionism and Nationalism as two distinct body politics in a transitional arrangement" (pp 268-9).

Brendan Clifford refers to his own pioneering role "as the original 'two-nationist' of modern times (post-Pogrom times)" (p208), and he adds: "The only 'two-nations' view in circulation was the one I put in circulation" (p215). That was unquestionably the case, for it was Brendan's articles in the *Irish Communist* during 1970 that had convinced me of the validity of that analysis and persuaded me to join the British & Irish Communist Organisation myself in early 1971 in order to add my own voice to its espousal. But there was another political objection to such espousal that was very different from my father's 1971 outright denial of the fact of two nations. One evening, shortly after I had joined the B&ICO, the late Pat Murphy called to our family home in order to have a preliminary *pow-wow* with me before we proceeded to some other meeting. My late mother, Kay Keohane O'Riordan, insisted on coming into the front room in order to give Pat a piece of her mind. "You've given them a theory!" were the words she used as her punch line in lambasting Pat and the B&ICO's "two-nationist works and poms". When we left the house, Pat said: "That's the best political argument I've heard against our 'two nations' line". For it had not at all been based on a denial of such a fact, but was centred on the political expediency of publicly acknowledging that fact. As far as my mother was concerned, 'two nationism' was dignifying the pogromist powers-that-be in Ulster in a manner that would give "Croppies Lie Down!" the respectability of a National Anthem, rather than have it forever recognised as the Orange sectarian *Horst Wessel Lied* that it undoubtedly was.

My mother always responded to the actuality of those who were being oppressed there and then, rather than indulge those who hypothetically might find themselves oppressed under a different set of circumstances. It had also been the case that, although a member of the Irish Workers' League/Party and the Communist Party of Ireland, she never bought into the CP 'justification' of the Soviet suppression of the 1956 Hungarian Uprising. She could never agree to a denial of the fact that Hungarian workers had risen up against their oppression, on the CP grounds that "real socialism" was in danger of being overthrown throughout Eastern Europe if the Hungarian revolutionaries had been allowed to succeed. So, in

political arguments with my father over the course of the next two years, she continued to champion the good name of Imre Nagy, the Hungarian National Communist Prime Minister, who had defied the Red Army and who would be executed at Khrushchev's behest in 1958 (See also "*In Remembrance of Two Fools*", as a free download in the previously mentioned July 2006 issue of *Irish Political Review*).

In 1971 my mother could only contemplate the actual reality of the oppression of half a million Ulster Catholics, rather than speculate about the potential oppression of a million Ulster Protestants in the hypothetical event of being forced into a united Ireland. If in 1956 the central political reality for her was that the Hungarian people were not guilty of oppressing a single Soviet citizen, the central political reality for her in 1971 was that neither was Nationalist Ireland guilty of oppressing a single Ulster Unionist subject, and that, as far as she was concerned, was that! But if hers was the best negative argument against the B&ICO espousal of the 'two nations' analysis, it remained a *cul-de-sac* in its own right. Politics cannot make progress on the basis of a suppression of other undeniable facts, no more than by self-deluding denial itself. At the end of the day, Martin McGuinness had to declare the war over with a *de facto* recognition of the reality of two nations. And yet, as Brendan Clifford has argued, the regime that Britain had imposed on Northern Ireland made a war to undo that particular construction inevitable—even if that war only ended up being successful after learning some lessons from the failed Border campaign of the late 1950s. Foolhardy or not, Connie Green had been willing to sacrifice his life in that previous campaign. This decorated anti-fascist war hero had returned to his native Derry to find—well, what? Brendan Clifford concludes: "I do not see Northern Ireland as having been a Fascist State, because it was not a State, but an undemocratic device of the democratic British State serving an ulterior purpose." (p 247). And yet, but for the fact that Northern Ireland was not a "State" in its own right, he has also argued: "If Northern Ireland was a State, or if it is to be taken to have been a State, I do not think the description of it as Fascist would be unreasonable." His argument continues:

"It would be a *de facto* One-Party State, though this status was achieved without the legal prohibition of other parties {except, of course, the banning of Sinn Féin itself!—MOR}. The State would be the mobilised *Volk*, constituting two-thirds of the population. Elections would be assertions of the *Volkish* will organised by the State, free of party disputes about policy... Measures were taken to ensure that elements of the population that did

not belong to the *Volk*—the special people of the State—left the State in large numbers. The spokesmen of the special people frequently referred to the non-*Volkish* elements as inferior types. There was a civilised conviction that inferior types bred faster than the higher forms of humanity, and that it was therefore necessary to find ways of ensuring that the higher breeding rates of lower types did not swamp the *Volk*" (p242).

Since Northern Ireland was not a State at all, we must accept that for that reason alone it was not a Fascist State. During the Irish Army deserters controversy, a Seamus Breslin wrote (*Irish Independent*, February 18):

"Two men went to school in Derry city together. At the outbreak of World War Two, one joined the British army and the other headed south and joined the Irish. After being demobbed, they both returned home. The ex-British soldier got a new public house and a job in customs, both due to his service. The ex-Irish soldier lived in squalor with his family in a disused US navy hut, unemployed and on benefits. There was no special treatment for service this side of the border. Maybe everyone should have joined the British forces and left Ireland defenceless?"

But Breslin was being far too kind to the (London)Derry Orange junta. Catholic British Army ex-servicemen and their families were also treated with contempt, as the decorated Derry World War Two hero Connie Green was to experience. I had previously assumed from a blog reference that the Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers was Green's regiment. I can no longer state with certainty which regiment it was that he belonged to. Brian Hanley and Scott Millar have written: "*In November 1955 Saor Uladh attacked Roslea RUC Barracks ... and Connie Green, a former Royal Marine, was killed*" (*The Lost Revolution: The Story of the Official IRA and the Workers' Party*, 2009, p11). But Barry Flynn has written:

"The attack was thwarted and resulted in the death of Connie Green from Derry, who was shot dead by an RUC officer. Green had been a former member of the British Parachute Regiment and had served throughout the Second World War in various capacities and locations. On his return to Derry, he joined Saor Uladh and used his experience to train local volunteers." (*Soldiers Of Folly: The IRA Border Campaign*, 2009, p43).

If the latter is the more accurate account, of course, it is all the more bitterly ironic, in view of the Bloody Sunday massacre carried out in Derry by the British Parachute Regiment in January 1972.

Connie Green could only respond to how he experienced the Derry to which he had returned home after being demobbed at the end of the Second World War. To him it bore many more similarities to the

fascism he had been told he was fighting against than the democracy he was supposed to be fighting for when decorated for bravery by the British Army during the Italian campaign. And, in his sick-bed conversations with my mother, the Cork anti-fascist RAF war veteran Kevin Neville had ample opportunity to relate to her his motivation for joining forces with Connie Green in that November 1955 RUC barracks attack, and how it came about that it was these two British ex-servicemen who had fired the first shots in the first post-war military campaign against that regime.

So, what of Connie Green's Derry City which, despite having a two-thirds Nationalist majority, had for over half a century been gerrymandered under the heel of a local Orange junta? A quarter of a century further on, as he campaigned for the Good Friday Agreement, the Ulster Unionist Party leader David Trimble showed his ongoing contempt for the Nationalist majority in Derry City. He was reported as follows by Déaglán de Bréadún in the *Irish Times* on May 19, 1998:

"Mr Trimble posed with his two friends on Derry's Walls, with the Bogside in the background. Under this agreement, he claimed, even the Bogside was '*as British as Bangor or Bournemouth*'. That won't win any republican or nationalist votes, especially since this was the site of the time-honoured custom of Apprentice Boys throwing pennies down at their nationalist neighbours."

Five months later, in October 1998, David Trimble was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Eoghan Harris was script-writer for Trimble's acceptance speech that December 10th, as Harris never tires of reminding us, most recently in the *Sunday Independent* this past June 24th:

"(Sinn Féin Vice-President) Mary Lou McDonald, on 'Morning Ireland', coolly steals the line I wrote for David Trimble about Northern Ireland being '*a cold house for Catholics*'..."

The Harris words actually spoken by Trimble were: "*Ulster Unionists, fearful of being isolated on the island, built a solid house, but it was a cold house for Catholics. And northern nationalists, although they had a roof over their heads, seemed to us as if they meant to burn the house down*". What a reprehensible piece of rhetoric for Harris to be proud of! In 1969 Catholic houses were not cold, but very hot indeed, as Unionist mobs proceeded to burn them down. And once again there were British ex-servicemen who felt compelled to take up arms on behalf of Northern Ireland's Nationalist minority. In the *Irish Times* of 1st December 1971 Andrew Boyd reported on one particular response to the Unionist anti-Catholic pogroms of August 1969:

"When James Lynch, a local leader in

the Ardoyne district of Belfast, was arrested by the British Army in the early hours of Monday, November 22nd, the Catholic Ex-Servicemen's Association, of which Lynch is a leading member, issued an ultimatum to the security authorities... Jimmy Lynch was set free on Wednesday afternoon... '*Jimmy Lynch was arrested by the Green Howards*', said Phil Curran, General Organiser of the CESA, '*on the orders of Stormont's Premier, Brian Faulkner, a man who himself did not volunteer to serve his King and Country during the Second World War. Yet Faulkner, who was of full military age during the war, now proclaims himself a loyalist and can order the British Army to arrest British ex-servicemen*'.... Lynch served in the Royal Engineers from the outbreak of war in 1939 until he was demobbed in 1946. He saw action in France, Italy and Germany. He returned to civilian life to become a docker in Belfast. Until the Paisleyite attack on Bombay Street in August 1969, Lynch was not even remotely interested in politics... August '69 brought him into political activity and changed his whole way of life completely. When Ardoyne was attacked on August 14th and 15th there was no one to defend the Catholic population. So Jimmy Lynch and twelve other ex-soldiers of the British Army volunteered to act as a defence force... Throughout the night of the Paisleyite attacks the ex-servicemen dodged from one position to another, thus giving the impression that Ardoyne was being defended by an adequate force. This defence force was really the beginning of the CESA... The CESA is now under attack from the Stormont Government. No fewer than 22 members of the Association have been interned, on Faulkner's orders, in the Long Kesh concentration camp. They include war veterans like Joe Parker, who served 23 years in the British Army."

Those pogroms lit the fire that led to the Provisional IRA becoming an effective army. Although I was opposed to the Provo war throughout, I cannot withhold my admiration for the political acumen of Martin McGuinness in recognising the difference between what he had won by war and what he could never win by war, and for in turn forging an effective peace process in conjunction with the Paisleyites. That is why I spoke out as follows in a letter published by the *Irish Times* on 26 September 2011:

"I am somewhat bemused at the statements by Fine Gael Ministers Shatter and Hogan, respectively, that Martin McGuinness is an inappropriate person to become President of Ireland, because of '*his exotic background*' and for '*carrying too much baggage from his past*'. At the time of his death at 23, Phil Kelleher had been a top class rugby player, scheduled to wear the green jersey in the next International match. He was, of

course, also a police officer, when shot in the back by IRA gunmen in a provincial hostelry shortly after chatting with the charming hostess behind the bar. The local IRA General who had ordered that 1920 Halloween killing, also saw to the execution of two young Protestants, named Elliot and Chartres, on charges of identifying and informing on Kelleher's killers. The charming Longford hostess had been Kitty Kiernan, fiancée of Michael Collins, while the local IRA General was Seán Mac Eoin who, in his memoirs entitled *With the IRA in the Fight for Freedom*, went on to dismiss Kelleher as "*a young ex-army officer who was given orders to take action against the IRA and clean up the area*". Fine Gael, also styling itself the United Ireland Party, was so proud of General Seán Mac Eoin's '*exotic background*', that it deemed him a most appropriate person to become President of Ireland, running him as the Fine Gael candidate in both 1945 and 1959. I would appeal to the Republican-spirited among Fine Gael voters, who like myself believe in unity-by-consent, to recognise the heroic work undertaken by Martin McGuinness over the past decade in working for a New Republic, based on consent and by exclusively peaceful methods, and conclude that there is no more appropriate candidate to now become President of Ireland."

Since, as a two-nationist, I welcome McGuinness's recognition of the rights of the one million British in Northern Ireland, it would, accordingly, be hypocritical on my part to have any quarrel with him shaking the British Queen's hand as Northern Ireland's Deputy First Minister. But in one joint action with Unionism he has taken a step too far. At the close of my August article in this series I wrote of "*the pathetic roles played to date by both Éamon Gilmore and Martin McGuinness in respect of this year's controversy concerning the Irish Army deserters*". Given my otherwise profound respect for McGuinness, perhaps I should not have mentioned him in the same breath as Gilmore. Nonetheless, on this particular issue, his action still remains pathetic. The *Irish Times* reported on June 13:

"Almost 5,000 members of the Defence Forces who deserted their posts during the Second World War and joined the British army are to be offered an amnesty and pardoned. The Government has also formally apologised to them for the way they were treated at the time. In making the apology yesterday and announcing the pardon and amnesty, Minister for Justice and Defence Alan Shatter said the Government recognised the importance of the deserters' contribution to the Allied victory."

Not just a pardon, but an apology! Yet, as the *Irish Times* previously reported on

January 25th, Shatter specifically highlighted the fact that McGuinness had given the green light for such action: "*On Monday (January 23) the Northern Ireland Assembly unanimously backed the campaign for pardons for the servicemen involved.*" It is indeed bitterly ironic that Martin McGuinness led the way for such interference by a British regional assembly in the internal affairs of this sovereign Republic. Sinn Féin has rallied to the cause of those who betrayed this Republic during the Second World War by deserting from the Irish Army in order, instead, to join the British Army. Sinn Féin's action would have been anathema to Saor Uladh, given the latter's unequivocal championing of 26 County sovereignty. For the Saor Uladh attack on Roslea RUC barracks had been of even greater political significance than the fact that the two casualties in its ranks were both British ex-servicemen. The more noteworthy fact is that this military offensive had been commanded by its Chief-of-Staff, a sitting member of Seanad Éireann who had been elected to that House of the 26 County Oireachtas at the behest of the Fine Gael/Labour Coalition Government. Fine Gael and Labour also need to be reminded of some aspects of their own party histories!

(to be continued)

Manus O'Riordan

Erratum: "Not all" is close to meaning the very opposite of "not at all". A typographical error on my part, by omitting the critical word "at" from a sentence about the Curragh Camp Communist leader Neil Goold in part three of this series (October issue), would have seriously misled readers as to what I had intended to say. The phrase in question should in fact have read: "*As for Goold himself, his own agitational activities after his release were not at all concerned with Britain's war effort but became decidedly more Republican than ever before.*"

MO'R

Index To Irish Political Review 2012

Labour Comment is edited by Pat Maloney, who is the author, unless otherwise stated

January

The European Union vs. The Eurozone. Has Micheál Martin Lost The Plot? *Jack Lane*
The Coalition's First Budget. *John Martin*
ECB Acts As Political Europe Consolidates. *Philip O'Connor* (report of letter)
Thoughts On Northern Ireland. *Wilson John Haire*
Priory Hall And *The Irish News*. *Report*
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (Promissory Notes; An Embarrassing Climbdown?; Solvency And Liquidity; Nonsense; Fianna Fáil; The Budget)
Items From *The Irish Bulletin*. 1919: Part 6
Es Ahora. *Julianne Herlihy* (History And Irish Academia; John A. Murphy; Elma Collins)
The Dunmanway Killings, curiously & curiously. *J. Lane*
William Sheehan And Britain's Militarism. *B. Clifford*
Biteback: Gallipoli, Two German Officers And The Fog Of Military History. *Donal Kennedy* (unpub. letter)
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (More Semi-State Bodies; Cost Of Dying; Household Charge; Secret Service; Documentary Of 2010)
It's Not Sufficient To Be Sour. *Desmond Fennell*
St. Fintan's Widgey Hit By Well-Deserved Belt Of A Crozier. *Manus O'Riordan*
Naval Warfare. *Pat Walsh* (part 17)

Index To Irish Political Review, 2011.
Antiquum Documentum. *Ruairi Ó Domhnaill*
Inside The Spider's Parlour. *Wilson John Haire*
Distributists Occupy Wall Street. Mondragon, Part 3. *Labour Comment*

February

The Right To Desert. *Editorial*
The Euro: Realities And Abstractions. *Jack Lane*
Deserters: Ireland A Fascist State? *Report*
Readers' Letters: Views Of Sinn Féin. *Stephen Richards*
Iran Not Trying To Develop A Nuclear Weapon—US Defence Secretary Panetta. *David Morrison*
Not Sufficient To Be Sour. *Jack Lane* responds to Desmond Fennell
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (Pensioners; Failed States; When Was Independence?; The Media And Change; Mary Raftery; 'Unexpected' Death)
Raymond Crotty's Appeal To England:
Introduction. *Brendan Clifford*
Eire: A Land Where Emigrants Are Born. *Raymond Crotty*
Some Comments On Raymond Crotty's Article. *John Martin*
Es Ahora. *Julianne Herlihy* (Elizabeth Bowen, Lies, Spies & Academics—Qui Bono?; CUP & Einbhear Walshe)
Deserters And Their Champions Equally Unworthy Of Trust. *Donal Kennedy* (Unpublished Letter)
The Further One Gets From Belfast'. *Niall Meehan* replies to Jeff Dudgeon
The 1934 Larkin Affidavit: A Comment. *Jeff Dudgeon* replies to Manus O'Riordan
Crozier Antidotes For Hart Maladies. *Manus O'Riordan*
Items From *The Irish Bulletin*, 1919. Number 7
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Inside Job; Corporation Tax; Fee-Paying And Public Schools; Ultra-Privileged Schools)
Needs Sectioned? *Wilson John Haire* (Poem)
The Guilds And Capitalism. Mondragon, (4). *Lab. Com.*

March

The Trouble With Democracy. *Editorial*
Europe: Spinning Like A Top. *Jack Lane*
Readers' Letters: "Leave Those Kids Alone". *Cathy Winch*
Poems. *Wilson John Haire:* Needs Sectioned? *Open The Door, It's Me*
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (The State And The People; Money; The State And Money; Plus Ca Change . . . ; Promissory Notes)
Germany And The Eurozone. *Mark Langhammer*
The Sovereign People & The Administrators. *Nick Folley*
A Tribute To Conor Lynch. *Jack Lane*
Conor. *Malachi Lawless*
The Ceremony. *Report*
The Septic Tank. *Feargus O Raghallaigh*
Elizabeth Bowen In The Limelight. *Julianne Herlihy*
The 1934 Larkin Affidavit. Comment by *Jeff Dudgeon* and a Response by *Brendan Clifford*
"Taking It Out On The Protestants". *Jack Lane* on Dunmanway and other events
Deserters, The Holocaust And Neutrality. *Philip O'Connor* (Unpublished letter)
Naval Warfare. *Pat Walsh* (Part 18)
Biteback: Cavalier With Archives. *Soldiers*. *Eamon Dyas* (Two Unpublished Letters)
Items From *The Irish Bulletin*. No. 8. Feb. 1920
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Ireland First; Tourist Industry; Recent Legislation) 27
From Guild To Trade Union. Mondragon, (5). *Lab. Com.*

April

Fianna Fáil: on the road to nowhere? *Editorial*
A Tale Of Two Taoiseachs. *Jack Lane*
Readers' Letters: Federalism The Way Forward For The UK. *James Annett*
Keynesianism—cause or cure? *Jack Lane*
More Translation Needed. *Chris Winch*
Promissory Note Architecture. *John Martin*
'Save The Tele' Rally. *Mark Langhammer* (Speech)
Septic Thoughts. *Jack Lane*
Gerry Lawless. *Brendan Clifford* (Obituary)
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (Happy Paddies; RTE; The Sunday Independent; Trade Surplus; Fiscal Pact)
Elizabeth Bowen And Her Admirers. *Julianne Herlihy*
Republicanism—some thoughts for *Stephen Richards*. *Pat Walsh*
Comments On Desmond Fennell's Picture Of Ireland. *John Minahane*
A West Cork Protestant Testament. *Manus O'Riordan*
Heroes. *Wilson John Haire* (Poem)
Biteback: Corporation Tax. *Philip O'Connor* (Unpublished Letter)
Irish Merchant Navy? *Report:* letter, *Dermot C. Clarke*
Items From *The Irish Bulletin*. March 1920 (No. 9)
Euro In The Ring. *Philip O'Connor*

Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Is Oil Well In Cork?; Fracking For Oil And Gas; The Sunday Independent; Household Charge; Titanic; The Mahon Tribunal; NAMA; The Economy; Defence Forces)
Guilds And The Town, Mondragon, (6). *Lab. Com.*

May

A New Treaty With 'Our Gallant Allies'. *Jack Lane*
Syria. *Editorial*
Some Thoughts On Last-Detich Unionism And 'Norman' Pat Walsh
The Irish Times Regrets. *Editorial*
Promissory Note Deal. *John Martin*
Mahon's Star Witness. *Editorial*
Anne Harris. *Editorial*
Poem: A Source Said. *Wilson John Haire*
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (*Denis O'Brien*; *Elaine Byrne*; *Eoghan Harris*; *Corporation Tax*; *Property Taxes*)
Elizabeth Bowen And Her Admirers. *Julianne Herlihy* (Part 2)
Items From *The Irish Bulletin*: 10. April 1920
Harris And *Dunmanway*. *Jack Lane* (Report)
The North And *Dunmanway*. *Wilson John Haire*
The *Dunmanway Killings*, *Curiouser* And *Curiouser*. *Jack Lane* (Part 3)
Naval Warfare. *Pat Walsh* (Part 19, Final)
An Irish Anti-Fascist RAF Volunteer, and some other soldiers. *Manus O'Riordan* (Part 1)
Biteback: Which Portraits Should Be Removed? *Tom Cooper* (Report)
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Party Annual Conference; Dingle—Dangle; Governance; The Titanic)
The Protestant Reformation And The Guilds, Mondragon, (7). *Lab. Com.*

June

Happy Anniversaries! *Editorial*
Austerity Report: Mystery Of Greek Minimum Wage. *Philip O'Connor*
Readers' Letters: *Anne Harris*: A Comment. *Jack Lane*
The Stability Treaty Referendum: The Case For A 'No' Vote. *Eamon Dyas*
An Away Day For UCC History Department. *Jack Lane* (Report Of *John Regan* meeting held in Cork)
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (*Godwin's Law*; *Harris's Retreat*; *Martin Corry*; *Austerity & Growth*; *Irish Debt*)
Another Known Unknown. *Jack Lane* (*Gerard Murphy* & *Dunmanway*)
Correction. *Jack Lane* responds to *Barry Keane*
QUB Tangles With Irish History. *Seán McGouran*
Es Ahora. *Julianne Herlihy* (*Dis-Establishment*; *Sins Of Our Age*; *Abdication*; *Banville*)
Mahon's Star Witness. *Editorial Series* (Part 2)
Views Of Sinn Féin. *Brendan Clifford* (reply to *Stephen Richards*)
In Memory Of *Jim Hurley*. *Manus O'Riordan*, *Tom Barry*
Ireland To Call For EU Ban On Israeli Settlement Goods. *David Morrison*
The Unquiet Man. *Seán McGouran*
Biteback: *Eamon Ó Cuív* (Report: letter, *David Alvey*)
Items From *The Irish Bulletin*. May 1920 (Part 11)
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Constitutional Amendment; Public Service Pay; Statute Law Repeals)
Irish Labour Party In Denial But Not In Clonmel. (Reports: *John Cunningham*, and *The Nationalist*)
Labour Becomes A Commodity, Mondragon, (8). *Lab. Com.*

July

"Shaken, Not Stirred" ? *Editorial*
YES Vote Vindicated, Ireland's Treaty Referendum. *Editorial*
Readers' Letters: Myanmar's Aung San Suu Kyi. *Philip O'Connor*. *Deserters For Empire?* *Donal Kennedy*
Micheál Martin on Sinn Féin. *Report*
Poems by *Wilson John Haire*: *Get On Your Coat Of Dual Colours*. *Who Wears The Pants?*
Visions And Realities—*Trotsky*, *Stalin* and the Fiscal Treaty. *Jack Lane*
Referendum Result. *Report*
Austerity, Growth And The Fiscal Compact Treaty. *Jenny O'Connor*
Ordo-Liberal Austerity? *John Martin* (Reply to *E. Dyas*)
Bon Nui! *Report*
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (*Census*; *Ireland v Iceland*; *Devaluation For Ireland*; *Then And Now*; *Stimulus Package*; *Sinn Féin*; *Royal Bank Of Scotland*)
Bowen Again..... *Jack Lane*
Elizabeth Bowen And *Ambassador Dulanty*. *Jack Lane* (Report)
Mahon's Star Witness. *Editorial Series* (Part 3)
The *Dunmanway Killings*. *Jack Lane* (Report)
Es Ahora. *Julianne Herlihy* (*Summer Holidays*; *State Abuse*)

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

ABORTION LAW

No sooner had the results of the Children's Referendum been declared on Sunday 11th November 2012 than the citizenry of Ireland were verbally and visually distracted from the Referendum results by a nationwide organised and concerted pro-abortion campaign centred around the death in Galway University Hospital of an Indian woman Savita Halappanavar. The unfortunate woman died on Sunday 28th October 2012 which was two full weeks before the Referendum results were announced. The media was silent for a fortnight and then and only then started winding up Savita's story. Day by day the level of hysteria in the media was ramped up—everybody was being told how to feel about this sad event.

Most of the pressure was being created by the media led by *The Irish Times*, which promoted an anti-Catholic line throughout. TV3 put on several balanced programmes. RTE tried to ignore the matter at first and then made it the last item on the Late Late Show. It was not at all a fit subject for a light entertainment programme but by then the Station's News was running it as a first item and seemed to have all its reporters working on it around the clock.

But it was the social media—that misnomer—that picked up the story or rather the Irish media version of it, which quite rapidly gained international attention sending women from New Delhi to Washington, Cork to London and Dublin to New York out protesting Ireland's backward ways with mawkish images of flickering candles, pictures of the dead woman and outrageous claims that Ms Halappanavar was literally killed by the Irish Catholic Church. All this and no one knew the real story except what was attested to by a husband who was bereaved. Mr. Halappanavar claimed that his wife went into Galway Hospital not for an abortion but because she felt ill. Later it seems the baby girl started to miscarry and, from what her husband Praveen stated, the baby was ill from E Coli ESBL and septicaemia. The baby died on Wednesday 24th October 2012 and Savita who was seriously ill from the same strain of bacteria was treated by antibiotics in intensive

care for four days until she died on the 28th October 2012. Praveen now tells the media that he is convinced that an abortion would have saved his wife's life but he is not a medical doctor or a nurse. We do not know any medical facts from the medical people who treated Savita or even indeed at this late stage know who those people were.

All of the media comment—well most of it—is just journalists generating column inches and sound bites for their own ideological purposes. It seems that the political establishment has been ambushed while trying to get to grips with the situation. Dr. Reilly, Minister for Health, has now two inquiries ongoing and no doubt the truth of what occurred will be reported in due course. In the meantime we have the pro-abortion elements in the media commentariat howling and baying for abortion legislation *now*.

What the Government must do now very urgently is to legislate for what is in accordance with the Constitution of Ireland Article 40.3.3 which states:

"The State acknowledges the right to life of the unborn and with due regard to the equal right to life of the mother, guarantees in its laws to respect, and, as far as practicable, by its laws to defend and vindicate that right."

The Constitution is quite clear. But where are the laws? No where! Fianna Fail, Labour and Fine Gael have utterly failed us on this and so has our Civil Service. No law. They have hidden behind the guidelines issued by the Medical Council for the guidance of Obstetricians and the principal guideline is:

"In current obstetrical practice, rare complications can arise where therapeutic intervention (including termination of a pregnancy) is required at a stage when, due to extreme immaturity of the baby, there may be little or no hope of the baby surviving. In these exceptional circumstances, it may be necessary to intervene to terminate the pregnancy to protect the life of the mother, while making every effort to preserve the life of the baby."

That is commonsense. It is easy to understand although not so easy in individual circumstances to apply. But it is as near as we are likely to get in terms of moral fairness to both mother and baby. It is also in accordance with Article 40.3.3 of the Constitution. So why does not Minister Reilly enact a law immediately embodying the Medical Council's guidelines? Why indeed? Why has Minister Reilly established a Commission loaded with pro-abortionists when the Constitution does not allow abortion? There is no problem for the Commission to examine

(which is why it does not meet much), other than the problem that Minister Reilly has not enacted into law the existing guidelines of the Medical Council. Fine Gael promised to do it before it was elected. It is a vital issue and so why was it not done? Is it because of the massive financial lobbying of the Abortion Industry? One hopes not but it doesn't simply stack up.

We need this legislation now. A good drafting lawyer could do it in a day or two and the Dáil and Seanad could pass it in a day or two, like they pass the laws on their own remuneration and expenses. If Taoiseach Enda Kenny and Minister Reilly are decent, honest representatives we will see this legislation enacted within a week. If they kick for touch again on it, the country will know what they are at and who is likely to be behind them.

PUBLIC INTEREST DIRECTORS

Public Interest Directors were appointed by Minister Brian Lenihan in 2008 into banks receiving public money. He said at the time that these Directors—two in each bank—were to defend the taxpayers' stake in the Banks. But he and his Civil Service did not tie down the function to be performed with the result that the appointees have 'gone native' and they are now Bankers instead of Watchdogs and the reason is very simple. When the bankers were on their knees looking for help from the taxpayers, Minister Lenihan handed over our money (easy!) and our bank guarantees (€440 billion—no problem!) without passing a law that the Public Interest Directors, in addition to their duties under the Companies Acts, should also have the power and the duty to report, say monthly, to the Minister for Finance and that the Banks should have a duty to give the Public Interest Directors all the data they needed to do their work. This was not done with the result that Minister Noonan, Department of Finance, has to recently state in the Dáil that he does not talk to the Public Interest Directors nor do they talk to him! This is a ridiculous situation and entirely unnecessary in view of the fact that the Government is in charge on our behalf. All the Government has to do is to pass a law to enable action by the Minister and the Public Interest Directors. If a Constitutional Amendment is needed, I think the citizens would have no problem with it to control the banks. The existing situation just does not stack up at all.

CHILDREN'S/ADOPTION REFERENDUM

This referendum does not stack up at all no matter how sanguinely you look at it:

- The Explanatory Memorandum with the Bill lied and misled the TDs and Senators who voted for it;
- The Fine Gael party's canvassing literature lied to the voters about it;
- Minister Frances Fitzgerald misrepresented the terms of the Referendum when she spoke in public and to the media about it; and to cap it all
- I and every other voter who had a vote to cast in two polling stations in Cork North Central were directed to the wrong place to vote. We were directed to vote at "Concert Hall, City Hall Booth 1, (Riverside Entrance) Cork".

But there were no polling booths at that address. A small inconspicuous notice on paper attached to the railings directed us to another building in another street inside of which there were two Polling Stations with two Polling Clerks at each. How many voters for these two polling Stations did not get to vote? The number is critical because the Yes exceeded the No in Cork North Central by 47 votes. Were there misdirections for other Polling Stations also? The Polling Clerk was quite insistent in demanding that I hand over my Voting Information Card with the address on it but I insisted the card was my property and she was not entitled to it. (What were they doing with people's seized cards?) I kept it, but there was a general air of disapproval around me which was certainly not pleasant!

Only 19.2% of the electorate voted Yes. That is 58% of the 33.49% who turned out. The Amendment was approved by 19.2% only of the electorate!

TERENCE MACSWINEY

Terence MacSwiney is the honoured name of the Lord Mayor of Cork who was arrested by the British Army, court-martialled by its officers, and locked up in Brixton Prison, London where he died on hunger strike in 1920. It took ninety years for his memory to be honoured by naming the shortest Quay in Cork after him—Terence MacSwiney Quay. That is the correct address of the City Hall and not "Concert Hall" and "Riverside Entrance". Who was responsible for this messing? No name was given for the official responsible on the Voting Information Card. Only "Cork City Council Register of Electors". Maybe those in City Hall don't know where they are either? Of course, the people have not spoken in this referendum.

Michael Stack ©

Desmond Bell's Frank Ryan. *Brendan Clifford* (Film Review)
Biteback: That Handshake! *Donal Kennedy* (Report)
Items From *The Irish Bulletin*. 11th June 1920 (12)
"Immediate And Terrible War"—Some British Army Plans. *Philip O'Connor*
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Auditors & Reporting)
Primitive Communism And Private Property, Mondragon, (9). *Lab. Com.*

August

Euro Crisis: Politics of Recovery vs Politics of Illusion. *Editorial*
The Past Was Orange. *Editorial*
The Moriarty Tribunal. *Editorial*
Biteback: Inviting 'Our Gallant Allies'. *Jack Lane* (Report). *Cory 'Terrorism' Claim Challenged. James Fitzgerald*
The Mystery Of The Dunmanway Killings. *Jack Lane*
Britannia's Children. *Wilson John Haire* (Poem)
Austerity, Aspiration And The Treaty. *Eamon Dyas*
Mitbestimmung. *John Minahane*
Europe Subverted. *Editorial*
Sinn Fein's Political DNA. *Seán McGouran* reports on a meeting
A Literary Fantasy. *Jack Lane*
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (Sinn Fein & Fine Gael; 'Modern' And 'Historic' Sinn Fein; Fine Gael; The Labour Party; The Irish Economy; The Bank Guarantee ... Again; Spanish Banking Crisis; British Benevolence; Science In Ireland)
Views Of Sinn Fein. *Stephen Richards, Brendan Clifford* (Letter Dispute)
Northern Ireland: Threat Of Regional Pay. *Michael Robinson*
An Irish Anti-Fascist Volunteer And Some Other Soldiers. *Manus O'Riordan* (Part 2)
Items From *The Irish Bulletin*. 8th July 1920 (13)
Cork Employment Resource Centre, 1988 to 2012. *John Holford* (Part 1)
Aquinas & Private Property. Mondragon, (10). *Lab. Com.*
Summer Floods & Water Privatisation. *Michael Robinson* (Report)

September

Northern Ireland: Proconsul Politics. *Editorial*
Feeding The Sectarian Thesis. *Jack Lane*
Editorial Digest. (Normal Politics?; SF & Prisoners; Challenges to SF; BICO)
Bill Sharkey. *Keith Sharkey* (Report of Appreciation)
Dunmanway: Some New Information. *Barry Keane* (Press Release)
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (Battle Station; Bill O'Herlihy; Charles Haughey; Journalistic Independence; Olympic Games; All That Glitters; London 2012; Olympics & Politics)
The Fiscal Treaty. *John Martin* (Reply to Eamon Dyas)
Friends Of The RIC? *Tom Cooper* (Letter)
On Certain Immutable Economic Laws. *Joe Keenan* (Reply to August Editorial on the Economic Crisis)
The Road To Recovery Is Through A New Social Compact. *John Martin* and *Philip O'Connor* (Reply to Joe Keenan)
How To Make Enemies And Appal People. *Wilson John Haire* (Poem)
Es Ahora. *Julianne Herlihy* (Phoenix Park Concert; Diplomatic Errors; Marriage Foundation UK; The Academics; Abuse Memorial)
Views Of Sinn Fein. *Pat Walsh* (Reply to Stephen Richards)
Items From *The Irish Bulletin*. 10th August 1920 (Part 14)
Biteback: Orange-Green Common Ground. *Roy Johnston* (Unpublished Letter)
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Public Service Ethic; Pensions; TDs' Liabilities)
Guilds And Communes. Mondragon, (11). *Lab. Com.*
Trade Union Notes
Obituary, Cork Employment Resource Centre, 1988-2012. *John Holford*

October

Political Resolution Of The Euro, "Step By Step". *Editorial*
Future Referendums On 'Europe'. *Jack Lane*
Armistice Day. *Donal Kennedy*
Readers' Letters: A Question Of Finance. *Ivor Kenna*
Socialism: Utopian Or Incoherent. *Joe Keenan*
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (Bank Guarantee ... Again; The Irish Times And Germany; Germany And Greece;
Queen Of Supermax. *Wilson John Haire* (poem)
Statement From *John Young*. Report on Eve Morrison and Kilmichael Ambush
Gush Shalom (A Palestinian Poem, contributed by David Morrison)

TRADE UNION NOTES

LESS TAX—Irish people are still paying far less tax than people in most other industrialised countries, says a new report by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

The OECD's annual report on the tax wedge, the amount paid by employee and employers minus welfare payments, shows that an Irish couple with one person earning and two children paid just 7.1% of their income in taxes last year, compared with an OECD average of 25%. (*Irish Independent*, 27.10.2012)

U.K. Trade Union membership—has fallen below six million for the first time since the 1940s.

There are now 5.98 million members of TUC-affiliated unions, which is fewer than half the number just 30 years ago.

The TUC blames the fall on job cuts in the public sector.

Trade Union ranks soared in the post-war years. By the end of the 1970s—a decade of widespread industrial unrest—more than 12 million workers were paying their subs.

According to TUC figures, union membership peaked in 1980 at 12.2 million. *RBC online*, 7.9.2012)

A Land War Leader, The Bard. *Jack Lane*
Es Ahora. *Julianne Herlihy* (British Embassy Party; Summer Book Launch Party; Irish Studies Journal; The TCD Connection; The Marriage Foundation; Colm Tóibín, Vargas Llosa And Roger Casement)
An Irish Anti-Fascist RAF Volunteer And Some Other Soldiers. *Manus O'Riordan* (Part 3)
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Children's Rights Referendum; Abortion Legislation; Constitutional Law And Children)
Items From *Irish Bulletin*, September 1920. Part 14
Team GB—The Anglo-Saxon Is A Sport! *Philip O'Connor*
The Captains And The Kings, poem by *Brendan Behan*
Labour Comment: Fanfani And The Guilds. Mondragon, Part 12
Trade Union Notes: Accidents; Earnings; Trade Surplus; Jobs Market; Tax on Workers

November

Some Home Truths. *Editorial*
A Pointless Presidency? J. Lane on Ireland And Europe
Readers' Letters: Uncritical Of Germany. *Kells Reader Stefan Lehne. Joe Keenan*
The Spirit Of Capitalism? *Giorgio Francesconi*
Dublin Fascists And British Legion Remembrance. *Peadar O'Donnell*
North Waziristan . . . not many dead. *Wilson John Haire* (Poem)
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (The RIC Commemoration; GUBU; British Intelligence; Brady Bluster)
How Capitalism Works In Blarney. *Jack Lane*
Political Engagement Or Utopianism? *John Martin* continues the Economic Debate
Es Ahora. *Julianne Herlihy* (Travels To Nordic Neighbours; Stockholm; Oslo)
Pat Murphy And The IWG. *Brendan Clifford*
Dunmanway Debate:
Prying Out Sectarianism. *Editorial Introduction*
Bureau Of Military History & The Dunmanway Controversy. *Jeff Dudgeon* (Letter)
Dunmanway: Some Comments. *Editorial Comment*
A Race Through Sectarianism. *Wilson John Haire*
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Children's Rights Referendum; Fourth Estate; The Bankers; USA Presidential Election)
Items From *Irish Bulletin*, October 1920. (15)
Guilds And The Law. Mondragon, (13). *Lab. Com.*
Finian McGrath Press Releases: Resigns As Chairperson Of Dail Technical Group; Fuel Costs

GUILDS continued

which, like all great pieces of English legislation, only purports to make clear something that has been already done.

CAPITALIST SYSTEM

"The tendency of national control to dwarf municipal or local effort has scarcely been sufficiently allowed for in Miss Kramer's book. It can be traced very clearly in the Poor Law and in the educational question of to-day. Although one may not be able to say that any specific statute made any radical change, the tendency of a whole series of statutes against the guilds is undoubtedly to weaken the position of institutions which were before all concerned with town economy, local matters, and local trade. That the guilds were equally dwarfed by the capitalistic system arising up alongside of them is perfectly true, but, never-the-less, the reiterated declaration of the Government that certain proceedings were unlawful must also have materially weakened the prestige of the guilds, and made men regard the Government as the controlling power over the local monopolies.

"Miss Kramer differs from Professor Ashley as to the effect of the Act of 1563 on the gild system. He looks upon the statute as marking the final superseding of the gild powers by the Crown. She considers that the system was in no way affected. She brings out very clearly that wages in towns had been settled hitherto by the municipalities acting in conjunction with the crafts, and she maintains that they still continue to do so.

"But the Act was not wholly without effect. We see this from an instance given by Mr. Unwin (*Industrial Organisation*, p.119). After the passing of the Statute of Artificers, the Lord Mayor of London caused the clothworkers to inquire into the wages of the journeymen. Some received £4, some £5, some £6 by the year, but 'in respect of the Act of Parliament lately provided they have agreed to give every journeyman for his wages by the year £7 if the Lord Mayor would so allow it'. The result of the statute was to move the Lord Mayor to take action; the Lord Mayor stirred up the City companies, who determined the rate of wages, and the result was a more uniform, and in many cases a higher, rate of wages. From that time onwards, in London at least, the rating of wages was fairly constant, as reports had to be made to the Privy Council, the guilds would be subject to a much more thorough supervision than before, and in so far their standing as industrial entities would be weakened.

GOVERNMENT NOT HOSTILE TO GUILDS?

"I am therefore unable to agree with Miss Kramer when she considers that the series of statutes of the sixteenth century left the guilds unaffected. At each step the Government assumed more and more responsibility for industrial conditions. The cumulative effect of such statutes no doubt tended to accelerate the decline of the guilds, which were suffering at the same time from the competition of the capitalistic system. The Government certainly was not hostile to the guilds, although Henry VIII found it convenient to appropriate some of their money. It was far too useful a thing to have men grouped together in some form where they could be effectively regulated, and could carry out the Government's instructions. But the statutes altered the position of the crafts. They had become in the sixteenth century national institutions and national instruments as they never had been before. Alongside, and far more important, were the justices of the peace, whose prestige

overshadowed that of the guilds even as regulating agents. The essence of the old gild system was that the crafts were municipal institutions, and Miss Kramer has brought out in a very interesting manner how far they were, after all, dependent on the municipality. But because no sudden upheaval can be traced, it seems an exaggeration to say that the statutes were a dead letter. They were the expression of the subordination of the municipal to the national, which was bound to so alter the character of the merely municipal that it becomes a totally different thing. The Statute of Artificers professes to make no change, only to make former statutes clear. But clearness makes for efficient application, and in the hands of a vigorous administration like that of Elizabeth I, the Government and not the guilds became finally responsible for the regulation of the industrial life of the nation."

(Lilian Knowles, *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 15, No. 60 (Dec., 1905), pp.543-548.)

TRADE UNION NOTES

AVERAGE PAY—The economic downturn has taken a big chunk out of the average worker's pay packet since 2008.

Average annual earnings across all sectors were €35,900 last year, a fall of close to €900 in just three years.

Earnings fell by 0.6% last year and by 2.4% over the previous three years, the Central Statistics Office said.

Bankers and those in insurance and other parts of the finance industry are the highest earners of 13 different sectors looked at by the CSO.

The average gross wage for bankers and insurance staff works out at almost €51,000 a year -- but it is still a fall of 4.5% since 2008.

The lowest earners are in the catering industry, where the average gross pay is just short of €17,000.

Earnings in the accommodation and food services sector fell almost 7% since 2008.

Of the 13 different employment sectors studied by the CSO, there was a fall in average earnings in all but the industry category.

Experts said this reflected pay levels in multinationals in the pharmaceutical areas.

The biggest drop in the past three years was in the arts and entertainment sector, where earnings fell by 10% to €23,400.

In construction, there was a 9% fall in the last three years with earnings now averaging €35,611.

High pay was also to be found in IT and in the public sector. The average gross

earnings for jobs in information and communications was €49,768.

In public administration and defence, the average gross salary worked out at €47,060 last year.

Average earnings fell in all but five sectors last year—wholesale and retail, transportation and storage, information and communication, administrative and support services and education.

Along with pay cuts, workers have also been hit with a range of income tax changes and the introduction of the universal social charge.

These changes were not included in the gross earnings figures put out by the CSO yesterday. (*Irish Independent*, 8.11.2012)

EATING YOUR CAKE AND HAVING IT—Hospital consultants have voted in favour of work practice changes by a slim majority—but no doctor is bound by the decision.

A survey by the Irish Hospital Consultants' Association (IHCA) has resulted in 57% of its members saying yes.

The changes include working evenings and weekends, giving more power to clinical directors and speeding up the signing of forms to collect private health insurance bills for public hospitals.

However, the IHCA leaves it to each individual member to decide if they want to accept changes. (*Irish Examiner*, 2.11.2012)

*****To page 25

GUILDS continued

statute was probably not wholly without effect, though, of course, they might have done the same if there had been no statute. The importance of the statute lies in the fact that it constitutes a precedent for Government interference with the guilds. The thin end of the wedge is always the important thing in English law. We only progress by proving a precedent. It is only natural that the significance of a precedent should not strike an American who is not steeped in the historical-mindedness of the English temperament. It is this tendency to assume that what is in reality a change is nominally no alteration of what has gone before that makes it so difficult to trace craft history.

"That English ruling class, forged through the chaos of the 17th century, which took command in the 18th century, came close in the 19th century and early 20th to achieving its ambition to rule the world, is one of the wonders of political history.

"But what is a wonder to me is how it elicited such deferential submission from the social layers beneath it, because it was not a traditional aristocracy but an upstart elite. But it did generate deference.

"This is the genesis of Imperialist England as far as I have been able to figure it out."

(Brendan Clifford Appendix,
The Genesis of National Socialism
by T. Desmond Williams, 2012.)

"Mr. Unwin, whose excellent book on *Industrial Organisation* Miss Kramer does not seem to know, has stated this very forcibly. 'A love of compromise which prevents the latent issue from taking visible shape, a disposition to ignore transition and to disguise change—these are political virtues of the first order, but they are apt to obscure the significance of history by concealing the working of those ideal forces, by reference to which alone a progressive development becomes intelligible.' It was no novelty for the Government to interfere in civic affairs. As Miss Kramer herself points out, it had already regulated the prices of bread and ale, and decreed uniform weights and measures. Here was the precedent which could be extended to industrial affairs, and in England, when once an interference has taken place, it is the groundwork of future action. Hence it seems to me that Miss Kramer has underrated the significance of the Act of 1437, and that Dr. Cunningham is right when he sees in it the precedent of the

nationalising of industrial organisation.

JUDGES TAKE OVER

"The effect of the Act can be judged better when we come to the Act of 1503, which Professor Ashley has termed 'a significant departure'. This gave the supervision of the guild ordinances over to the judges. One can again argue that there was little change here. The justices of the peace, whether town of country, were judicial functionaries representing the Crown. It is merely an administrative change transferring the oversight from one branch of the judicature to another. But the new authorities were not local men, and therefore were probably more independent, and the alteration, in intention at least, signifies a tightening of the royal authority over the guilds. That this Act was not a dead letter is shown by the fact that the London companies obtained the proper legal endorsement, and if the great and wealthy City companies had to come into line, it is not probable that lesser corporations escaped. Indeed, there are many instances of such authorisation, although in some cases, such as Exeter and Bristol, no record of such a proceeding seems to have survived. Miss Kramer seems to consider that the new Act must have failed in effect, since she has been unable to discover any disapproval of craft ordinances. This does not necessarily mean that the judges failed in their duty. It might equally be interpreted to mean that when the guilds presented their ordinances they eliminated those rules which they knew would not pass, and that the Act, therefore, had the required effect. Even if the judges ruled out certain ordinances, it is not likely that this would be recorded. They would pass those they approved of—no judge could condemn everything—and the general result would be a registered authorisation of the rules. The statute of 1503 had complained of the action of the craft guilds in regard to 'prices of wares'. Miss Kramer brings forward some interesting evidence to show that prices were in many instances fixed by municipal authorities, and not by the guilds, and she argues that the crafts did not 'claim the power to determine the price of an article on guild authority alone', and that, since they never had the power of determining prices, they could not be deprived of it. Professor Ashley, she considers, is wrong when he maintains that the Act of 1503 was a great blow at guild authority in the matter of prices.

GILDS FIX PRICES

"But the Government evidently con-

sidered that the guilds had the power to fix prices, for it directly accuses them in the preamble of making 'unlawful and unreasonable ordinances as well in prices of wares and other thing'. It may have been unlawful for them to do this, but they obviously did it, for it forms the chief specific indictment against them. The preamble, by the way, purports to be quoting from the earlier statute of 1437, and seems to assume, therefore, that the guilds had the power of arranging prices when the earlier Act was passed.

"Although Miss Kramer considers that 'no important modification' follows this Act, she herself admits that it formed part the whole industrial policy of the English Government, and as such, therefore, it clearly points to an overshadowing of guilds by the increasing authority of the central Government. It was an attempt to fit them into the national scheme of well-ordered life, in which the crafts were bound to lose initiative and the control of industrial life, and become mere instruments of the Government. The statutes point, not in the destruction of the guilds, but to their subordination. We notice the same thing happening directly the Poor Law gets fairly under way. It is first of all largely an affair of charity and the municipality. The State interferes with a few general directions in 1536, making, so it would seem, little or no visible change. From that time onwards we trace the progressive intensification of control until we get the system completely nationalised and codified by 1601. The same tendency may be traced again in the nineteenth century in educational matters and in the factory laws. English history is composed of small experiments which accumulate into great schemes. Miss Kramer considers the re-enactment of an Act as an evidence of its previous futility. This seems to me scarcely an accurate interpretation. Almost every statute verbally strengthens its predecessor a little, makes some small change, and the aggregate is large. The Act of 1503, which dealt with prices, is followed up by the Acts of 1531 and 1537, which dealt with apprentices, till the whole is codified in the great Statute of Artificers*.

* The Statute of Artificers was a group of English laws (1558-63) which regulated the supply and conduct of labour. In particular it set wages of certain classes of worker, it regulated the quality of people entering certain professions by laying down rules for apprenticeships and it restricted the free movement of workers. Effectively, it transferred to the newly forming English state the functions previously held by the feudal craft guilds. The Statute was abolished in 1814.

continued on page 26



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 30 No. 12

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

Mondragon, Part 14

"Two conclusions previously reached by Dr. Kramer and other authorities are reinforced; namely, that conflict was an important force not only in the institution and progress of the English guilds, but also in their amalgamation and subsequent decline; and that governmental hostility and repression had relatively little to do with their final fate" (Alfred Plummer, Ruskin College, Oxford, 1927, *Labour Comment*, November 2012.)

Craft Guilds and the Government

"...anyone who has the temerity to follow in her steps will have an unprofitable task" was the summary of T.H. (Thomas Humphrey) Marshall, the British sociologist, referring to *The English Craft Guilds: Studies in their Progress and Decline*, published 1927 by US sociologist Dr. Stella Kramer.

Twenty-two years previously, in a review of Dr. Kramer's *The English Craft Guilds And The Government* (1905), Professor Lilian Knowles (1870-1926) of the School of Economics, London, had the 'temerity' to challenge a core principle of Kramer's writings, namely that the role of "governmental hostility and repression had relatively little to do with their final fate"

Professor Knowles (1870-1926) entered the School of Economics as a research student in 1896. She remained connected with the School for the rest of her life; she was the second person of either sex to hold a Chair of Economic History. "*She had no taste for re-setting old tales.*" It was 1921 before she published her first book: *The Industrial and Commercial Revolution in Great Britain during the Nineteenth Century*.

The London School of Economics and Political Science (informally the London School of Economics or LSE) was founded in 1895 by Fabian Society members Sidney Webb, Beatrice Webb and George Bernard Shaw.

Below we reproduce Mrs. Knowles review in full:

"The main purpose of this book is to formulate a destructive criticism of views which have been hitherto held by eminent economic historians as to the relations between the craft guilds and the central

Government in England. The craft guilds were the dominating feature of English industrial life between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries; by the time of Elizabeth I they change in character and become something essentially different from the old craft guilds of mediaeval England. They have become associations of capitalists acting under the orders of the central Government. In attempting to account for this transformation much stress has been laid on a series of statutes purporting to regulate the guilds and the conditions of labour generally, the general effect of which was to accelerate the decline of the guilds as arbiters of trade in their localities. Miss Kramer's point is to prove that to whatever cause this decline may have been due, it certainly was not due to legislation. That the English Government, thoroughly conservative in its industrial policy, was responsible by legislative enactments for the decline of the guild system is altogether unlikely. All the

weight of available evidence shows the State encouraging the old craft companies to the last.'

NATIONALISING THE GILDS

"She begins by criticising Dr. Cunningham's view of the Act of 1437. In the preamble the guilds were accused of making 'unlawful and unreasonable ordinances', and were ordered in future to submit their rules to the justices of the peace or the chief governors of the cities. This was a direct interference from above with a municipal institution, and Dr. Cunningham considers it to be an important step towards nationalising these institutions (I., 445).

"According to Miss Kramer, this Act had no real effect and denoted no change, and cannot, therefore, be reckoned as a factor in the decline of the guilds. She brings out very clearly that, nominally at least, the municipalities had control of the craft ordinances for more than a century, and that the statute only reiterated the usual custom when it ordered the guilds to submit their rules to the chief governors of the city.

"The novelty, however, seems to lie in the fact that the Government should interfere at all, and should back up the legitimate authorities. The statute itself seems to prove that the conduct of the guilds had become definitely a national affair, and though under so weak a Government as that of Henry VI, the Act possibly amounted to little more than a pious opinion as to what ought to be done, still, it formed the groundwork of the Act of 1503. Moreover, Miss Kramer adduces instances (p.53) to prove that the guilds did present their ordinances for approbation to the municipalities, and therefore the

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

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

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

33 Athol Street, Belfast BT12 4GX or

2 Newington Green Mansions, London N16 9BT

or *Labour Comment*, TEL: 021-4676029
C/O Shandon St. P.O., Cork

Subscription by Post:

12 issues: Euro-zone & World Surface: €40;
Sterling-zone: £25

Electronic Subscription:

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

You can also order from:

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

continued on page 27