

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

November 2012

Vol.27, No.11 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.26 No.11 ISSN 954-5891

Some Home Truths . . .

Ireland is a capitalist democracy. This means that Ireland democratically chose capitalism—doesn't it?

Can it be said that a capitalist democracy did not actually chose capitalism? That it had no choice in the matter because it lives in a region of the world where nothing else was possible, or allowable?

When Bill Clinton was President of the United States, and decided most of what went on in the world, he said that liberty was democracy and free markets—or was it that democracy was liberty and free markets? Anyway, free markets were an essential element. And America had the means of ensuring that what it considered essential was what existed. And Irish democracy was happy to comply with what America judged to be essential. It made itself an instrument of the American campaign, seconded by Britain, at the end of the Cold War, to ensure that nothing but freely-operating capitalism could exist in the world—that is to say, capitalism that operated freely in the service of Ameranglian hegemony.

The great obstacle in Europe to the free operations of capital globally was the well-ordered and corrupt crony capitalism of Germany.

The corrupt practices of crony capitalism became the catch-all explanation of situations in which capitalism did not make most people in a society better-off.

Crony capitalism—as far as one could gather its meaning from its regular use by the *Irish Times*—was when economic decisions were made outside the market and imposed on the market. At one moment the great crony capitalist who corruptly obstructed the free flow of capital around the world in search of profit to the benefit of everybody was Dr. Mahatir of Malaysia. Dr. Mahatir's political interference with the market was certain to bring misery on his people.

When it turned out that Dr. Mahatir's obstruction of the globalist market saved Malaysia from the misery that overtook neighbouring countries which complied with globalist demands, we just heard no more about him from the globalist media.

And likewise with Robert Mugabe. After fighting a war he made a settlement with Britain, under which the white colonial regime in Rhodesia was to be dismantled and the country was to become the independent state of Zimbabwe. It was part of the agreement that Britain would finance the abolition of the colonial land settlement—would buy out the landowners it had imposed on the country in comparatively recent times and return the land to the natives. But Britain's concern about Rhodesia was limited to ending the Unilateral Declaration of Independence, which the Rhodesia settlers had made and which the international situation made it inexpedient for it to recognise as legitimate. It was itself not willing to undertake military action against its "*kith and kin*" in Rhodesia. It let the Rhodesian natives fight a war for independence against the kith and kin and then acted as intermediary to bring about majority rule, i.e. democracy.

Britain did not honour its undertaking to finance a land reform to end the colonial land settlement. The white settlers were therefore left in possession of the land seized in a recent conquest, protected by a legal system designed for the conquest.. When Mugabe resorted to direct action to take the land and distribute it amongst those who had fought the war for independence, the Courts held his actions to be unlawful. A great global cry was started up against the illegality, corruption, cronyism and authoritarianism of the Mugabe regime, and it was reported that by dispossessing the white settlers (called

continued on page 2

Ireland And Europe

A Pointless Presidency?

Enda Kenny and most of the Cabinet went to Brussels on 3rd October:

"Taoiseach Enda Kenny will seek to establish "clear lines of communication" prior to Ireland's looming presidency of the EU when he and more than half the Cabinet hold discussions with the European Commission in Brussels today, a Government spokesman said" (*Irish Times*, 3 October 2012).

In this day of emails, Facebook and Twitter it is patently absurd that the Taoiseach and a host of Ministers would need to go to Brussels to "*clear lines of communication*" and this is obviously a euphemism for a real problem.

The real 'breakdown' was spelt out in the same report:

"Today's meetings take place in the aftermath of last week's joint statement by finance ministers from Germany, Finland and the Netherlands, which was seen as contradicting a pledge by EU leaders in June to help break the link between bank and sovereign debt. The Government spokesman last night played down the significance of the finance ministers' declaration and said the June 29th statement was "a very clear signal of intent and a decision on behalf of all the heads of government to very clearly break the link between bank and sovereign debt"..."

At the Brussels meetings the Taoiseach and 10 other Government figures met 27 Commissioners and discussed Ireland's Presidency of the EU, which starts on 1st January, and there was plenty sympathy and reassuring words for the Government's case for sticking to the June 29th Council agreement. But words are cheap when you don't have the power or responsibility to follow up on your words and that is the stark reality about all the people met by Kenny and company.

Kenny has been shocked at the three

continued on page 6

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Some Home Truths. Editorial	1
A Pointless Presidency? Jack Lane on <i>Ireland And Europe</i>	1
Readers' Letters: Uncritical Of Germany. Kells Reader	3
Stefan Lehne. Joe Keenan	3
The Spirit Of Capitalism? Giorgio Francesconi	14
Dublin Fascists And British Legion Remembrance. Peadar O'Donnell	7
North Waziristan . . . not many dead. Wilson John Haire (Poem)	7
Shorts from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (The RIC Commemoration; GUBU; British Intelligence; Brady Bluster)	8
How Capitalism Works In Blarney. Jack Lane	9
Political Engagement Or Utopianism? John Martin continues the <i>Economic Debate</i>	10
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (Travels To Nordic Neighbours; Stockholm; Oslo)	12
Pat Murphy And The IWG. Brendan Clifford	15
Dunmanway Debate:	
Prying Out Sectarianism. Editorial Introductio	18
Bureau Of Military History And The Dunmanway Controversy. Jeff Dudgeon (Letter)	19
Dunmanway: Some Comments. Editorial Comment.	21
A Race Through Sectarianism. Wilson John Haire	22
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Children's Rights Referendum; Fourth Estate; The Bankers; USA Presidential Election)	24
Items From <i>Irish Bulletin</i>, October 1920. (Part 15 of series)	25

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

Guilds And The Law

Mondragon, Part 13

(back page)

McGrath Resigns As Chairperson Of Dail Technical Group

Fuel Costs

(Press Releases, page 27)

influenced by what they know.

Without a healthy core of crony capitalism and corruption committed to the national interest, countries are helpless today. It used to be the case—not very long ago in historical terms—when peoples might do their own thing according to their own inclinations. There is now no corner of the world so out-of-the-way and so backward that it is left alone to do its own thing. Nothing in the world is now outside the world market. The world market now includes everything in the world. It was created by Britain and the United States. Two decisive events in its creation were the British war on China in 1841 to compel it to open itself to the sale of opium from British India, and the arrival of American warships in Japan ten years later with an ultimatum that it must abandon the peaceful, unprofitable seclusion in which it had lived for centuries and open itself to the world—or else!

There was once an argument that international trade as good for everybody because it wouldn't happen if it wasn't. And there was a degree of truth in it when the world consisted of countries that were basically self-sufficient and so were free to exchange products for products as they saw fit. That world has gone. World capitalism has for some time been the medium of existence of all countries. And what goes on in international trade is not the trading of product for product but the movement around the world of capital from a handful of powerful centres, with capital increasingly taking on magical financial forms. And, if there is not yet complete freedom of trade, freedom to trade or not trade has long gone. The world will not allow freedom not to trade—the world being the control exerted by a few states over the 180 states that exist in it.

The great advocate of free trade in Ireland for many years was Garret Fitz Gerald. Free trade was sacred. It was the engine of economic growth. Then one day it struck him that there had been enough economic growth. He thought that the world should be content to settle down where it was at. What was the point of the rush for still further economic growth at an ever-accelerating pace with no conceivable end to it?

But how can the world be stopped without everything being thrown into chaos?

He had written his free trade propaganda for forty years without asking what it was all about, and without seeing that the more

"commercial farmers"), he was bringing about famine conditions in what had once been an agriculturally productive country and that mass starvation was imminent.

What the "commercial farmers" were was never explained in the global media. It was only with difficulty that it could be found out that they were the colonisers, who still owned vast tracts of land, and that each employed hundreds of labourers to produce luxury goods cheaply for European markets.

A democratic Opposition party based on the urban working class was cultivated and financed by Britain and Europe. The fact that it could not win elections was explained by authoritarianism and corruption, rather than the fact that it represented a minority interest in the country. The regime held firm against this internal Opposition which was the spearhead of international capitalist pressure in support of the colonial land settlement.

No actual famine was reported although year after year the international media declared it to be imminent.

Then a remarkable thing happened.

Mugabe disabled the globalist campaign by persuading the Tsvangirai movement to join the actual Zimbabwean national democracy instead of acting as the spearhead of the propagandist ideological democracy of globalist capital. He accepted the land reform. He was therefore of no further use to his international backers. He entered into Coalition with Mugabe and joined in regularising the condition of post-colonial Rhodesia, and Zimbabwe was dropped out of the news.

The character of the Western media as a propaganda apparatus of globalist capital was clearly demonstrated in this event.

The Irish media might have been expected to understand the Zimbabwean situation, and to at least remain silent, because of the crucial part that reform of a colonial land system played in the Irish national movement. But Irish history has been subjected to a process of erosion by Oxbridge hegemony of the History Departments of Irish Universities during the past thirty years, and it sometimes seems that those who still know something about it feel obliged to show that they are not

capitalism was driven towards globalist free trade, the less possible it was for it to settle down peacefully. Capital is restless. It must be always on the go. It is under internal compulsion to expand. Its purpose is to produce profit—i.e. to expand itself. But profit must be able to invest itself, or it withers. And invested profit expands the capital which must produce even more profit. A boom is generated and the pace of the boom increases until there is a slump. And there must be a slump because the hectic character of the boom causes the elements of the system to get out of alignment. The slump leads to destruction of economic resources. Firms go out of business. The fittest or the luckiest survive. Then business begins to pick up again at a lower level, but at a level higher than the low point of the previous slump.

We are at present going through a slump. By choosing capitalism we chose a boom and slump system of economy. And, if we chose it, we have no grounds as a democracy for complaining about the slump. If it is held that we did not choose it, then there is something very false about the meaning we attributed to democracy.

The international capitalist system—the international system in which capital flows more or less freely around half of the world—took a lot of arranging. It was established by the English ruling class of the 1688 Revolution by means of war and trade, following the vision of its martyred prophet, Algernon Sidney. As between war and trade, war was the dominant element—as the Irish, who were its first victims, should know. Trade could not have broken open the world for English capital. Nor could defensive war. Sidney laid down the principle that offensive war was best, and no one has yet counted all the offensive wars by which his successors established the world market.

The traditional societies of the world did not destroy themselves under some magical influence exerted on them by the example of capitalist market activity. They had to be conquered by the overwhelming military power generated by capitalism, and be broken down internally by that power, before they could be made to see the merit of living life in the medium of the market, and have their politics remade into the game that we call democracy. Few of them have been any good at that game. The crudity with which they play it is called corruption. But we in the capitalist centres do not want them to be good at it, because if they were they would take effective capitalist control of their material resources, which we need, and sell them

Uncritical Of Germany

I wish to renew my subscription to your excellent publication... Overall, your publication is good but perhaps unduly sympathetic and uncritical of German Government intentions in relation to the Euro and attitude towards Irish banking crisis. Just because the British Tories have historically adopted an imperialist and oppressive approach to Ireland; particularly the six counties during the recent 30 year old troubles there; does not mean that their euro-scepticism in relation to a single European state and currency is completely wrong; and that the German establishment's actions and intentions towards other EU nation states are necessarily totally unselfish and positive.

Kells Reader

Stefan Lehne

I note that in the *Irish Political Review* editorial of October 2012 Stefan Lehne is described as "*the leading foreign policy functionary of the Austrian State*".

That was true until about a year ago. Now he is a visiting scholar at Carnegie Europe at Brussels.

Stefan Lehne was formerly an important Austrian bureaucrat. He is now an academic working with what appears to be an important American foreign policy think tank. This distinction is very important and should have been taken into consideration in writing the editorial.

The Austrian State since the Second World War has skilfully applied Christian Democratic and Socialist policies. As a result it appears to be weathering the present international financial crisis more successfully than other EU member states. However, as Lehne has retired from his civil service position, and is now working for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, it is not at all clear that Lehne is propagating Christian Democratic views within that body. That should have been taken account of in the editorial, which gave a misleading impression of Lehne's standing by suggesting that he represented the position of the Austrian State in that body.

Joe Keenan

dear to us. It is very useful to us to be able to moralise about their capitalist ineffectiveness as corruption as we simply plunder their material resources.

Ten years ago Ireland was participating exuberantly in the international capitalist boom that followed the collapse of the Soviet threat to the system. There was then no democratic possibility of imposing restraints on the boom in order to lessen the shock of the inevitable slump.

We are now dependent on the Germans to alleviate the impact of the slump on us—and we have become very anti-German. We congratulate ourselves on having rejected the influence of James Connolly and Roger Casement in 1914 and taken part in the Hun-hating war on Germany. We embrace that war, which had disastrous consequences for Europe, as "*Our War*". We deplore the military action we had to engage in to gain independence after we had voted for it because Britain refused to accept the verdict of the ballot-box, but we glorify militarism if it is British. Those who made possible the establishment of an Irish democracy were psychopaths,

serial killers. But the Fighting Irish were great—the ones who joined the British Army.

We hate Germany because it is bailing us out, and become like English Jingoos. But how did it happen that Germany is in a position to bail us out? Because it maintained a system of crony capitalism lubricated by corruption and thereby restrained itself. It did not immerse itself in the market. It remained capable of not shopping over long weekends. It kept up a cosy, informal relationship between local banks and local industry. And the German "*economic miracle*" following the massive destruction inflicted on it in 1944-5 and by post-War plundering, was accomplished in the baffling ideological medium of Papal Encyclicals.

We were not always baffled by that fact. Britain was, which was why Europe escaped from it in the post-War generation. And now we have progressed and are baffled by it too.

Britain disdainfully refused to join in the European project at the start. When it took off, it tried to join but was refused

during the Christian Democrat era of Adenauer and De Gaulle. Eventually it got in and set about subverting the project from inside. There was a great "corruption" campaign against Christian Democracy, in which Ireland was active. There was the campaign for random expansion, which wrecked the original dynamic. And then Britain appointed a Minister For Free Capitalism In Europe—a *Minister for Competition*—who set about eroding restrictive practices.

And the first Minister for Competition was the former radical socialist, Kim Howells, who was Arthur Scargill's lieutenant in the Miners' Strike that miscarried. English socialist opposition to the EU in the first instance was that it was an obstacle to socialist development. When socialism collapsed as a mass movement in England—largely as a consequence of Scargill's misconceived Strike—many socialists moved easily from opposition to the EU on the ground that it was an obstacle to socialism, to opposition on the ground that it was an obstacle to free capitalism.

The anti-corruption campaign against Germany was successful in greatly reducing the crony capitalist relationship of finance and industry. This made it necessary for the banks to find something else to do with their money. So they began speculative investment in the international money market. (What else could they have done? They had to do something. Capitalist money of the modern kind evaporates if it isn't used.) And this contributed something to the boom in which capitalism in Ireland was unable to restrain itself.

But Germany did not immerse itself entirely in the money markets. And, when the slump came, it was the only EU state capable of alleviating its effect. Therefore it is hated.

Survival of the Eurozone now depends on Franco-German collaboration. France is important chiefly for political reasons. It is the biggest EU state not on the verge of bankruptcy and it has the moral status of having come out on top in the last two Franco-German wars.

At the present moment, Ireland remaining committed to capitalism, the only practical course of action is the one adopted by Brian Lenihan at the start of the crisis—to tighten itself up in the way required by Germany. (It is unthinkable that it should emulate the German system—the crony capitalist/corruption nonsense is still too thick in the air.)

It is, of course, possible that the Eurozone will break up and the EU will fall

apart. And a prudent democracy prepares for credible contingencies. Anti-EU policies are therefore not politically irrelevant, though they do not meet the practical requirements of the moment. However the existing anti-EU positions need a much greater critical engagement with European realities if they are to be effective in such an eventuality.

*

It is a measure of the strength of Thomas Pringle's legal challenge to Ireland's ratification of the European Stability Mechanism that the Irish Courts referred vital aspects of his case for settlement by the European Union Court at Luxemburg. Moreover, for the first time ever, the EU Court will sit with all 27 judges presiding. (Each member-state has a representative in the Court. Usually the Judges sit in groups of 3, 5 or sometimes 15. With all the Judges sitting, it means the voice of British Judge Christopher Vajda QC will be heard. The Irish representative is Aindrias Ó Caoimh.)

Pringle's case exploits the dichotomy between the European Union and the Eurozone States. With Britain vetoing coherent EU action to deal with the financial crisis, states confronted with the need to take practical measures to save the Euro have been obliged to stretch the EU Constitution to find authority for their actions.

The European Stability Mechanism, which has been allocated 500 billion Euros and is empowered to fund indebted states, is not a proper institution of the European Union argues Labour's John Rogers, Pringle's barrister:

"Developed in haste, the ESM treaty is at odds with and undermines the EU legal order... In trying to defend the compatibility of the ESM with the EU treaties, the intervening member states and institutions have had to engage in mischaracterization and distortion in the confusion of form and substance and in legal and conceptual contradictions" (see *Washington Post*, 23.10.12).

"We are concerned that a body outside the union and not subject to union law could take measures in connection with the union and dictate conditions that will be imposed on member states in matters so fundamental and integral to the union as its economy and its currency" (Irish Times 23.10.12).

Pringle argues that the ESM, which was declared operational on 8th October, violates the no-bailout provision under EU law and encroaches on the role of the EU in economic and monetary policy.

He says that the creation of the ESM, which like the temporary European Financial Stability Facility can offer financial

aid in return for budget-austerity conditions on Governments, needed a change in the Treaty on the functioning of the EU. Thus the March 2011 decision by EU Governments to change a legal provision in the Treaty to allow for the creation of the ESM was adopted incorrectly.

He also describes the ESM as an inter-Governmental Treaty done outside the EU and an illegal mechanism to "circumvent" the bailout prohibition in existing European Treaties, according to court documents. John Rogers argues:

"We are concerned that a body outside the union and not subject to union law could take measures in connection with the union and dictate conditions that will be imposed on member states in matters so fundamental and integral to the union as its economy and its currency"

Koen Lenaerts, a Belgian and Vice-President of the court, asked Rogers about the meaning of the word bailout: "Are you really saying that member states would, as a matter of union law, be prohibited to help one another in whatever framework it would be?" Lenaerts is the reporting judge and will write the draft judgment that will serve as a starting point for discussion among the judges. (The court's final decision won't show dissenting judges' views or how the vote was split.)

Michael Cush, leader of the Irish state's legal team Ireland told the court. that it regards the ESM provisions as "fully compatible with the treaties". He says that Pringle's arguments "ignore the actual wording of the amendment" and "above all its purpose, which is to confirm that the euro-area member states may in times of crisis establish a stability mechanism".

"Such a mechanism will not affect the union's exclusive competence regarding monetary policy for the euro area nor will it increase the limited competence that it has in respect of the co-ordination of the member states' economic policy" (Irish Times 23.10.12).

The ESM is formally due to enter into force on 1st January, 2013 and the European Court of Justice has been forced to fast-track the case, in order to avoid interfering with that timetable.

*

At a moment when Irish economic recovery is heavily dependent on consolidation of the Euro-zone by Franco-German action, and Britain has committed itself to independent development outside the Eurozone (and therefore in conflict with it), the Irish Establishment, lacking a European dimension in its make-up, is adapting itself to British requirements. it refuses to take part in the Transaction Tax which the

City of London has rejected. And it has consulted the British Ambassador about how centenary commemorations of national events leading to the formation of the Irish state should be conducted, even though those events occurred in conflict with Britain.

Irish national morale at the level of the State has been in a condition of collapse for forty years—excepting the years when Charles Haughey was Taoiseach, made Ireland a presence in Europe, made it a participant in the post-Cold War capitalism boom, and was blackguarded for it at home.

The moral collapse came about because the Irish Establishment was conned into accepting responsibility for the effects of British misgovernment in Northern Ireland. It fell into a state of mind in which it appeared that to hold Britain responsible for what Britain did with the Six Counties would be an expression of paranoid Anglophobia.

The British Ambassador suggests that Irish centenary events should be rolled up in a package with British centenary events for "inclusive" commemoration.

Britain manipulated European conflicts to bring about the Great War against Germany, Austria and Turkey. James Connolly and Roger Casement were of the opinion that its purpose was to maintain its world dominance by putting down a serious trade rival. We are required to dismiss that opinion without thinking about it—it would not be so easy to dismiss it if it was thought about—and to subscribe to the view that in organising that catastrophic war Britain was somehow defending freedom.

Britain won this war for freedom, and then arranged things so well that it launched another World War for freedom twenty years later. Large numbers of Irishmen joined the British Army at the instigation of the Home rule Party for the 1914 affair. In 1939, the 26 County Irish state, having just freed itself from British occupation by getting its ports back in 1938, decided not to make itself available to Britain for the War. (That is what neutrality meant. Britain had ensured that Ireland did not have an Army capable of fighting a war.) The British propaganda said that, because Ireland did not make itself available as a British base of operations, it was "the neutral island in the heart of men". And in recent years it has been cultivating the notion that Ireland was a kind of black hole, so closed in on itself that it denied that there was a World War going on in the world, and called the World War the

Emergency. (See, for example, Dr. Fearghal McGarry in *Irish Historical Studies* No. 136: "Much of the extensive historiography of Irish-German relations was understandably focussed on the 2nd World War, or the Emergency as it was known in Ireland".) In fact the 2nd World War, as a military event, was amply described in the Irish papers. The Emergency was the condition in which Ireland was put by this war in which it did not take part.

The victor in that war was Communist Russia. Nazi Germany, having defeated Britain and France in Europe, was held and driven back by Communist Russia. While Russia was stopping the Nazis, and Britain was doing no fighting worth mentioning, convoys of supplies from America were sent to Russia on British shipping. The Russian Government recently wanted to award medals to survivors of those Arctic Convoys, but the British Government ordered that British citizens would not be allowed to accept them.

From 1941 to 1945 Communist Russia was the beacon of freedom in the British propaganda. Russian victory made half of Europe Communist. Cold War against Russia began immediately in 1945, and Churchill wanted to make it a hot war while America had the monopoly of nuclear weapons. Forty-five years later the Soviet system collapsed and Russia was thrown open to Western capitalist intrusion. It was good from 1941 to 1945. It became evil through having defeated Nazism. In 1990 it became good again. No difficulty would have been made about the awarding of Russian war medals during the 1990s, when Western capital did as it pleased in Russia and the standard of living in Russia plummeted. But now Russian capitalism has taken itself in hand, and acquired the ability to operate the market in the national interest. It is no longer helpless prey to Western capital, so it is evil again. So convoy survivors are forbidden to accept medals for their contribution to the Russian defeat of Nazism.

And T.P. O'Mahony, Religious Correspondent of the *Irish [Cork] Examiner*, sees the prison sentences given to Pussy Riot for pornographic blasphemy in a Cathedral as a dire threat to democratic freedom. During the Cold War the curbing of religion in Russia was one of the evils of the regime. Now it seems that it is religion that is the evil.

*

A suggestion that the Royal Irish

Constabulary should be parcelled up with the Guards and their "murder" in 1916-21 be commemorated proved to be a step too far for the time being.

The RIC was Irish in the same way that the Indian Government of the time was Indian—that is to say, that it was an apparatus of the British state for controlling the natives whose name it took.

Ireland was notionally an integral part of the British state under the Union, and therefore part of the ruling body of the Empire. But the police force in Ireland was organised on different principles to the police force in England. It was not a County Constabulary, locally based and locally representative. It was a centrally-organised coercive and espionage apparatus, indoctrinated with an Imperial morale, and deliberately alienated from the populace. It was a caste set apart from the community, and was the prototype for Imperial policing in other parts of the Empire.

The first act of the government elected in 1918 was to institute a boycott of the RIC and set about destroying it. Because of that, the war of Independence has been categorised by revisionism as a Civil War—which is a kind of racial or religious view of what was a political matter. The recruits to the lower ranks of the RIC were mainly Catholic Irishmen, but they were shaped into an apparatus of the British State for use against the Irish populace. And they continued to act as an instrument of the British State after the Irish electorate rejected it.

*

Another step too far was the demand of Ulster Unionists in the Northern Ireland Assembly that the Irish Government should apologise for bringing the Provisional IRA into existence and sending it on a murder campaign in the North. Even Micheál Martin felt obliged to reject that demand. But, in doing so, he launched a tirade against the devolved Government in the North as a way of getting at Sinn Féin. He has a frivolously devious mind which is incapable of saying anything straight.

The Northern Ireland Assembly has no government function. It may adopt motions by majority vote if they have nothing to do with government and do not require Executive action. Matters affecting government can only be carried by majorities within the representatives of both communities. And departments are shared out between the parties of the two communities without reference to the Assembly.

Britain decided in 1921 to set up a sub-government in the North in circumstances

that meant that it could only function by aggravating communal antagonism. After almost fifty years that antagonism led to a Unionist pogrom against nationalist areas, which was responded to by a nationalist insurrection.

Jack Lynch played a mischievous part by making an inflammatory speech in mid-August 1969 in which he apparently threatened/promised military action, and then instituting criminal prosecutions nine months later against people who only obeyed his instructions. But Lynch's erratic conduct, deplorable though it was, was not what caused the course of events in the North. The British government was, and remains, the responsible body in the North. It decided in 1921 to govern it by means of sectarian sub--government in party-politics, but the main body of legislation affecting the North was always enacted at Westminster.

Today the devolved government has no sovereign power of state any more than the old Stormont had. Its budget is the British budget. It is given a sum of money to share out. The size of the sum is not decided by Sinn Fein. What the Provos have done is change the face of devolved politics by ending majority rule and overriding the numerical minority status of the nationalist community by means of institutional arrangements. If one wants to call those arrangements "*sectarian*"—as Martin has done—they at least create an equalising of the sectarian balance in which the position of the Catholic community is greatly improved.

Gerry Adams pointed out that Martin might be taken more seriously "*if he supported the efforts to get fiscal powers transferred to the North's Executive... Or if Fianna Fáil organised in the North as they have frequently pledged to do...*" (IT 26.10.12)

The economic basis for the present settlement in the North is slight. Republican elements that condemn the ending of the war as treason are trying to unsettle it—and are given access to the British media in their efforts. And Martin echoes them. He seems to know no other way of competing with Sinn Fein in the South than by trying to upset the apple-cart in the North.

*

The Unionist demand for an apology from the Dublin Government for creating the Provo IRA does no more than repeat the nonsense published by the Official IRA about forty years ago—that Fianna Fail financed the Provos and encouraged "*sectarian*" war in the North in order to split the Republican movement and ward

off the socialist revolution, which the Officials were on the verge of launching in the South. It was gibberish. The only evidence of money paid to the IRA is that it was paid to the Official IRA. Elements of that IRA went through various metamorphoses and ended up in the leadership of the Labour Party, which is now in government in Dublin. The Unionists only say now what they said then. And they keep silent as their Coalition partner rejects it.

*

Another Sticking initiative in the news is the private recordings made by Provo dissidents fed up with the ending of the war, spilling the dirt on their former colleagues in order to discredit them. These recordings, made under a guarantee that they would not be released until the death of the person making it, were lodged in Boston College (USA). It is said that the recordings were organised by Lord Bew of the Official IRA. The only sensible way of regarding Lord Bew for many years past is as a member of the *regime* in the North—the Whitehall regime of the Northern Ireland Office, that is. The NIO has gone to court in the USA demanding that the tapes be made available to them.

A Pointless Presidency

continued

Finance Ministers who appeared to dissent from the June 29th Council meeting that promised to alleviate Ireland's debt problem. But he should not be surprised. You can't guarantee full solidarity among EU Member States on Euro issues because the EU Council, like other EU structures, are NOT now the structures for dealing with the Euro. It is no wonder therefore that dissension arises from their decisions. Kenny should wake up and realise the consequences and the follow-up necessary that arises from the successful referendum that agreed the inter-Governmental Fiscal Pact that deals with the Euro.

That provided a new means of dealing with the Euro. It created a task-specific means of doing so—an inter-Governmental means of doing so. The existing EU structures have proved themselves unable to cope with the current issues of the banking and Euro crises and anyone who still believes in these structures for dealing with a problem that they have clearly failed to deal with is living in cloud cuckoo land. It may be uncomfortable for politicians to leave the comfort zone of the EU structures and all the mantras that are trotted out but if they persist with their denial they are being delusional.

Once upon a time the EU Presidency was significant—when the EU itself was significant. The most successful Irish Presidency was presided over by Haughey in 1990. It sanctioned the unification of Germany when Haughey outmanoeuvred and nullified Thatcher's objections to this development. That was the last piece of Irish statesmanship and established the State's credentials as a genuine player among the states of Europe. It also ensured the later transfer of funds that helped fuel the Celtic Tiger era.

(Speaking of Haughey, I assume that, when the Government tries to limit the benefits of the free travel for pensioners which he introduced, they and those who only see him as corruption incarnate, will encourage all the beneficiaries of the scheme to take the opportunity to liberate themselves from his baleful attempt to corrupt them by agreeing to limit and ideally to purify themselves by abolishing this venal scheme!)

This Irish Presidency will be essentially a pointless Presidency, despite all the associated hype. Participants will be looking over their shoulders at what happens elsewhere—among those states that are dealing with the Euro issues. By contrast the EU states will not be the masters of their own destiny.

Events in the EU will be a sideshow and it is absurd to see practically the whole Government traipsing over to consult with EU representatives about an agenda that none of them will be able to determine. That ability lies with the states of the Fiscal Pact—and the major states within that. The Presidency will only be important insofar as it relates to developments resulting from the inter-Governmental agreement between these states. The Presidency itself, like the proverbial King, has no clothes but nobody wants to say so as that would mean a denuding of countless EUophiles and an exposure of their phantom role at the 'centre of Europe'. All the hype and PR work cannot hide that fact.

The Irish Presidency could be historic if it made this new reality crystal clear. This could easily be done. This could be a unique and historic Presidency if Kenny and the Government gave top priority to a specific meeting of the Eurozone and Fiscal Pact states to deal with Euro issues and treated the EU Council as a quite separate, secondary animal which, in any case, it is legally. This would cut to the chase and could set a clear pattern for the future. It would concentrate minds on the Euro and the *agreed* means of dealing

with it. This would be revolutionary—which in many cases is simply doing what is obviously necessary. But nowhere in all the hype is anything like this possibility alluded to.

If such a clear distinction was made, it would help prevent the pass-the-parcel approach that dominates at the moment between the Commission, the Council, Germany, *ad hoc* groups of states or Finance Ministers, the European Central Bank, etc. The Government should be banging the Fiscal Compact drum, not the EU drum. The former drum is tuned to deal with the Euro but the EU drum is not and will only produce bum notes on the issue, as the intervention by the three Finance Ministers have proved.

Any further EU Treaty changes are beside the point. What is needed by referendum or otherwise are concrete agreed developments of the inter-Governmental Fiscal Pact, like the banking union, and not grandstanding, or grandiose palaver about new EU Treaties. This is a choice to be made and the sooner the better.

But Kenny seriously undermined his case for doing anything like this and promoting solidarity among Eurozone states when the Government decided to opt out of the common tax on financial transactions among 11 Euro states, agreed on 9th October. The case for this opt-out is pathetic at every level. It could affect jobs in the financial services! Oh dear, how many jobs have been lost to the economy by the antics of these same financial services here and elsewhere? And how many jobs could be secured by a properly regulated and properly taxed financial sector? These same services—i.e. largely banks have had millions poured into them by states—are delicate souls that cannot be asked to pay a tax on their services. This tax is an example of the kind of thing that is inherent in the Fiscal Pact if it is to succeed. Thankfully, the major Eurozone states realise this.

Such behaviour by Kenny and the Government, if it continues, will ensure that Ireland will make itself tangential to Eurozone developments under the illusion that it will be better off by making itself a dependency of the City of London. Any Irish EUophile should choke on the words "*being at the centre of Europe*" after this.

This Presidency *will* be pointless because this Government will no longer be taken seriously as player in Europe by those that matter. Any rhetoric to the contrary will just be nauseating hypocrisy.

Jack Lane

Dublin Fascists And British Legion Remembrance

{Editorial note: Peadar O'Donnell became Editor of the IRA newspaper *An Phoblacht* in the late 1920s. The Irish Branch of the *British Fascisti* had been inspired by the Italian dictator Mussolini and was formed by Irish veterans of the British Army's Imperialist War. These Fascists were to play a particularly provocative role during the British Legion's Remembrance Services in Dublin each November 11th—Armistice Day. In the following excerpt from his 1963 memoirs, *There Will Be Another Day*, O'Donnell recalled his efforts to tackle the British Legion's Fascist problem.}

If anybody is ever tempted to examine IRA documents of the late 1920's, '30 and '31, he could easily make the mistake certain other people made at the time—suspect me of a lot more influence than I enjoyed... But while I failed to involve the IRA as a body in the land annuity agitation, other influences dragged it leftwards. The world economic crisis was making itself felt, both in the city and the countryside, and emigration was no longer the answer to unemployment. Wealthy America was broke and strong men were on the breadline there. Unemployment was rife in Britain. IRA men, out of work for the first time, found themselves at the labour exchanges and they did not like it. They had but to rid [sic] their throats in anger to have leadership thrust on them. Their influence brought employed workers onto the street when the unemployed marched. There were occasions when the O/C Dublin Brigade, watching such demonstrations go by, could only look on the marching throng as a projection from his own command, so completely was it staffed by his junior officers. These same forces gathered for anti-imperialist rallies, of which Frank Ryan was the popular leader; Frank was a gifted public speaker and a bonnie agitator. He won international fame as an anti-Fascist fighter in the International Brigade during the Spanish Civil War.

There was no political face to this mass unrest. Leaders, slogans, demonstrations, commemorations gave it marks of identification, but it was a great lurch leftwards on no definite terms. Frank Ryan led the demonstrations against the Union-Jack devotees that came out of hiding for the Armistice celebration at College Green on 11th November. As a memorial service, the Armistice ceremony was treated with respect. No conflict stirred until, at the end of the two minutes silence, a section

of the crowd struck up the British national anthem and broke out in a flutter of Union Jacks. The organised basis for this outburst was the British Fascisti with headquarters at York Street. Trinity College students rallied to them, partly—but only partly—in the spirit of a rag. A great brawl swept across College Green and into O'Connell Street.

The IRA was anxious that the British Fascisti should be deprived of the power for mischief. By themselves this Fascist group meant little; their power for harm derived largely from the forces they drew around them by brawling. The remedy for it all was to shift the Armistice meeting from College Green. I forget now how this chore was passed on to me or whether, in fact, I took it on myself: I think that unlikely. Anyway I met (the British Legion's) General Sir William Hickey to discuss the matter with him, and Hickey agreed it would be well to find another venue. During our chat I was amused to find that General Hickey looked on himself as a bit of a patriot, and that he was encouraged in this view by a sense of grievance against the British War Office, and especially Field Marshal Henry Wilson. As the evening mellowed I encouraged Hickey in his grievance. I invited him to picture himself as an Irish hero, somewhat in the pattern of Eoghan Roe O'Neill, only a lot more favourably circumstanced; with his fifty thousand ex-soldiers he could free Ireland. It was all great fun and I wrote a speech Sir William was to make at the next Armistice rally and it is a great pity if he was not moved to file it away somewhere, when he came on it next morning. It was a good speech.

Peadar O'Donnell

NORTH WAZIRISTAN... NOT MANY DEAD

If you can't get them leave the stones red-hot.
Every day is bugspat day, kill-list day.
Don't talk human, talk insect, it's child's play.
Talk bluebottle as that granny is swat.
Talk machine as that house is blown to bits,
vegetable when turnip heads explode.
Talk hover-fly, five thousand feet to goad,
sotto-voce when you drive them out of their wits.

Twenty-four hours they watch the community,
no wedding parties, no funerals, no school,
missing that photo-opportunity.
Nintendo-operators wait and drool
with White House and Whitehall immunity,
to kill and kill and kill, the only rule.

Wilson John Haire
29th September, 2012

Shorts

from
the Long Fellow

THE RIC COMMEMORATION

What is the point of history? That is the question that arises from the RIC commemoration last August. It might be thought that the purpose of history is to explain why "*we are where we are*" to use a current cliché. In most countries the present ("where we are") is not considered a bad place and accordingly the national heroes of the past are commemorated.

In this country, long before the current economic crisis, a large swathe of Establishment opinion became embarrassed with the present and therefore history became problematic. If "*where we are*" is not a good place to be, the events which caused the present must be denigrated.

What is called "*revisionism*" is not a re-interpretation of history, but rather an expression of regret that the past was not different to what it was. In present day France there may be people who regret the demise of the *Milice*, but they are on the outer reaches of the political fringe. Their sentiments do not find their way into a mainstream newspaper.

Former Editor of *The Irish Times* Conor Brady had an article in that newspaper (24.8.12) welcoming the commemoration of the Royal Irish Constabulary planned for the following weekend. His thesis was that the Garda Síochána was a continuation of the RIC and that it wasn't—the murder of Cork Lord Mayor Tomas MacCurtain notwithstanding—as bad as is made out. No mention of Bloody Sunday 1920!

Brady starts off his article tentatively enough. Apparently the old RIC symbol (the heart and the crown) is somewhere at the back of a staircase in the Officers Club of the Garda Depot. However, in the course of his article he has the following remarkable statement:

"Contrary to the common belief that the early Garda Síochána was heavily populated with former RIC members, just 13 men transferred to the new force."

By any standards that constitutes a revolutionary change in personnel. So much for continuity! Like so much of revisionist thought it is nothing more than wishful thinking.

GUBU

The Irish Times, of course, has problems with more recent history. Conor Brady

(Editor of *The Irish Times*, 1986-2002) has never satisfactorily explained why his newspaper failed to publish the "*white nigger letter*" when it was made available in the British Public Records Office in December 1999. His successor, Geraldine Kennedy, conducted a long interview over three evenings with Major Thomas McDowell as part of its 150th anniversary celebrations in 2009 (*The Phoenix*, 25.9.12). But *The Irish Times* saw fit not to publish it even after McDowell had died.

It might be thought that the newspaper would be on safe ground covering the short-lived Haughey Government of 1982. This was the era of GUBU (Grotesque, Unbelievable, Bizarre, Unprecedented) the newspaper assured us (29.9.12). The article featured an interview with retired civil servant Jim Kirby, who headed the security section in the Department of Justice.

In the article Kirby describes a meeting Charles Haughey called in July 1982, which was addressed by Joe Ainsworth (Assistant Garda Commissioner):

"It was an extraordinary meeting in which Ainsworth indicated that the law of the land was not going to be operated in relation to terrorists. Haughey ordered that no notes were to be taken, which was very unusual for a meeting like that. Indeed, on a number of occasions he directed one of the people present to stop writing when he appeared to be taking notes.

"The nub of it was that Haughey wasn't going to operate the Criminal Law Jurisdiction Act (passed by the previous Fine Gael-Laobur government as a compromise to the extradition of IRA activists). This was the law of the land, and this was a vital piece of legislation in dealing with terrorism—and you know it wasn't going to happen. There were gasps around the place. I could see some of the others' faces. We were all mesmerised."

The Irish Times felt it necessary to allow Ainsworth a right of reply (10.10.12).

On the question of the meeting Ainsworth had this to say:

"...the meeting was designed to further curtail subversion, not assist it through inaction.

"At no time did I say that the law would not be enforced against subversives and nobody at the meeting uttered such words, including the taoiseach. Neither was this implied in any way. The commissioner of the Garda Síochána, along with the senior diplomats, the attorney general and the minister for justice were also present. Does Mr Kirby mean to convey that they sat there mute as I made such an astounding and treacherous statement?"

This comes close to accusing Kirby of being a liar, since it is difficult to see how

two people could in good faith interpret the same meeting so differently. And Ainsworth makes it very clear that it is not just a question of his word against Kirby's. Elsewhere in the article he throws down the gauntlet to *The Irish Times*:

"The notion that I would assist subversives by inaction is grotesque, shocking and an insult to my character. There were others at the meeting. Clearly, they were not interviewed prior to publication. The recollections of those present who are still alive should now be sought and reported by your paper"

BRITISH INTELLIGENCE

One of the scandals of 1982 was the so called Dowra affair. A witness who was to appear in an assault case in Cavan was arrested by the RUC in the North on the morning of the Trial. As a consequence the prosecution case against Thomas Nangle, the brother-in-law of Sean Doherty, the Minister for Justice, collapsed. The implication was that Doherty had perverted the legal process by using his influence over the Gardaí, who in turn somehow influenced the RUC to ensure the key witness would not turn up at the trial.

Ainsworth offers another plausible interpretation:

"There are alternative views about the arrest including one that it was part of a British intelligence operation. In any event, I was never involved in perverting, or attempting to pervert the course of justice and to imply that I was, however veiled, is a grotesque insult to my character."

He then refers to foreign (i.e. British) infiltration of the Garda:

"No doubt other people have come to the same strange conclusion as Mr Kirby about Dowra. Yet I cannot really blame them for I know they were the victim of dark forces operating from the shadows who were pumping out carefully tailored propaganda. The smears they disseminated about me were obviously a great success.

"I have a very good idea exactly who was leaking disinformation from inside the Garda to the media. Of interest, all of them had worked closely, perhaps too closely, with foreign services prior to this. The deceivers were prone to telling people that their phones were tapped, when they weren't."

BRADY BLUSTER

Conor Brady was on hand to respond to Ainsworth's robust reply

Early in his article Brady says:

"The former deputy commissioner is now advanced in years. He served the State over a long career and he is entitled,

of course, to seek to defend his record. But whatever about the details, it is important that we do not lose sight of the central facts of what happened" (*The Irish Times*, 13.10.12).

What is the purpose of saying that Ainsworth is "advanced in years"? Is not Kirby also "advanced in years"? But Brady's sly implication cannot hide the weakness of *The Irish Times* position. His "whatever about the details" comment shows that he does not want to go into details. Ainsworth challenged *The Irish Times* to publish the recollections of others present at the July 1982 meeting. If Brady's response is anything to go by the newspaper has no intention of taking up that challenge.

Later on Brady rather limply says:

"Some differences of recollection are only to be expected when two men, one a former senior civil servant, the other a former senior garda, seek to recall events of 30 years ago."

But the differences are of such a magnitude that—in the Long Fellow's view—they cannot be explained away as "differences of recollection": either Ainsworth is lying or Kirby is lying. Brady seems unable to make a full-blooded defence of Kirby.

The remainder of Brady's article is nothing more than bluster. He doesn't deal with Ainsworth's points but just re-asserts some of *The Irish Times*' long-held beliefs. Here is what Brady thinks of Ainsworth's views on the Dowra affair.

"... he {i.e. Ainsworth—LF} implies that the so-called "Dowra affair" may have been the product of a British intelligence operation. This goes beyond the most vivid flights of the imagination.

"A man due in court to give evidence in an assault case was improperly locked up by the RUC at the request of the Garda Síochána. The accused, himself a garda, was a brother-in-law of the minister for justice, Seán Doherty. This had about as much to do with British intelligence as with the Legion of Mary."

Why does this go "beyond the most vivid flights of the imagination"? British Intelligence infiltration of the highest echelons of the Garda Síochána is not at all a "flight of the imagination". Jack Lynch felt it necessary to sack Garda Commissioner Edmund Garvey in 1978.

Brady seems to have something of a blind spot on the question of British Intelligence in Ireland. He has never felt it necessary to comment on the well-documented links with British Intelligence of his former boss, Major McDowell. It would be interesting to hear Joe Ainsworth's views on this matter!

How Capitalism Works In Blarney

"The price-tag on Blarney Golf Resort has been slashed to one tenth of its original building cost—so now you can snap it up for a mere €3.9 million. For that, you'll not only get the only golf course in Europe designed by US golfer John Daly and the adjacent 61-bed hotel, there's also eight, two-bed rental lodges and 168 acres of land. Meanwhile, the hotel includes a bridal suite, bar, restaurant, conference and banqueting suites, a spa and health club with 20m pool. Built in 2004 at a cost of €40m, four months ago the price tag for the luxury resort was €7m but, with no offers coming, the receiver, Billy O'Riordan of PricewaterhouseCoopers, instructed auctioneers CBRE to further slash the asking price. While the auctioneers hope to sell the entire complex in one lot they are also prepared to talk to bidders interested in sections of it. Paul Collins of CBRE said they would likely seek formal bids by the end of October or early November. "We will then assess the bids and, hopefully, there will be a clear winner", Mr Collins said. The auctioneers believe the resort is well located to cash in on the 400,000+ tourists to Blarney every year" (*The Corkman*, October 04, 2012)

This is a tale of our times—and of the future. Here we have an example of what will give rise to a 'recovery'. Capitalism works with booms and slumps. That is its nature. The current slump will lay the basis for another boom. This hotel will be bought for a song. Whoever does so will make a fortune or at least they cannot possibly lose. And there will surely be an individual or group of individuals who can raise the money to buy it.

And there may well be such an individual close by who has the money to do so thanks to the boom. Once upon a time, circa 2007, there were grand plans finalised to build a new village at Blarney, a stone's throw from this hotel. It was to be called "Stoneville" because, if your sight was good enough, you could have viewed the Blarney Stone from there. Geddit? The local railway station was to be reopened and every facility that makes a village was to be built.

A local former—let's call him Dan—owned the land earmarked for this. At a certain point Dan could name his price for his land and, though reluctant, found it impossible to resist selling—probably for at least a million per acre. He rented back his fields while plans were progressing. Then the banking crisis and the slump arrived and "Stoneview" disappeared from view. It became a deserted village before

it was built. Dan found that he could again name his price to buy back his fields from a developer/bank anxious to sell. He had his fields and his millions but only got real satisfaction from the former.

I am sure Dan, or some friend of his, might suggest that he use some of his small change to snap up the golf resort bargain. Even if every building on it fell down and every green and hole disappeared, Dan would be happy with the green fields in a great location.

Blarney itself is a marvel—if not a miracle. Its most well known and lucrative business is based on a ridiculous ritual, kissing the Blarney Stone. Every year, as reported above, hundreds of thousands of quite normal people come there in coachloads from all over the world to participate in this. Some, from America, spend their life savings to join in. It's a secular pilgrimage, something like a Hajj without Mohammad. This ritual and its accompanying notion is Blarney's great commodity, even more valuable than Dan's farm ever was. It confirms the concept in Marx's famous opening lines of *Capital*:

"The wealth of those societies in which the capitalist mode of production prevails, presents itself as "an immense accumulation of commodities", its unit being a single commodity. Our investigation must therefore begin with the analysis of a commodity. A commodity is, in the first place, an object outside us, a thing that by its properties satisfies human wants of some sort or another. The nature of such wants, whether, for instance, they spring from the stomach or from fancy, makes no difference. Neither are we here concerned to know how the object satisfies these wants...."

The bemused citizens of Blarney are certainly not very concerned with how this nonsense satisfies whatever wants it does for the hordes of visitors but they are very happy about it all as it certainly satisfies a lot of their pockets.

Blarney is in the diocese of Cloyne. I sometimes wonder if one of its former Bishops, Berkeley, visited the place and got the idea there that the world is really all in the mind. It would certainly make you wonder that it might be so.

Jack Lane

On-line sales of publications:

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

Political Engagement or Utopianism?

The most striking feature of Joe Keenan's *Socialism: Utopian or Incoherent* in the October *Irish Political Review* is the complete lack of engagement with the actual politics and political conflict in the country, a feature also evident in his *Certain Immutable Economic Laws* in the September issue. There is nothing about the conflicts over economic direction or social policy choices that dominate Irish politics; about Social Partnership as it currently exists or has developed; conflicts over relations with Europe etc. This is all regarded as irrelevant because, as it was put in the September article:

"...the integrity and independence of the Irish State must be restored; not defended, for at present, neither exists in any fit fashion that it might be defended at all; but rebuilt, tended to and restored. In pursuit of that then is the absolute requirement for government to be re-established on the understandings and the agreements of a new social partnership...SIPTU may very well be the last surviving institution of the independent Irish State that Connolly formulated and de Valera founded."

Anything that actually exists or has a relationship to the existing State cannot be defended. We must start again. He goes on to glory in the epithet "*Utopian*" in relation to his position.

In his second reply he continues as he started or, in his own words:

"...hymning Sancta Simplicitas, singing the praises of Holy Simplicity".

We are then asked to meditate on the Shaker hymn that is the centrepiece of Aaron Copeland's *Appalachian Spring*. Perhaps we should all praise the Lord and repent our dialectical ways!

Most of the remainder of the second reply is taken up by texts. These are not holy texts, but the opposite. It seems that the founding documents of the European project show that it was flawed from its conception, and that Original Sin is identified as Article 3 (f) of the original Treaty of Rome committing to "*the institution of a system ensuring that competition in the common market is not distorted*".

But worse was to follow! It is claimed that in 1986 free movement of capital and services as well as labour flexibility were considered. Treaty articles committing to

free movement of services and capital are quoted, but none of the articles which are featured refer to labour flexibility.

There are two thoughts that arise from this. Firstly, we are given an analysis of the free market orientation of Europe without once mentioning the Common Agricultural Policy and the European Social Fund. The CAP enabled Irish farmers to have a decent standard of living. The price supports meant that they were no longer dependent on the British market. Irish agriculture continues to receive about 1.6 billion euros through the CAP. In the early 1990s Ireland received billions in structural funds, partly as a result of the political skills of Charles Haughey, which helped the country emerge from the recession of the early 1980s and was a key factor in 15 years of unprecedented growth. But these non market elements are simply ignored.

The second thought that arises from Joe's analysis is: which parts of the provisions quoted does he oppose? Does he wish to abolish the market? To take the most controversial provision, is he against the free movement of capital?

The Irish economy has benefited not only from free movement of capital within the EU but movement of capital from outside it. A large part of the productive economic activity in this country is from foreign multinationals. There are about 100,000 direct jobs and at least an equal number of other indirect jobs generated from companies owned by foreign capital. Much of this is high-end world-class manufacturing, such as the Intel plant in Leixlip. What does the Irish working class think of this? There is no doubt what it thinks. Not only is it in favour of the State's policy of attracting foreign capital into this country, but it is against any tampering with existing policies which might undermine that objective.

At last year's Dublin West By-Election the matter was put to the test. The Socialist Party was within touching distance of a spectacular victory when the Fianna Fáil candidate pointed out to workers in the many multinational companies in that constituency that the Socialist Party was in favour of the Utopian policy of increasing the 12.5% Corporation Tax rate {to an arbitrarily punitive level} without a convincing argument as to how

those companies could be persuaded to remain in Ireland.

It's amazing how policies devised in splendid isolation seem so 'simple' and in the working class interest, but when subjected to scrutiny by the real working class in the 'here and now'—as distinct from an abstract idealisation of it—they become far less 'simple'.

Remember, no one in Dublin West—including the Socialist Party—was disputing the question of the free movement of capital *per se*. The issue was the tax rate on multinationals and whether an increase would discourage foreign capital from staying in Dublin West. The Socialist Party suddenly decided that it was after all not in favour of increasing the tax rate. When it said that other countries had a 35% corporate tax rate in its literature, it was just giving a description of the world, which had no political import! But too late! The left leaning voters of Dublin West couldn't quite stomach transferring their allegiances to Fianna Fáil, but they were not going to elect the Socialist Party candidate. The successful Labour Party candidate may not have been much good, but at least he was not likely to cause harm.

This is not to say that an increase in the 12.5% should be opposed in all circumstances. In my view the Irish State should consider negotiating it with our European partners (who want us to increase it) as part of an overall package of fiscal and tax harmonisation. It would be very foolish to just throw away the bargaining chip of the 12.5% rate without countervailing measures to ensure existing jobs are preserved. But the Socialist Party had set its heart against the evils of Europe and therefore could not propose engagement in such negotiations. And so the 12.5% rate must remain.

While politics may not always be clear (or simple) there can be no doubt—at the very minimum—that it is in the interests of the Irish working class to have a functioning state. The substantial legacy of Connolly is his programme for building a national state outside the British Empire, linked to the advanced states of Europe, which would give the Irish working class—what Pat Murphy described as—a "*proprietary interest*" in that state. The interests of the working class are served by maximising its power to influence the shaping of the state.

A functioning state, to be sovereign in the world as it exists, must at the very least be able to pay its way in the world. That does not mean that it should never run a deficit. But, if it is to run a deficit, it must

be able to obtain credit. Some States may have greater room for manoeuvre than others. But even the United States—a country with the most powerful army in the world and a world currency at her disposal—comes up against the limits imposed by economics. We could have a long, tedious and pointless discussion about the precise form of words to describe that reality, but the reality will not change. Denying that reality or retreating to a land called Utopia will not change that reality. On the contrary, such an approach disables effective political action.

Ireland was a functioning state and continues to be a functioning state. However, it came under the illusion that it could have the tax system of Texas and the Social System of Sweden and pay its public servants in excess of her German counterparts. Everything happening in the world from 1990 seemed to offer a justification for such a belief.

The illusion was a common one in the globalist world following the collapse of Soviet communism. Globalisation, it was believed, had ended the capitalist cycle of boom-and-bust; had ushered in a half century of endless expansionary growth; and financial tools, which had become productive forces in their own right, were the key to that growth. Just before the crash, a leading Irish economic commentator—Marc Coleman—published a book entitled *The Best Is Yet To Come*. Large sections of the population, including ordinary workers and even people on welfare, became property owners, letting and sub-letting properties to migrant workers and using the proceeds to fund levels of consumption that soon bore no relation to the actual level of production in the country. It is estimated that, of the "distressed mortgages" under discussion at the moment, nearly a quarter of a million were "buy-to-let" loans. A Teachers' Union leader (Senator Joe O'Toole) described the process agreed in the early 2000s for deciding public sector pay as an "ATM machine".

All of this was financed by international credit. David McWilliams explained to the Irish people how an unjustifiable level of consumption financed by credit was devouring the savings of German and French workers.

When the credit was tightened the illusion was shattered. The Irish State has an institutional memory (in economic matters at least). It remembered how its recession of the early 1980s had been prolonged because it failed to deal with the crisis at an early stage. In 2008 it did not make that mistake again. Unlike Greece

it began the process of fiscal adjustment early in the crisis. International commentators described us as obtaining "first mover advantage". It is likely that we would have emerged from the crisis if it were not for the fact that, unlike in the 1980s, the economic crisis was not just domestic. It could be said that the policies pursued by Fianna Fáil 'failed' because we had to go cap in hand to the Troika, but as a result of those policies the Irish State's relationship with the Troika is completely different to that of Greece. Most of the groundwork had already been done.

The allegation is that *Irish Political Review* defended the Troika. It did not. It neither supported nor opposed it. But it accepted it as a reality. The Irish State cannot obtain sufficient credit elsewhere. But this does not mean that there is no alternative to the Troika. There is always an alternative. But I don't believe it is in the working class interest. It was spelled out by Cormac Lucey (ex advisor to Michael McDowell) in the *Sunday Business Post* during the Fiscal Treaty debate. He argued for exit from the euro. Since we could not obtain credit elsewhere, this would involve an immediate balancing of the books involving a 'slash and burn' of the public sector followed by a return to the sterling zone. That is, at least, a feasible alternative. The left wing view does not take account of that reality.

The *Irish Political Review* has made two points regarding the Troika. Firstly, the Irish Government has far more room for manoeuvre than it is admitting. Nothing that Joe has quoted from the IMF has changed this fact. In particular, the extract on the minimum wage does not suggest that the Irish State is being dictated to.

Secondly, the editorial pointed out that there are a number of areas where the Troika's policies are in the working class interest. Joe presents the IMF report in a similar disengaged, detached fashion that he presented the articles of the EU Treaties. What for example is his opinion on keeping the PRSI [social insurance] rate at the lowest rate for the low paid beyond 2013? How could that not be in the interest of the low paid? Texts are interesting in so far as they go, but what effect have they in the cut and thrust of political conflict? I would suggest three issues of public controversy in which I believe the Troika's policies are in the interests of the working class and have been resisted by the Government.

a) the Troika is suggesting a far higher rate of property tax than the Government is willing to countenance. Indeed Fine Gael would rather not implement any property tax; it blames FF and the Troika

for the small progress it has made.

b) the Troika has dissociated itself from calls to end the Croke Park Agreement because it sees Social Partnership as an effective and socially balanced approach to tackling economic problems. This has put a stop to some of the right wing *Sunday Independent*-inspired hawks within the Government.

c) The Government has been dragging its heels on eliminating restrictive practices within the professions as recommended by the Troika.

The EEC or EC or EU is a haphazard development. Up until about 1990 the *Irish Political Review* and its predecessor magazine was unambiguously pro-Europe. But, to paraphrase Keynes: when circumstances change policy must change. The expansion of the EU eastwards following the collapse of the Soviet bloc had undermined political integration; the Union was in danger of becoming nothing more than a free trade area. There are two important factors, which have changed in recent years. Firstly, Russia has demonstrated that she is a functioning state after the disastrous Yeltsin years. She put a stop to EU expansion by her decisive intervention in South Ossetia. Secondly, the economic crisis has forced on the EU the necessity of greater political integration. This integration is around the euro zone countries. Indeed, existing EU institutions have been by-passed as Germany takes a leadership position. The fact is that "England", which Joe says was a "determining factor", has been sidelined. The *Irish Political Review* should be prepared to engage with these new developments.

CONCLUSION

The *Irish Political Review* should completely reject Joe's position, which is Utopian and apolitical. It is an attitude of mind devoid of all political substance. Its effect would be to bring about political disengagement or quiet contemplation of the injustices of the world. The Shaker hymn cited is a hymn of renunciation, which is completely at variance with the best instincts of the Irish working class. The political consequences of such a position are disengagement from Europe and a return to the British sphere of influence.

John Martin

Tell us about upcoming events

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

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

es ahora *

TRAVELS TO NORDIC NEIGHBOURS

Ever since Scandinavian literature exploded on the scene with the likes of Henning Mankel, Joe Nesbo, and more especially Stieg Larsson with the post-humorous publication of the Millennium Trilogy—interest in these countries has grown phenomenally. But it's the Swedish Larsson who undoubtedly has the biggest reputation. Long before the novels, there was his tireless journalism against fascist activism in his native country. His work against the rise of far-right extremism in Sweden carried substantial risks to his life and when he had finished his novels and handed them into his publisher, he unfortunately died of a heart-attack. So at the beginning of this month himself and I decided to travel to Amsterdam, Stockholm and Oslo on a quick nine day jaunt. Schiphol Airport is an international hub and we had to travel there and back again so we decided to stay over for three nights and look at Amsterdam while we were at it. What we didn't factor in were the appalling security measures we were forced to endure and the time-wasting at airports that became such a disruption that one sometimes lost the will to live.

But, after getting the train in to Amsterdam, we walked to our hotel which was right in the centre of the city and I immediately nearly got mown down by a tram which are very silent as they slide along their lines so thereafter I had to be extra vigilant. For the next few days we walked everywhere and enjoyed the sights. There is a huge ethnic mix in the city and to my surprise the biggest proportion seemed to be Arabic. How that translates out into the country as a whole I would like to find out.

Amsterdam has become grimy, sleazy and, of the three capital cities, definitely the one we won't visit again. The so-called "drug cafés" or pubs are a huge draw-back as they have drugged out people sitting around the pavements with their tattoos, dreadlocks and rings and bars slotted over their faces in a grim exhibition of masochism. Across the canals are the prostitute markets which, if anything, are even grimmer. People like to stress how liberal all this is but people—especially women—trafficking is going on here on a large scale. There was a museum of torture with a thin faced dominatrix lolling at the door, smoking a fag—which had something to do with the absolutely absurd smoking

laws in such a context. In the busy shopping street of Kalverstreet, we came across a beautiful Catholic Church called 'De Papegaai' or "The Parrot"—the "RC Church of Sts. Peter and Paul". Masses were said every day in English and Polish—and Latin at the weekends.

There was on the second day an impressive display of police, cars, and vans with coms., along with swat-like teams with all kinds of gadgets of warfare. These all spilt into the square and surrounded it and then came the horses and their riders with all kinds of weaponry hanging off their uniforms. We were amazed and wondered what had caused such an extravagant show of force? But, even though every one spoke good English, there was just a shrugging of shoulders when we asked about it.

One thing I will attest to and that is the people of Amsterdam have no equals in bad manners. Pedestrians, cyclists—all would try and mow one down and there was never an apology. Cyclists were supposed to use their bells at all times but not once did they do so. People used to tell me that Parisians were chauvinistic but I have always found them to be polite and helpful. So it was with relief that we left Schiphol and headed for Stockholm, though before we could get our plane we had to go through a surly security exercise once more. I went to help an elderly gentleman who had to take off his shoes as he had extreme difficulty doing so and was warned in the sternest way "*to keep away*". What do they say about small people and power? And of course we found that the whole process of checking in our luggage was mechanised and we spent ages trying to work the system out, with me muttering that after this pigs will fly before I go near an airport ever again.

STOCKHOLM

We arrived in Stockholm on a Thursday and had great weather for the duration, very cold but dry. Sweden is in the EU but not the Euro and Swedish kronas were a big difficulty. Well actually the prices were the difficulty, as they were so astronomical. From the plane we could see that trees here were big business; once we landed all the big firms were well-represented by signage as we passed by in our way into the city.

After waiting ages for a bus, we made the fatal mistake of getting a taxi and our eyes watered when we had to pay up. Inside the hotel—a bit too late for us by then—there were many warnings about taxis and how they were unregulated. We had decided to stay in the five-star Sheraton Hotel in which—by booking early in the year and then going at a time when high

season was over—we had got a good deal. What startled us were the many warnings about *thieves*. The reception gave us a list of warnings about never leaving any workman into our room at all times, closing our windows before we left the room, closing our window before we went to sleep at night even though we were several stories up etc. This was very alarming, especially for those of us with an anxious state of mind. After check in, there was a little fiasco with the lifts. We tried two with no success and so over to the receptionist who told us we had to insert our room card to get the lift to move. It took us a little time to know where we had to insert the card as the instructions left a little to be desired. Finally we were off and this time we were in stitches of laughter. The reception desk was laid out for us ordinary guests and then there were the banks of staff dealing with the monied classes with gold/black Amex cards. We speculated that all the security was for them, but still by this time they had managed to instil in us or rather *me* that we should be on our guard.

We came down to dinner and had a look around. The décor was cutting edge Swedish design. There were a lot of people mingling and I looked at the large notice board to see that the 'Annual Meeting of International Funding/Aid Agencies' were convening there, so that accounted for the buzz. I would love to know how much was spent by them because they seemed to be having a great old time. The billing for their meals and the drinks were very discreet but I think one can guess who was paying out for all this hoopla. Having looked at the prices, and with himself now calculating between their currency and ours (having been much chastened by the taxi-man), we had to cut our cloth according to our measure.

There was an incredible number of wealthy Arab guests, who were very unfriendly to the staff, whereas the many Japanese were having a ball and taking pictures of everything with their latest technology. I would never have expected Stockholm to provide me the next day with an unlikely image—that of a completely clad Arab woman in the burqa with even the eyes being veiled as she walked behind her western-dressed husband, who was wearing a beautiful cashmere suit of the highest Italian quality. They were being escorted into our hotel by several other Arabs—probably body-guards.

Stockholm is a very beautiful city, though its famous cobbled stones were wearing after a time on the feet. We walked all over the old city Gamla Stan, crossed the huge river and wandered down towards

the harbour. We passed the Royal Palace and Royal Apartments and lovely old mediaeval buildings meticulously preserved. We walked through very narrow streets with some slight declivity towards the harbour. But the prices everywhere were mouth-watering. So there were no café or pub pit-stops, and it was with pinched calves that we finally arrived back in our hotel. Next day we hit the main shopping drag where all the big stores were located including some of the British brands. By this time, we had window shopping down to a fine art but got the added bonus—for me—of seeing a shoot where snow was being blown around: and in which the actors were walking up and down trying to look indifferent to all of us gazing at them. I thought it might have been the filming of *'Wallander'* the BBC TV series (by Henning Mankel) but saw no sign of Kenneth Branagh or anyone else I recognised.

By Sunday we were off to the airport again for Oslo but this time the hotel got us a fair rate on a taxi as we had learned our lesson by then. Stockholm seemed to be closed down for business—even the busy little kiosk in the hotel lobby was closed and shuttered off—whether this remained for the whole of the day we don't know but I wouldn't be surprised if it was. Despite the fact that policing was not evident to us, SAPO, the Swedish Security Services with the local police were probably all around because the amount of wealth was utterly outstanding. Because the taxi landed us in the wrong terminal of Arlanda Airport—unknown to us at the time, we had to trudge well over half an hour through to the next terminal for departures, where we were again met by a bank of machines and another security search. Most of the machines wouldn't work and finally I went up to an airline man who asked me why we were not using the machines. I nearly wept but tried to explain and—just as I thought he was having none of it—he waved his hand for our one bag for cargo luggage and we were through *finally*. The Swedes like the Dutch are very unfriendly and curt and deal with everyone as though it is a business transaction. I'd wither on the vine within a week of living in either society from sheer lack of interpersonal contact and chat

OSLO

Oslo is the capital city of Norway, which is neither in the Euro zone or the EU itself. Its currency is the Norwegian Kronar. On the plane from Stockholm, I was sitting beside an old man who began talking to me. It was quite plain that he was very lonely. He told me he was 85 years and spoke movingly about his wife who had died two years previously. He told me how beautiful she was and then to my amazement got out a number of snaps from his little bag which he wore around

his neck. Indeed the snaps from going through different years showed an incredibly beautiful woman. She was always celebrating something and he was the one taking the pictures so they all were of her alone. I congratulated him on her beauty and he nodded, very satisfied. I asked him if they had any children and he threw me by saying that with his first wife he had two and with her, *"the love of my life"*, he had another two but they were not really in his life as they were busy living their own.

In response to my questions about Norway's oil riches, he told me that recently he had been in hospital and had the best of everything and then had a four-week recuperation in a spa-like place with its own swimming pool and all attendant therapies. He also said he got so much for taxis as he lived outside the town. All other travel—except planes—was free. But he added that the Americans didn't like this as they thought they were too socialist. I said it was not their business and he agreed. When I asked him what kind of Government they had, he rather surprised me by saying that they were *"bad"*. I think he said that it was a coalition of Labour (or Liberals) and the Greens but they had left everyone *in to* the country and the Norwegians felt pushed out—but the good news was that there was an upcoming election in this November and he hoped that the far-right would get in. For someone of that age it was all rather surprising. It was obvious he remembered a different Norway and he said that, for all the oil riches, he and lots of people he knew would rather the old Norway of fishing than this new one with its influx of foreigners. Looking out of the plane I saw lovely little farms similar to Ireland, and of course like Sweden and Holland—water was everywhere. As we were disembarking from the plane, I gave him a handshake and, though seemingly weak and thin, I was surprised at the strength of his.

This time we got a shuttle bus into town and were at our hotel within a little over half an hour. Oslo is smaller than Stockholm and therefore gave a more intimate vibe. But, again, prices were skyrocketing compared to ours. The food in Oslo was terrible for a simple reason: they had fine fish but they put in pork to every dish. For a Lutheran country, it was a rather joyless Sunday as expected. We did pass a mosque on the way in from the airport but it was out in the middle of nowhere. As the man on the plane had said, Oslo was a city of lots of different peoples. Again lots of Arabs, but ordinary working ones, and there was a huge number of Vietnamese; Roma beggars were everywhere; Polish and some other Europeans were visible in the catering industry. But again in our hotel the biggest number of visiting delegations were from Japan and especially

the ship-building industries.

On our first day as we walked up towards their Parliament there was some excitement on the street ahead. Again they were loads of police cars, huge blacked-out bus-size vans, and the police horses. There was enough weaponry to wipe out an average country. The horses were ridden by women police and they had pistols, big sticks, and even bigger whips. The latter were curled around their gloved hands many times over and certainly were not for use on the horses. We took some pictures but always with the perspective that we might well be asked to desist. Whatever politicians were there—they were getting great protection, but from who or what?

Oslo's statuary was spectacular and was not of the awful modernist movement. There was a huge plaza in front of the harbour where island ferries plied their trade. The weather was sunny and cold. We looked at the Nobel Peace centre and all the surrounding buildings were just staggeringly cool with light everywhere. Across the plaza and beyond the Parliament buildings was the long straight road up to the Palace. Going further the other way was the Catholic Church with a notice board saying that Masses were in English, Polish, Vietnamese and Latin. It was a very lovely intimate church and we were lighting candles when a young Dominican priest ran up the steps and bowed his head and started quietly praying.

There were beggars everywhere and some graffiti, with a very efficient little truck going round with some great machinery getting rid of the graffiti. What was not expected by me was the number of people who were obviously on drugs or mentally ill who were often shouting and around whom one definitely didn't feel safe. When in a Hard Rock Café afterwards (remember them in the London of the 70s-80s), we were served by a tattooed man going for a punk vibe who asked us where we were from? This always poses a problem. After replying Ireland, Cork seemed unknown, so when he pressed I did mention Cork and he *knew it*. But it turned out he was from Australia and knew about Australian Rules football. He also added that I had *"a very thick accent"* whereas others had told me I had *"a lovely dialect"*. I suspected the spectre of English or good old Pommie prejudice. But that incident couldn't take the shine off me as the day after we were heading for Schiphol Airport and from there to our beloved Cork where we landed at 9.30 pm and put back our watches one hour. Home, home at last, Thank God.

Julianne Herlihy ©

The Spirit Of Capitalism?

I read with interest the article on Amintore Fanfani in the last issue of the *Irish Political Review*. I was surprised at how accurate the article was, having long grown resigned to the self-satisfied crassness with which Italian politics is commonly approached in these islands. True, I would have preferred a proper source reference for Professor Campanini, rather than merely his academic title, and some people would identify not Fanfani but later Florence mayor La Pira as the author of the first article of the Italian constitution — but these are debatable details.

Fanfani was indeed a remarkable person, although cryptical manners, occasional low cunning, and even a short stature made him an object of scorn for some.

He was successful at a very early age in academia. He was a leading fascist intellectual (and a teacher at Milan's School of Fascist Mystique, which was supposed to train future generations of Fascist leaders, a sort of Fascist West Point—no wonder Fanfani "*did not try to hide his Fascist record*", how on earth could he ?). He eventually became one of the two (the other being Moro) towering figures of Italian democratic politics—from the late 'fifties to the mid-seventies. He held high office also in later years, but after his failure in the divorce referendum of 1974 he became just one of the revolving characters of the Christian Democrat scene. He was even a painter of supposedly much more than *dilettante* standing.

But did his critique of capitalism produce something on which we can build today ?

I would readily agree with his dismissal of what I would call Max Weber's protestant narcissism. I hope I am not being nationalistic, but let me point out that Engels himself, in his preface to the Italian translation of *Das Kapital*, described Italy as the country in which capitalism was born. Furthermore, as the article points out, the notion of personal vocation did not need to wait until Martin Luther to see the light of day. In fact, it is a notion that can arguably be traced back to Aristotelian ethics, and at least to Aquinas.

However, dismissing Weber does not take us very far. Another of Fanfani's ideas, rightly mentioned in the article, is perhaps of much greater interest. It is the notion that capitalism has always existed. Or at least, we could say, has always existed in societies which are not based on mere subsistence economy.

The article refers to capitalism as "*the*

idea of minimum means". Perfect. I would agree that capitalism is nothing more than the idea of achieving the maximum possible result with the minimum of means. It is no more than rationality applied to economic life. It consists in choosing the most efficient path to achieve *that which you have chosen*. The big mistake is to confuse a critique of what is being chosen, with a critique of the way in which the choice is implemented. Capitalism concerns only the second part, it only ensures that you achieve efficiently whatever economic aim you have. If the choice is objectionable, criticise it, not 'capitalism'.

As usual, we must be careful with words. By capitalism I mean the economic system we know, based on (largely) unrestrained economic initiative. I would agree with the received wisdom according to which this system is preferable to all known others, and I would also argue that this system is in no way contradictory to Catholic principles. AND YET. It is also true that this capitalism in which we live is highly objectionable and behaves in ways which is not compatible with Catholic principles. This is saying no more than human freedom in itself is not harmful—it is our highest attribute—and it is certainly not in itself incompatible with Catholicism, but can be exercised in objectionable manners.

At the heart of the models of capitalist economies, as self understood and self explained by free market economics, are the production function and the consumer utility function. The first determines supply, the second determines demand. In the end, it is demand, it is the consumer that, within the constraints of the production function, decides what will be produced and in what quantities. There are many complications, not least the difficulty (or impossibility) of finding uncontroversial ways in which individual demand functions can be aggregated into a collective demand function. It remains the case, in my opinion, that in broad terms capitalist economies fairly accurately reflect the collective choices of consumers.

What changed between the age of the guilds and later economies is that consumer preferences changed. This was in part because an element of institutional nudging was removed, but above all because the "*triumph of the precapitalist spirit in the minds of many*" waned. {I would say 'pre-modern' rather than 'precapitalist'.}

The free market system does not prevent us from shopping ethically, from buying fairtrade products, from supporting co-operatives, from bankrupting the pornography and gambling industries . . . Nor are these merely notional freedoms. Successful (albeit not always well advised) consumer boycotts and company PR budgets testify to the inherent power of the consumer.

The difference between the premodern and the modern world, let alone this squalid post-modern world in which we are stranded, is not so much capitalism, which, to repeat, has a longer existence, but rather secularisation and its degeneration. Firstly we have were 'freed' of institutional constraints which nudged us toward certain ethical preferences, and then, increasingly, we veered toward the idea that the immediate, the tangible and the mere selfish, are all that matters.

Here professor Max Weber can come back and claim all he wants for his Protestantism. Not that Protestantism *per se* was and is secular. But the split and the strife brought by Protestantism were decisive in discrediting religion itself, and, with it, the very notion of an objective ethics that should guide our actions.

When we criticise 'capitalism', we really criticise a degree of moral decline as manifested through consumer preferences. I know, and accept, that ideas are not absolute rulers, far from it. Technology does affect moral behaviour (but not moral principles in themselves, I would say). Without the pill and household appliances, the socially accepted sexual morality and female behaviour would be very different from what they are today. I also know and accept the idea that a lot of generosity exists in our societies. It is not all doom and gloom. It remains that the social ills we see and resent are not the result of a System, of the 1%, of the bankers, of the speculators, . . . no, it is worse than that. They fairly accurately reflect the spirit of the age. If you want to call this spirit 'capitalism', please do. But you will confuse the issue, in my opinion.

If, big if, this is so, then Fanfani's early support for an authoritarian system may have been more than accidental. Only an authoritarian system would quickly solve (or rather appear to solve) the problem of modernity (or 'capitalism', if you must).

Of course, I do not support such a 'solution', which would be in any event not just unethical, but also impossible to implement, and counterproductive—it would be no solution at all. But I also think that 'capitalism' is not the right target.

What we have ahead of us is a long *Kulturkampf*, but not of the sort that that simple-minded Prussian protestant had in mind.

Giorgio Francesconi

Report: Extract from speech by **Omalu Yeshitela**, Chairman of the *African Socialist International*

No Capitalism Without Imperialism

"Marx declared,

"The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black skins, signaled the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief momenta of primitive accumulation..."

In the same work Marx also explained, though not intentionally, the obvious contradiction impacting the relationship between white people, including 'workers', and Africans and most others, the contradiction that is responsible for a commonality of cross-class interests within European society:

"Whilst the cotton industry introduced child slavery in England, it gave in the United States a stimulus to transformation of the earlier, more or less patriarchal slavery, into a system of commercial exploitation. In fact the veiled slavery of the wage workers in Europe needed, for its pedestal, slavery pure and simple in the new world."

African Internationalists are historical materialists whose investigation and analysis of the world has as its starting point an examination of the world from the objective reality and experiences of Africans and the vast majority of the people on the planet, including the "white" or European people.

So it is clear to us that imperialism is not a product of capitalism; it is not capitalism developed to its highest stage.

Instead, capitalism is a product of imperialism.

Capitalism is imperialism developed to its highest stage, not the other way around.

The imperialism defined by Lenin has as its foundation the "*primitive accumulation*" spoken of by Marx.

Finance capital, the export of capital, monopoly, etc., are all articulations of a political economy rooted in parasitism and based on the historically brutal subjugation of most of humanity.

Unlike Marx and Lenin, we African Internationalists deny that there has ever been anything progressive about capitalism.

Capitalism was born parasitic.

Capitalism was born in disrepute, born of the rapes, massacres, occupations, genocides, colonialism and every despic-

able act humans are capable of inflicting on others.

Capitalism was not responsible for some great, otherwise unimaginable leap in production, which—despite its contradictions—resulted in progress and enlightenment.

What capitalism did was to rip the vast majority of humanity out of the productive process—in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Australia and what has come to be known as the Americas.

...capitalism has been the absolute factor in restricting production and development by concentrating productive capacity in the hands of the world's minority European population that sits atop the pedestal of our oppressive reality.

Capitalism was not the good, "progressive" force that is the precursor to something better for "humanity". Capitalism was a disaster that rescued Europe from a diseased feudal existence at the expense of the world.

Europe is not the center of the universe.

...

Today's white left is also locked into a worldview that places the location of Europeans in the world as the center of the universe. It always has.

Otherwise, Marx would have been forced to declare that the road to socialism was the destruction of the "*pedestal*" upon which all capitalist activity occurs, not some maturation of contradictions within the capitalist society upon the pedestal, a

society that owed its success to the existence of that pedestal.

...

African Internationalism has brought us to a different understanding than that held by Marx and Lenin regarding the way forward in the struggle against capitalism. It is rooted in our recognition, supported by the extensive quotes from Marx above, that it was imperialism that gave birth to capitalism and not the other way around.

We claim that

"African Internationalism is a scientifically falsifiable theory as can be seen in this question: Would capitalism and the resultant European wealth and African impoverishment have occurred without the European attack on Africa, its division, African slavery and dispersal, colonialism and neocolonialism?" (*One People! One Party! One Destiny!*)

Lenin stated that imperialism is capitalism that is characterized in part by parasitism. But from what we have already seen from the pen of Marx, capitalism was born parasitic.

That is the meaning of the enslavement, colonization and annexation of other countries and peoples by Europe."

[The African People's Socialist Party
<http://bermudaradical.wordpress.com/about/who-am-i/>

This speech can be read in full in the forthcoming issue of *Irish Foreign Affairs* (Issue 16)

Pat Murphy And The IWG

After my obituary article on Gerry Lawless was published earlier this year, I was sent a copy of an internal document of the Trotskyist group that was established after Lawless and Liam Daltun broke up the Irish Workers' Group late in 1965 in order to wage the struggle against Stalinism. While that struggle was still being waged within the IWG, information was laid with the police of the Royal Navy, which led to the attempted arrest of one of the 'Stalinists'. It was evident in the circumstances that the information was laid by either Lawless or Daltun or both. The internal document of their group, which is largely about a conflict that arose between Lawless and Daltun once they had broken free of the seductions of Stalinist realism, confirms that this was the case. In making a case against Lawless, Daltun mentions in passing that Lawless was proud of the fact that he made use of the police in the factional struggle. That is

how I assumed it was. I would have been very surprised if it had been Daltun who did the informing. But, when the fate of the world is at stake—and that was how it seemed to them at the time—anything can be done to save it: that was the reasoning. I am glad to find that Daltun didn't do it, and that he didn't like the fact that it was done by his close associate.

Another interesting thing I learn from that document is that Daltun was paid £10 a week for a couple of weeks so that he could write an answer to something I had written. The money was paid to him by Lawless from funds made available by the general Trotskyist movement in London. That was while we were all supposed to be working out things together within the IWG, under an agreement that Pat Murphy made with them. Ten pounds free of tax and insurance was a pretty good weekly wage at the time.

I don't know what it was that I wrote that caused such apprehension among the great names of British Trotskyism that they became advisers and paymasters to a group within the IWG. Whatever it was, it was written while I was working as a manual labourer. And, as far as I recall, I was digging graves by hand at the time in Highgate Cemetery.

There an old gravedigger showed me where Marx had actually been buried before being dug up in the early fifties and placed under a monument on the main avenue of the graveyard. He had dug him up and handled his bones. The idea was that one should approach tourists who were admiring the great head on the monument and offer to show them the actual burial spot in a modest out-of-the-way area, and get a tip. But I was never any good at that sort of thing.

I was living at the time in a room that Daltun arranged be sub-let to me, in his substantial flat, and I was discussing things freely with him. I could see at times that he had to restrain himself from unleashing his great physical power against me. But he always did restrain himself—though I recall that once he got right to the brink of letting himself go. However, I had been a Gaelic football goalkeeper, unprotected by rules in the goal-mouth melee, and I didn't let that disconcert me.

Whatever writing I did was at a workingmen's cafe in the Liverpool Road on the way to work. I got up an hour early to make time for it. Of course I could only do it that way because I didn't have to grapple with a self-contradictory tangle of theories every time I put pencil to paper, as he had. Poor Liam! I reckon he earned his tenner a week.

Daltun was the first person I knew who read the *Irish Times*. I had never seen it until I saw it with him. I suppose I knew it existed, but it had not penetrated into Slieve Luacra then. And it was not to be got there for another thirty years. But Liam could not get through the day without it, and without a French newspaper whose name I forget. I found it incongruous that a fierce Republican and Marxist revolutionary was addicted to the imperialist culture of the Anglo-Irish remnant. He gave me some practical reason why it had to be read, but I could see that it was soul-food to him. At first I put it down to eccentricity but, as time went by, I noticed that he was far from being the only revolutionary who was spiritually dependent on it. I had a go at reading it, but I couldn't stay the course. One of the first issues I read had a column of advice for emigrants. It advised against race-mixing, and parti-

cularly warned *cailíns* to beware of the charms of black men.

One of Daltun's reasons for reading the *Irish Times*, that I recall, was that it occasionally had a column or an article in Irish, and things could be said in Irish that would not be allowed in English. I was never attracted by the esoteric and I thought it was a debasement of Irish to use it as a secret language for expressing heresy. At the age of 12 I was bi-lingual for all the practical purposes of an academically unambitious 12 year old. My vocabulary did not extend afterwards as English was the actual language in use in Slieve Luacra.

Peter Hart, in his book that was hailed as a classic by Roy Foster and that the History Department of Cork University would tolerate no criticism of, said that Slieve Luacra was an Irish-speaking region. It hadn't been for over a century. One might have expected Cork University to know that. But perhaps the range of city thought did not extend that far into the wilderness—certainly not as far as the "*upland peasants*" that lived on the fare side of the Musher Mountain. But Hart was not in Cork University. And the reference he gave for the assertion that Slieve Luacra was Irish-speaking was me. In fact, I had never said anything on the subject but that Slieve Luacra was distinctive in that it did not wait passively for Anglo erosion to destroy the language and the culture with it, but by an effort of will pre-empted erosion by becoming English-speaking while transferring as much of its culture as possible into English. That was in the second quarter of the 19th century. I'm sure I said that clearly every time I referred to the matter, and I took Hart's treatment of it as the mark of a charlatan.

Pat Murphy urged me periodically to get in on the Gaelgoir business, get the *Fainne* and play them at their own game. It was one of the few things I disagreed with him about.

A year or two after the break-up of the IWG I was involved with Sean Kearney in publishing a periodical in Irish for a manufacturing development in the Gweedore Gaeltacht in Donegal. Quite a few issues were published. But it all came to nothing. Gweedore spoke Irish domestically, but absolutely refused to transact Trade Union business in Irish. Kearney was a stubborn, strong-willed individual, but even he could not make them do it. They had fixed ideas on the subject.

Then in 1970 I worked for a few weeks on the building of a housing estate that was to be the centre of a Belfast Gaeltacht. And something came of that. As far as I

observed in the 1970s and 1980s that Irish movement was rather contemptuous of the Republicans, with their *cúpla focal**. They took the "*Tír gan teanga*"** maxim in earnest and felt that they were laying foundations that were safe from political accident.

But to get back to Lawless and Daltun. Six or seven years after the break-up of the IWG, in the early seventies, I was living in West Belfast, almost in the shadow of Divis Tower, publishing a weekly directed against the war, which had some effect, and I was surviving. I heard that Daltun had killed himself in London. I never heard the story of it. But I wasn't surprised. He was too complex an individual—with a reflective bent along with a strong impulse towards action—to be satisfied with the position he seems to have found himself in after Northern Ireland blew itself apart. I imagine he was unable to find his way through the theoretical maze in which he was trapped so that he might be able to do something in a way that made sense to him.

Pat Murphy, who was a unique combination of Dubliner and Culchie, and whose knowledge of the world was got through direct observation of people and situations—he missed out on education due to a prolonged bout of bone-TB—gave an undertaking to Daltun and Lawless that, if they stayed the course with him, a socialist organisation that counted for something in the real world would be established, and they would have ample opportunity for exercising their very different talents. He was very sure of himself. They had drawn him into their group, but it was he who knew how to make something of it.

The difficulty was Trotsky's view of the Russian revolution and the state of mind it developed, which got in the way of a realistic engagement with the current situation. He got them to agree that we should try to reason our way through the course of the revolution, the nature of the system established by Lenin, and the kind of criticism made by Trotsky after Lenin died. They obviously discussed this with their London Trotskyist patrons, who were horrified, and made them ashamed of themselves. But by then they had started us up and when they retreated we carried on.

The Russian difficulty had to do with Trotsky's theory, or vision, of Permanent Revolution. But I will leave that for another article.

One of the things I discussed with Pat

* Few words. Ed.

** Country without a tongue.

Murphy in those times—I think the IWG broke up before it got to discussing such things—was how one might go about constructing a socialist economy in Ireland.

Pat was greatly impressed by the English Department of Agriculture and especially the Milk Marketing Board. The latter, as I understood him, was a sort of national wholesaler which controlled prices, maintained a steady market demand for producers, and maintained a degree of national self-sufficiency in the world market. Milk production was effectively an area of planned economy within the market.

Other spheres of agricultural production were also subject to State control, but with the object of exploiting the world market, which was of course an English creation. Prices of home-produced products were kept low by means of state-subsidies to English farmers, in order to compel exporters (chiefly from the English colonies, Ireland and Argentina) to sell cheaply into the English market. It was hopeless for England to try to feed itself. The possibility of that went in the mid-19th century with the repeal of the Corn Laws. England then arranged for the world to feed its industrial masses cheaply. Of course that arrangement depended ultimately on the power of English militarism and dominance of the world's seas, but Pat was appreciative of the internal economic arrangements in Britain by which it was facilitated, and he saw them as having a wider applicability.

These were matters in which Lawless and Daltun took no interest. Socialism was an affair of making revolution with the industrial masses and they did not seem to notice that the Irish population was predominantly rural and its economy predominantly agricultural. But I have heard a leader of the Farmers' Union explaining things much as Pat explained them.

I don't know that rural Ireland was any less socialist than urban Ireland. While I lived in North Cork it had one safe Fianna Fail seat (Sean Moylan's, who never courted popularity and challenged the electorate to disgrace itself by not electing him), one safe Labour seat (held by Paddy McAuliffe (who lived in a Labourer's Cottage, and showed the independence of spirit which the Labourers' Cottages, established by the Land & Labour League and the Unionist Government, were designed to instigate), and a third seat which was in contention between Fianna Fail and Fine Gael.

McAuliffe told me that in 1948 he had

opposed joining the first Coalition. He hoped to make the Labour Party a force in its own right, and he could not see that happening in alignment with Fine Gael. But the Party leadership wouldn't hear of it. And twenty years after that, with Conor Cruise O'Brien prominent in it, the Party leadership proclaimed *Socialism In The Seventies* and set about getting rid of the rural backwoodsmen who were holding them back. Ten years after that O'Brien became an Ulster Unionist—only to be described by a rival Unionist as a cuckoo in the nest.

The Official IRA (Stickies), having fought their lunatic war in the early 1970s, and gone through a phase of being Moscow's alternative Irish party, took on the leadership of the Labour Party, and last year threw away the opportunity to become the Opposition and put down its marker to be a future Government, preferring to take a few jobs from Fine Gael.

Political activity has to be conducted in the actual world. Protest can be conducted against the actuality of the world, from a fantasy viewpoint, and might occasionally make an impact on some feature of the actual world. Pat Murphy had, in my experience, a unique understanding of the actuality of Irish society combined with a strong will to act on it. His proposal to Daltun and Lawless that, if they stayed the course with him, he would enable their capacity for protest to be brought to bear on the actual world, and get to be something more than a passing phenomenon of protest within bourgeois politics, was realisable. I think that, left to themselves, they would have stayed the course, but world Trotskyism wouldn't have it so.

A couple of years after the IWG was broken up, Pat—in conjunction with Denis Dennehy—showed, in the Housing Action movement, what a bold agitation in support of a realistically-conceived demand might achieve. From that point on I was mainly concerned with Northern Ireland.

Pat's view was that public control of wholesaling was the practical point of entry for a socialist movement realistically engaged with the project of socialist reform of capitalist society.

I worked for a number of years as a labourer in a Co-op Creamery and Mill in Slieve Luacra. The Co-op had about 120 members—people who had been active in William O'Brien's land agitation, had bought the land they farmed under the 1903 land purchase subsidy scheme which he negotiated with the Unionist Government in 1903, and had supported his campaign against Redmond's Home Rule

Party in 1910 on the grounds that it had taken on a strong Catholic-sectarian character, and because of this and because it was committed to achieving Home Rule by manipulating the conflict of British parties, it was driving the situation towards Partition. Then in 1918 they had voted for independence—or had not needed to vote because Redmond had given up North Cork as lost to his cause before the second 1910 Election and his successor did not contest the seat in 1918. They had taken part in enforcing the 1918 vote in war. Then they limited the destructive effect of the Treaty War forced by Britain. After that they had got down to business in a market system modified by co-operative wholesaling.

They were milk producers in the main. They sold the milk to themselves organised co-operatively as a wholesaler. And they imported maize and fertilisers as a wholesaler and sold it to themselves retail. They employed a Manager from the Agricultural College in the University to oversee the business, but held regular meetings as a Co-op to advise him.

Every morning they brought the milk to the Creamery. I reckon the average was three or four 20 gallon milk churns each. I began the day by humping a few hundred churns—tanks we called them—onto a platform and emptying them into a vat while the farmers stood around discussing the affairs of the world. "*Going to the Creamery*" was a sociable business, except for one or two super-industrious fanatics.

Marx's comparison of peasants to a heap of potatoes in a sack struck me as absurd the first time I came across it. And, when I later came across idyllic descriptions of the socially and publicly concerned town life of the bourgeoisie in parts of the Continent, what it put me in mind of was North Cork peasants going to the Creamery.

Michael Davitt saw what one might call the bourgeois potential of the peasantry at a time when cultured opinion tended to see them as apes, and helped them to take the first steps towards realising it. Some years later Arthur Balfour saw it when he was Chief Secretary and was engaged in putting down the land agitation by police action, and when he became Prime Minister he collaborated with William O'Brien (whom he had once imprisoned) in realising in Ireland the Tory ideal of a property-owning democracy.

Davitt went on from the organising of the Irish peasants in the Land League to organising English workers in industry on similar lines. He was distracted when

Parnell, overcome by a Messianic vision of himself, set about destroying the Irish Party—but by then Davitt was finding that co-operative action did not come as easily to wage-workers as it had come to the tenant-farmers.

But if workers do not encroach on the capitalist system co-operatively, how is a socialist system to be brought about and maintained?

The scheme whereby the workers were to be reduced to a proletariat with absolutely nothing and then, through a revolutionary convulsion, were to become a working-class ruling class with everything—somehow creating a new kind of society in the process—did not seem realistic to either of us.

After 1969 I got drawn into the politics of the Northern Ireland situation while Pat carried on with working class self-help projects in Dublin.

I tried for a while to keep up with the new economic devices thrown up in the course of capitalist development, but then concluded that they were all just increasingly sophisticated developments within wholesaling.

My understanding of the market, aside from what I observed as the labourer in the Creamery Co-op, came from a reading of *Capital* while I was the labourer in that Co-op. That is to say, it was theoretical. Pat had somehow become fluent in the language of business economics. Between us we managed to figure things out.

We met at the Working Men's College in Camden Town, which was then the Irish centre in London. The WMC was set up by Christian Socialists following the Chartist scare. Its mission was to exert a liberal bourgeois influence on the working class. Its philanthropic patrons around 1960 came almost entirely from the City of London, and their world outlook was Liberal Imperialist. One or other of them would occasionally come down to awe the minuscule fragment of the masses that was there to hear them with their condescension and their expertise.

One day the Director of the Bank of England came and was quizzed by Pat in his own language. That was the closest I ever got to the centre of finance capitalism. The Bank of England, to give it its due, was eager to explain itself, and was pleased to be subjected to hard questioning. What I got from it was that the business of the Bank of England in its purely economic capacity was to facilitate wholesaling.

A few years later we met an Australian, Graham Ruthven, whose obsession was

the rise of capitalism in Europe. And his view was that the great banking houses had grown consistently from origins in small-scale wholesaling, one thing leading to another.

(To be continued, maybe)

PS: In my first article about Lawless and Daltun I failed to mention John Palmer. Like Joe Quinn, he hovered closely around

the edges of the IWG. He was, he said, the nephew of Sean Treacy—the Sean Treacy. He wrote an article about Treacy for a single-issue magazine published by Daltun before the IWG. It was called *Parabellum Patriot* as I recall. Palmer was, I think, a member of the inner circle of Tony Cliff's elite *International Socialism* group. And he was a journalist on the *Financial Times*.

Brendan Clifford

Letter To The Editor

A Prying Out Sectarianism

EDITORIAL NOTE

A long contribution on the Dunmanway killings of April 1922 has been received from Jeffrey Dudgeon, Member of the Order of the British Empire (see below).

Dudgeon was active in the sectarian disruption of the Campaign for Labour Representation and the Campaign for Equal Citizenship in Northern Ireland. These were cross-community groups, built up through 20 years of effort, whose object was to establish the possibility of non-sectarian politics by bringing the North within the democratic party-politics of the British state, which is, and always has been, the only state in the North. Exclusion of the North from the democratic system by which the state is governed rendered government in the North sectarian and undemocratic.

Whitehall was intransigently opposed to bringing the North within the democracy of the state—it had another use for it—and its influence was used to counter the influence of the CLR and CEC. Nevertheless, the pressure of the CLR and CEC increased steadily through lobbying of the Labour and Tory parties by groups that were demonstrably cross-community. At a critical moment the state succeeded in breaking up the movement by sectarian action. A Labour group called Democracy Now was set up, with lavish funding, to mimic the CLR, but as a Protestant body, festooned with Union Jackery. The organiser of the operation was Kate Hoey MP, who had joined the CLR and become the President. On her initiative confidential approaches were made to Protestants in the CLR—to all but a few who were judged to be beyond the reach of sectarianism—and most were siphoned off to Democracy Now by promises of various kinds. Dudgeon MBE was active in that business.

Democracy Now, with money to throw around, made a splash at one Labour Party Conference. It seemed to confirm the idea put forward by opponents of the CLR that the CLR was a Protestant Unionist ploy.

About 15 years of steady work showing that support for it was at least as strong in the Catholic community as in the Protestant, was conjured away in a moment. This is how media politics works, and Democracy Now was media politics. When Democracy Now had done their essential business of sectarianising the party organisation issue, it withered.

Dudgeon MBE was even more active in the job that was done in sectarianising the CEC and destroying it.

We have described this before. Dudgeon MBE has had many letters published in the *Irish Political Review* but chose not to deny or explain. Our characterisation of him as an active sectarian in the North in recent times stands undisputed.

But he has set up as a critic of sectarianism in the South long ago during the war which nationalist Ireland had to fight because Britain would not concede what was demanded by democratic voting. And the incident which interests him most is the one about which there is no evidence and everything is speculation—the Dunmanway killings.

The nearest thing to evidence is a Coroner's Inquest. None of those who are speculating furiously have bothered about that. And when Jack Lane brought it to light they ignored it.

Dudgeon MBE does not differ from the others in his obsession with groundless speculation. Where he differs is that he, with a record of sectarian action, has set up to be a critic of sectarianism.

Or is he a critic of it? We print his latest effort below—with an excessive liberal concession to his double standard, which cannot continue—and he appears to be saying in places that sectarianism is the necessary condition of all things in Ireland, (due perhaps to the intense sectarian pressure applied to it by British power for centuries and the sectarian British arrangements for the Six Counties?). And that would mean, of course, that all he did in his actions in Belfast was acknowledge the necessity of it.

Bureau Of Military History And Dunmanway Controversy

Barry Keane wrote of "former GAA President's statement to the Bureau of Military History (BMH) ends 1922 West Cork Protestant killings controversy". He added "both sides will be able to claim victory as the real story is revealed" and that, while Peter Hart "got the sequence of events right", Michael O'Donoghue's information "directly contradicts his thesis that the murders were sectarian". He concluded, the Dunmanway killings "were a unique stain on the reputation of the IRA" as per "de Valera's official biography" but they were not evidence of "systematic ethnic cleaning similar to that which happened to Catholics in the north".

The BMH archive of over 2,000 items, mostly witness statements, was "collected by the State between 1947 and 1957, in order to gather primary source material for the revolutionary period in Ireland from 1913 to 1921". It is separately described as ending on 11th July 1921. The Truce was seen as a suitable cut-off date as it avoided the Civil War and its preliminaries which were obviously highly sensitive in the south in the 1950s as so many of the participants were still alive.

That period was then only some 35 years earlier, the equivalent timeframe today for events in the late 1970s. However many of the Statements, like Michael O'Donoghue's, drift over into the 1922-23 period, and in his case extensively. References in the BMH files to the years 1922 and 1923 are numbered in hundreds. Of note is the fact that O'Donoghue's statement is the only one to mention the Dunmanway murders and similarly the only one to mention the supposed Anti-Sinn Féin Society or League in Cork.

One other witness statement, that of Patrick Collins (Capt. 'G' Company, 2nd Battn., Cork No. 1 Bgde.) does mention something similar: "It was known by our Intelligence Service that, during the latter half of 1920, there was formed in Cork an Anti-Sinn Féin organisation, comprising members of the Freemason and Protestant Young Men's Christian Association in Cork City." This unlikely combination however belongs to a somewhat earlier time and the city.

Barry Keane is far too sanguine about this controversy ending although he would very much like it to be so, believing it "a pointless debate". His added overstatement above about "systematic ethnic cleaning"

of Catholics in the north is largely for another day but it is worth reminding him that Peter Hart said such cleansing occurred in neither part of Ireland while the general fate of the northern Catholics does not suggest what did happen to them was systematic cleansing. It was certainly not entirely defensive as ninety-two police officers—RIC and RUC—were killed from 1920 to 1922 in the six counties.

I think Mr. Keane would prefer that historians concentrated on the main aspects of the War of Independence in Cork and the less problematic but Dunmanway was too great a crime to be a mere "stain" on the reputation of the IRA. It may have been exceptional but in a war in which Protestants feared they would suffer drastically it was inevitable, and probably more so in the post-truce chaos. Like Bloody Sunday, it was remarkable for the number of dead and the loss of control by the military.

In truth, Michael O'Donoghue's Witness Statement to the BMH adds very little by way of information where Dunmanway is concerned. Indeed it is hardly a Witness Statement at all as he is only reporting on what he has heard and surmising in consequence.

The Statement's worth comes from who is saying it, more than what is said. On the basic facts and taking it at face value, O'Donoghue is likely to be correct as to the sequencing and origin of the killings, as such comments did not endanger comrades' reputations. On the sectarian aspects, he has to be much less convincing since that is essentially a matter of opinion, something politically subjective.

The Statement must therefore be assessed, in its context, with caution and due scepticism. Overall it is a well-written, literary, stirring narrative of military campaigning, 377 typed pages in length. Although it is unsigned and undated a year in the 1950s can be inferred from a note of 19 August 1958 regarding the abstraction of several pages of his Civil War service description.

The tone and style of the short section (280 words) on the Dunmanway murders differs from the rest of his testimony. It is hard edged, defensive and plainly propagandist although his humanity seeps through. It was written as a tribute to a fallen comrade just after a mention of him.

No names or ranks of those who carried out the massacre are given nor were they likely to have been.

He wrote,

"Poor Mick O'Neill A grand chivalrous warrior of the I.R.A. less than two months later, he called at the house of a British loyalist, named Hornibrook, to get help for a broken-down motor. As he knocked on the door, he was treacherously shot dead without the slightest warning by a hidden hand from inside the house. The I.R.A. in Bandon were alerted. The house was surrounded. Under threat of bombing and burning, the inmates surrendered. Three men, Hornibrook, his son and son-in-law, a Captain Woods. The latter, a British Secret Service agent, confessed to firing the fatal shot, Why? God alone knows. None of the three knew O'Neill or he them. Probably Woods got scared at seeing the strange young man in I.R.A. attire knocking, thought he was cornered and fired at him in a panic. The sequel was tragic."

By the time of the killings, which started in the early morning of 26 April 1922, O'Donoghue had moved to Donegal. He talks of attending meetings in Cork at the end of March 1922 and then of his decision to go to Donegal as the 1st Northern Division's military engineer, swapping with one Mick Crowley. By late April 1922 he was out of Cork.

O'Donoghue concluded,

"Several prominent loyalists—all active members of the anti-Sinn Féin Society in West Cork, and blacklisted as such in I.R.A. Intelligence Records—in Bandon, Clonakilty, Ballineen and Dunmanway, were seized at night by armed men, taken out and killed. Some were hung, most were shot. All were Protestants. This gave the slaughter a sectarian appearance. Religious animosity had nothing whatever to do with it. These people were done to death as a savage, wholesale, murderous reprisal for the murder of Mick O'Neill. They were doomed to die because they were listed as aiders and abettors of the British Secret Service, one of whom, Captain Woods, had confessed to shooting dead treacherously and in cold blood Vice-Commandant Michael O'Neill that day near Crookstown in May 1922 Fifteen or sixteen loyalists in all went to gory graves in brutal reprisal for O'Neill's murder."

The use of the term "*anti-Sinn Féin Society*" seems to be exculpatory as O'Donoghue's assertion that religion was not the issue does not pass muster when he accepts the ten later deaths—all Protestant—were reprisals. Nobody has produced evidence of such an entity in 1922 although Peter Hart says a number of those killed had pro-British reputations not least the Hornibrooks. That coheres with Gerard Murphy who wrote of an "*anti-Sinn Féin*

Society' consisting of renegade British officers carrying out assassinations in Cork during 1920/21. But IRA men then used this as a blanket term to cover their own shootings of Protestants in the post-Truce period."

O'Donoghue's phrasing reads remarkably like Hart's memorable chapter heading *'Taking it out on the Protestants.'* (*The IRA and its Enemies*, 1998) With so many killings, often based on little more than perception, local gossip and grudges, it was inevitable that collateral damage would also occur with the wrong victims being picked out or relatives substituting, as may have happened in the case of the shot Church of Ireland clergyman, the Rev. Ralph Harbord. It is probably true that if Captain Woods had not resisted fourteen people would not have died.

The section is notable for being both justificatory and condemnatory yet the phrasing reveals his horror at the excesses of the days of rage. Minor points include him getting the month wrong (April not May) while later saying some of the Protestants were hanged which chimes with the statement by Matilda Woods, daughter of Thomas Hornibrook. Her husband was the uncle of Captain Woods who fired the fatal shot. (See Keane's valuable website <https://sites.google.com/site/protestantcork191136/> for such accurate details in his section *'Protestant Cork decline 1911-1926 Murders, Mistakes, Myths, and Misinformation.'*)

Perhaps Thomas Hornibrook, his son Samuel and Captain Woods were indeed hanged if their crime was thought to be murder, the word used here. Most accounts accept that the IRA was raiding their house in darkness. O'Donoghue unobtrusively understands their predicament. One welcome result of the developing controversy might be the discovery and reburial of the bodies of those three disappeared men which have never been located.

On the origin of the massacre, John Regan's supposition that the capture on 26 April in Macroom of the four British Intelligence officers and their later execution was related no longer stands up. Similarly the notion expressed in the *Irish Political Review* that there is a case for the killings having been the work of the British can be discarded. It has to be said however that O'Donoghue only implies IRA involvement, probably because it did not seem an issue at that time, and not one he wanted to emphasise.

Jack Lane wrote in the same *Irish Political Review* issue, *"But the killings*

were repudiated at the time on the basis that they were sectarian and would fuel sectarianism". This was indeed true—of both sides of the Dail—and it does not suggest the anti-Treatyites were *"prepared to kill groups of Protestants to further their cause"*. Most of the Cork IRA was anti-treaty for all sorts of reasons and its senior officers were at that moment in Dublin, as we know, but it has to be admitted then when blood is up sectarianism is never far from the surface. The killing of ten Protestants in county Cork after O'Neill's killing is in no way dissimilar to the Kingsmill massacre in county Armagh fifty-four years later where ten Protestants were taken out of a minibus and shot dead in reprisal for earlier killings.

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. Rebel or paramilitary forces would hardly be an exception to the pattern.

The only reason, I believe, is that Republicanism grew out of, maintains and certainly trades effectively—especially internationally—on a policy and reputation of bringing Irish people of all persuasions together. This could be possible with Irish Protestants, rarely of Unionists and certainly never of the pro-British population and Loyalists—the majority in the north. 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.

This successful piece of disingenuity or sometimes self-deception is at its most resonant with Wolfe Tone's statement of aims, worth quoting at length,

"To subvert the tyranny of our execrable government, to break the connection with England, the never failing source of all our political evils, and to assert the independence of my country—these were my objects. To unite the whole people of Ireland, to abolish the memory of all past dissensions, and to substitute the common name of Irishman, in the place of the denominations of Protestant, Catholic, and Dissenter—these were my means."

Not only did he fail then but his words now have only the opposite effect, and have done since partition. 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.

Michael O'Donoghue, having a twin brother James in the RIC, exemplified the split line amongst Irish Catholics, one more evident today with Home Rule sentiment surfacing as Republican hegemony slides away.

He wrote in his Witness Statement of that twin:

"His training completed, he was posted to Aughnacloy, Co. Tyrone, where he served until the R.I.C. were disbanded in 1922. I wrote back to mother and told her to warn her R.I.C. son never to write to me or never to mention that he had a brother in Cork at U.C.C. Furthermore, I wanted to hear no mention of him whatsoever in any of her letters, and I never referred to him at all. I was a bit alarmed about my own extraordinary position. Here was I now in Cork, an active member of the Irish Volunteers (now the I.R.A.), while my twin brother was in the R.I.C. Force in Ulster, and my father, an ex-sergeant, R.I.C."

He then related the fate of that brother in the Summer of 1922 after he left the RIC,

"The local I.R.A. police had promptly arrested him and ordered him to leave Cappoquin within 24 hours under threat of death. He had gone back straight to Gormanston R.I.C. H.Q., where he was retained in the R.I.C. for a few months longer. My parents were irate with the local I.R.A. for this bit of tyranny, and I, too, shared their resentment, somewhat. It certainly was galling for me, an I.R.A. fighter in North and South, to dash home to see my parents and family and to find that my brother, a demobbed R.I.C. man, returned home, had been driven away as a dangerous criminal at the point of the gun by the local Republican police".

An anti-Treatyite, O'Donoghue was no unseeing triumphalist, observing,

"It was just one of the many acts of bullying and brutal tyranny indulged in at that time by petty local Republican "warriors" to show their arrogant authority and self-importance. These acts resulted in the name of I.R.A. police becoming obnoxious in many districts. In many places, the local Battalion Commandant claimed supreme authority in his area and ruled like a feudal baron."

Once at war, there is little that can be done to curb excesses at command level let alone at the periphery. This witness gave honourable examples of how he tried while always defending his comrades but it is not the last word on the matter of Dunmanway.

Jeffrey Dudgeon
14 September 2012

Dunmanway: Some Comments

The Michael O'Donoghue Statement, about which readers were informed in the Press Release we received from Barry Keane (September *Irish Political Review*), is obviously not a Witness Statement to the Dunmanway killings. As we have pointed out repeatedly, there was no witness to any of those killings who threw any light on responsibility for them.

Bureau of Military History Statements are about the War of Independence and end, perhaps unrealistically, with the Truce. The Dunmanway killings of 26th to 28th April 1922 happened ten months after the Truce and four months after the 'Treaty'. The 'Civil War' was not to start for another two months.

The IRA was in both actual and official authority in West Cork, but the British Army had not left the country and it was in fact reorganising itself for action. The threat that Britain would bring all the resources of the Empire to bear on a reconquest—which caused the 'Treaty' to be signed in December 1921—remained operative until 28th June 1922, when Michael Collins, faced with a final ultimatum from Whitehall, launched what is called the Civil War.

The situation in April 1922 was that Britain had set up the signers of the 'Treaty' as the Provisional Government and was assisting it to form an army. But the Volunteer Army that had forced Britain to the negotiating table remained in being. The Provisional Government, which needed to present itself as a continuation of the Dail Government as well as the Provisional Government of the Parliament of Southern Ireland, was anxious not to precipitate a split in it. The IRA was therefore in official authority in West Cork in April.

On the morning of April 26th an IRA group was sent on official business to the Hornibrook house in Ballygroman. When there was no response to knocking on the door, the commandant of the group went to enter by a window and was shot dead from inside the house. The IRA group was apparently unarmed. It sent for armed support, entered the house, and the three men in occupation were executed.

The killing (murder ?) of the leader of an unarmed IRA group at the Hornibrook house may have been a last-ditch action by a group of armed British Loyalists who could not bear to accept the fact that Britain had conceded authority to an Irish movement which they hated and despised

—a case of better dead than Irish—or it may have been part of something more rational that miscarried.

In the afternoon of the same day a group of British Military Intelligence officers were arrested in Macroom some miles away, a town which had been the base of British military and torture activities during the War. They were questioned and executed. A confrontation with the British commander in the area (the future General Montgomery) ensued. The British stood down and accepted the accomplished fact. It must have been judged that the circumstances were not right from the British viewpoint to precipitate what was clearly an unstable situation with an ultimatum. (That was to be done two months later, with considerable destructive effect on the Irish cause, with the ultimatum to Collins to start a "civil war"—or else!)

The morning after the British Intelligence officers were caught (April 27th), there was a killing in Dunmanway. That was the start of a number of killings between the morning of the 27th and the morning of the 29th, which has been sensationalised as the Bandon Valley Massacre. The killings stopped on the morning of the 29th, leaving not a shred of evidence identifying the perpetrators. There were two witnesses—the wife of one victim and the mother of another. Their evidence at the inquests threw no light on the matter—except that the wife said one of the killers said to her husband: "*Take that your Free Stater, Free Stater, Free Stater*". That indicated an Anti-Treaty motive. The IRA in the area was predominantly anti-Treaty. It was still united in late April, and there were hopes that it could be kept united by fudging certain Treaty issues in the Constitution that was being negotiated—not by the parties in the Dail but between the Treatyite Party and Whitehall.

But Britain did not intend that the Volunteer army that had fought it to the negotiating table—after Westminster had overruled the results of two General Elections—should remain in being for the Free State. It vetoed a general Sinn Fein Election Agreement in mid-June and in late June it threatened to resume military operations if Collins did not make war on the Anti-Treaty group in occupation of the Four Courts.

The Four Courts were taken over by the Volunteers on April 14th, a fortnight before

the incidents in Ballygroman, Macroom and Dunmanway, but that did not bring about a rupture between Treatyites and Anti-Treatyites in general. The Election Pact was made over a month later (20 May).

The West Cork Republicans did not have a record of irrational action. They had no reason to embark on a killing spree of Protestants, signing their action by announcing that they were killing Free Staters. And if they killed them just because they were Protestants, hoping to spark off a pogrom of Protestants, why disguise it by pretending it was because they were Free Staters?

The IRA was split by Collins's acting under British ultimatum two months later. West Cork had to be conquered by the Free State. The Treatyite leaders, when they were forced to make war, lost sight of the reasons they had given for signing the 'Treaty' and their willingness to come to an agreement with the Anti-Treatyites if Whitehall had let them. They had to present the 'Treaty' as a positive good and blacken their enemies. But, as far as we know, they did not depict the West Cork Republicans as Protestant-killers who had been chafing at the bit for two months. They just ignored the inquest evidence as being incredible.

It seems that Martin Mansergh is the only one who takes it seriously. Dudgeon MBE doesn't. And that means he has rejected the only evidence there is and operates by speculative inference from circumstances.

In May 2011 he was very definite:

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

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

(It is unwise when making a rigorous induction from circumstances to make a categorical statement which misrepresents the circumstances. There was certainly another force in Cork then capable of disciplined military action. British forces had not yet ended their deployment in Ireland. And it has not yet been found possible to pin the Bank robbery on the Provos, even discounting the fact that the only piece of the loot yet found was in a policy building.)

Mr. Dudgeon is not so definite now. The speculation now is about the authori-

tative leaders being away, blood being up, and the sectarianism close to the surface breaking out. It begins to sound like the "renegades" or "mavericks" one heard about in Cork City. But the version of the operation described by Peter Hart as the "most plausible"—action by two to five companies with the connivance of many others—could not have been conducted without becoming known to the leaders, even though they were away from home at the time—and without leaving traces of knowledge amongst the populace.

The relevance of the O'Donoghue Statement is that it seems to be the first reference to the incident which holds Republicanism in some form responsible for it. This accords with the conviction—the groundless belief—of Dudgeon, Borogonovo, Mansergh etc., but it contains no information about the incident itself. It would be surprising if it did, as O'Donoghue was located far from the scene of the incidents at the time, and his single paragraph about it is an aside in a Statement about something else written thirty years after the event.

The popularity, in certain circles in Cork, of the belief that Republicans did it, seems to be connected with the complete rejection of the two nations view of the North forty years ago. It seems to be a way of feeling guilty about Protestants, focused on an obscure incident in the distant past, while refusing to engage with the infinitely clearer and more important matters of recent times—or of dealing with those matters in marginal terms which avoids the substantial issue.

For Dudgeon it is about a kind of blood-guilt incurred by Republicanism in West Cork during two days in April 1922 which was somehow transmitted to the Catholic community in the North under Protestant rule half a century later. His only substantial disagreement with the prevailing nationalist view in Cork city—and the only substantial disagreement between that view and Peter Hart's—seems to be about motivation. And, if Republican responsibility is speculatively taken to be definite fact in the absence of evidence, why cannot speculation about motive be equally free of the obstacle of ascertainable fact?

But Dudgeon's views are interesting in a different dimension. They are representative views, incautiously expressed—the views of liberal Unionism in its decay into ethnicism. Unionism rejected the possibility of a British line of development a little over twenty years ago and the would-be liberal strain is chagrined at the subsequent turn of events and is showing what was below its surface. We will comment on this next month.

A Race Through Sectarianism

Was there a grand strategy that might have changed the face of Northern Ireland instead of the lethal force that brought in power-sharing? None has come to light. Instead, a defensive/offensive citizen force saw the end of the old one-party Stormont regime. Now Martin McGuinness, as a developing statesman and successful guerrilla leader, has made a gesture of reconciliation with the majority community. He has shaken the hand of the British Queen, Commander-in-Chief of the British Armed Forces, and mother and head of a militarised family. She remains Royal, he remains a Republican. This isn't good enough for some Unionists, who are in denial about the past.

I have already in another article outlined some of the atrocities carried out by Shankill Road Butchers and by the British Army special forces, the Royal Ulster Regiments, along with the UDA, Ulster Freedom Fighters, Red Hand of Ulster Commandos and the Ulster Volunteer Force, coordinated by MI5/ MI6/ RUC Special Branch. Thankfully power-sharing has quietened things and politics is now the name of the game, for the moment.

Here is a short diary of a race through sectarianism. It seems as if the Catholic community was asleep for fifty years. But, without the stirrings under the surface where the roots were growing, there would have been no salvation for the Catholic community. The following happened to many thousands of us.

1936. I am aged four. Glasgow Street, off York Road, Belfast. One Sunday afternoon there is a bang. My father goes to the door. A man is casually walking away with a smoking revolver. Our next door neighbour, a Catholic woman, has been shot dead in a sectarian attack. No police arrive. Maybe the killer was a member of the RUC? That night my Protestant father barricades the front and back doors with the furniture. My mother is a Catholic.

1937. We move to Kilburn Street, off the Donegall Road. I am aged five. I am playing on the front of the road when a motorcycle draws up to the kerb. The rider fires about three times. A man in front of me falls to the pavement. The motorcyclist in accelerating away skids on the greasy square-setts of the road. He is hit by a tram

and lies there staring up at the sky. The motorcycle engine is roaring, with the back wheel turning. A woman comes out of a shop and picks up his fallen revolver and disappears. I take on the notion that it was I who was meant to be shot dead. Now the woman has the gun and I don't know where she is. I run home. I can't speak for about two days, despite being shaken to bits by both parents. I hear something about another Catholic being killed.

It is 1938. We move to the countryside of Carryduff, Manse Hill, Clontonacally. Two rows of WW1 huts, called Fairview Gardens but known as FU Gardens by the inhabitants. Twenty huts, twenty families, one outside water-tap for all. Maybe we moved to try and find peace, maybe it was to do with the rent money we owed, the money we also owed to the local shops. Probably both. There is sectarianism there but to a lesser degree. There is always sectarianism in Northern Ireland but you hope to find somewhere where it might be to a lesser degree. Severe poverty among both communities doesn't diminish it as some of the left thought it would.

At the top of Fairview Gardens are the fields of a local farmer. His farmhouse isn't too far away. I play in the fields and come across his dog, a Rhodesian Ridgeback he uses as a cattle-dog and also as a guard-dog. It is a young dog, playful and childlike, so we get along very well. It follows me home sometimes.

One night after midnight my mother wakes me and tells me to get dressed. She says to get the dog. So I creep up to the farm in the pitch-black and get the dog by the collar out of its kennel and lead it away from the farmhouse. My mother is now part of a group of about twelve women. They make for a field and begin cutting what we knew as *Curlies* (probably broccoli: it was eaten with vinegar). The dog pricks up its ears and gives a low growl at the presence of the women but I manage to quieten it.

Then we moved to a better house to Mealough, still in Carryduff. When the farmer who owned it discovered who we really are—five Catholic children, one Catholic adult—we got a notice-to-quit. But we stay and the next thing is three of his sons (two in the B-Specials) along with their friends are stoning our house, breaking the slates on the roof, smashing a couple of windows. The RUC was

dismissive of the attacks. I did enlarge on this in a previous article.

Britain had declared war on Germany and there was a lot of talk about fighting for democracy on the wireless. Just before D-Day, the 6th of June 1944, our house is attacked for the fourth time. I was 12 years old. I remember my mother, a devout Catholic, hoping the Russians wouldn't stop at Germany. Earlier in the war William Joyce, nicknamed Lord Haw Haw by Whitehall, had been on the German radio, with a programme especially beamed to Ireland, promising German help for Northern Catholics. I don't think we would have been too bothered about them landing. Though my father spoke continually about the value of communism he didn't take an anti-fascist line. We didn't have that choice through being tormented by the stone-throwing gang with the connivance of the RUC. The well water had been poisoned at one stage with blue-stone, a sheep-dip, and it almost killed my nine month old sister.

I mentioned the Rhodesian Ridgeback dog because dogs were to play another part in my life. The farm of our landlord was about a quarter of a mile away across the fields. As a boy I spent some time going into farmyards with most of the farmers being friendly. Our landlord farmer was usually hostile but I hung around anyway, ready to run. I was interested in his two border collies which were kept outside in an old pigsty. I had managed to make friends with them to such an extent that I could approach the farm on a dark Winter's evening without them raising the alarm.

One night about two am I sneaked out of the house and made for the farm with a box of matches. My intention was to burn down the hayloft in revenge for the stoning of our house. I opened the hayloft doors and the dogs raced inside. I lit a match but I couldn't see them in the dark. I called to them in whispers but they didn't appear. It was a very large hayloft, big enough for Sir Basil Brooke, the Unionist leader, to hold rallies for the faithful there sometimes. Afraid of having the dogs burn to death, I decided against torching the place. On the way back through the dark fields I thought of how the blaze might light up

the pitch-dark countryside. I could then be seen crossing the fields, my parents might wake up at the calamity it would cause and discover me coming back. Also, it being wartime and to have such a conflagration lighting up the night sky would cause a serious investigation by the authorities. Although, despite the total blackout precautions to frustrate German bombers, the people stoning our house did light a bonfire once in front of our house during WW2 for the Twelfth of July Orangeman's Day. (There were Women's Lodges as well but it was still Orangeman's Day.) The duty of the B-Specials was to scour the countryside looking for specks of light coming out of houses or outhouses. Catholic homes, including our own, had our doors knocked frequently with accusations that light was escaping from behind a blackout blind when there wasn't any. Sometimes the knocks came in the middle of the night when we were all in bed. We learnt not to answer the door. Any forced entrance we would have resisted. There was always a poker or two in the fire and water near the boil on the range. We were aware that Catholics were looked on as German agents. There had been rumours about someone on a hilltop waving a lamp while the German bombers passed very low over our area on two occasions. Once a B-Special told my mother that he didn't trust *Roman Catholics*. My mother who rarely swore answered:

"You have a fuckin' good reason not to!"

So I just slipped back into the house by the back door, went upstairs and passed quietly through my parent's bedroom to get to my own room.

I thought later I needed some help. The 100 Catholics, as opposed to the two or three thousand Protestants, were spread

over a very wide area to right outside Carryduff right up to Drumbo. I would sometimes meet up with boys of my own age. It was still WW2 and war militarises boys, and some girls. There was always live ammunition lost on the army firing-ranges in the area so we collected that and used it to barter for comics. We also played war games. At my Protestant school it was conventional warfare games. With the Catholic boys it was guerrilla warfare. We formed two groups. One was the ambush party and the other was the one to be ambushed. The would-be-ambushed were not going to be ambushed but the ambushers always had a tactician who saw to it that you were. You would be stealthily creeping up a lane when you felt the stick on your throat from behind. You were next on the ground being choked and sometimes being kicked in the face when things got out of hand. I did broach the idea of us doing something more serious in the area but no they had to be home for their tea by six.

Is it possible that some Protestants don't know what went on? I had a play produced at the London Unity Theatre in 1968. It was about the way Catholics had to live in Northern Ireland. A director and actor called Alan McClelland and his friend the actor Denis Hawthorne came to the theatre that night. Both were Protestant and both came from the mainly middle-class town of Bangor in County Down. They gave me a lift afterwards and discussed the play on the way home. Both said they had no idea that such things were going on. I found that hard to believe at the time. I'm not so sure now. But the powers-that-be at Stormont knew what was happening to us in Carryduff for it was they who encouraged it.

Wilson John Haire
2nd August 2012

LAUNCH & PUBLIC MEETING

at

Teachers' Club, 36 Parnell Sq., DUBLIN

SATURDAY, 17th November, 7.30 pm

Northern Ireland, What Is It?

Professor Mansergh Changes His Mind

by **Brendan Clifford**

The Genesis Of National Socialism

by **T. Desmond Williams**

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

Look Up the

Athol Books

archive on the Internet

www.atholbooks.org

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

CHILDREN'S RIGHTS REFERENDUM

This referendum should have been called "*The Adoption Referendum*" because adoption is the only new concept in it. The Constitution of Ireland already has: "*the natural and imprescriptible rights of the child*" in it and it referred to physical and moral welfare of all children. The "*physical and moral*" bit is proposed to be deleted and replaced by "*safety and welfare*". So the moral welfare of children is not to be mentioned in the future? Is it any wonder that the fabric of society is falling apart?

The enabling Bill for this referendum—*The Thirty First Amendment of the Constitution (Children) Bill 2012*—was, it says, "*Presented by the Minister for Children and Youth Affairs on 17th September 2012*". Presented to whom? Presented to the Dáil is the usual thing but the TDs and Senators were barely recovering from their Summer holidays on the 17th September! Also the Bill, badly drafted, was "*presented*", together with its official Explanatory Memorandum, which purports to explain the Bill but which instead was tendentious and evasive. The Memorandum consisted of a page and a half in each official language. On the first page, the one which would be read by any busy conscientious TD or journalist, was the tendentious stuff and the next half page contained the explanation of the Bill which should have been on the first page.

The lies and evasions included telling us that the Bill "*is in line with the recommendations of many experts over the years including the Report of the Joint Committee on the Constitutional Amendment on Children (2010) and the report of the All-Party Oireachtas Committee on the Constitution (2006)*".

These heavyweight reports do indeed reveal the views of very many experts and the views of the members of the two Committees. But the Bill *does not* reflect these expert views and the Constitutional Referendum *does not* reflect the expert views. The main thrust of this Referendum is to establish that families can, in certain circumstances, be broken up by taking members of the family of married parents and putting them up for adoption. A child put up for adoption under the new laws would have four parents and, if siblings were also taken and put up for adoption,

there would be multiple sets of parents. Chaos and mental disorientation on a huge scale will be inevitable.

Where did this concept of the adoption of the children of married parents come from? It was not even mentioned among ninety-five expert Submissions to the All Party Oireachtas Committee and specifically not mentioned in the Submissions of Barnardos and ISPCC and nor did Fine Gael/Labour Programme for Government refer to it. It was mentioned in the 96th Submission to the All Party Committee by the Adoption Board. The Adoption Board said that adoption of children of married parents is allowed in certain circumstances under UK law and the Board in 2006 recommended that such a practice be copied here. Barnardos operates in the UK. Is that the source of this family-breaking concept? Why not the fostering system which has a time honoured and well known history in Ireland?

Fostering can and should be regulated by laws under the Constitution without any need for Constitutional change. The Constitution in Article 2 recognises "*it is the entitlement and birthright of every person born in the island of Ireland to be part of the Irish nation*". This includes children Article 40 states "*all citizens shall, as human persons, be held equal before the law*". This also includes children and furthermore Article 40 goes on to state: "*This shall not be held to mean that the State shall not in its enactments, have due regard to differences of capacity, physical and moral, and of social function*" and in Article 40.3: "*The State guarantees in its laws to respect and as far as practicable by its laws to defend and vindicate the personal rights of the citizen*". This also applies to children.

So the State has the power in the Constitution to legislate for children as citizens in the same way it legislates for women as citizens and men as citizens. The fact that children have "*imprescriptible rights*" as children is recognised in Article 42.5. So why is Article 42.5 being dumped out? Is it by any chance because it also mentions "*moral*" welfare of the child which the new 42A.2.1 does not? There is obviously no case for changing the Constitution. It is a change in laws which is needed. The Referendum is a whitewash designed to make it appear that the Programme for Government is being implemented when it is not.

The drafting mistakes in the Referendum Act are serious. For example the wording of the Article 42A.3 "*Provisions shall be made by law for the voluntary placement for adoption and the adoption*

of any child". This is really serious stuff! It implies that somebody *owns* the child and that somebody can put the child up for adoption no matter what the child thinks. And children do think a lot. We are not necessarily, and not usually, talking about babies in arms here. We are talking about intelligent, walking, talking citizens. *Who* is to do the volunteering? It does not stack up at all. It is up to all sorts of interpretations. Is it a social worker who will do the volunteering? Or is it Barnardos? Or the father? Or Minister Frances Fitzgerald? In my opinion this Article 42A.3 is far too vague and too open to allow it to be used as a basis for legislation.

And then there is in Article 42A.4 two references to "*proceedings*". I presume that the intended reference is to Court Proceedings or Judicial Proceedings but that is not what 42A.4 says. No reference is made to Court or to judges. No right is given to any child to be heard. Only "*the views of the child shall be ascertained ...*" and it does not say who will ascertain, or what judge (if any judge!) will have regard to the child's views. It is all very lax and will enable lawyers to argue endlessly about it in years to come.

FOURTH ESTATE

The Fourth Estate is no longer with us. Journalists have almost given up on real journalism. No journalist has, it seems, examined the Act and its Explanatory Memorandum. Or if they have, they have not yet commented intelligently on it. The only intelligent comment on the Act came from retired Judge Hugh O'Flaherty in *Independent.ie* and he said "*we don't need a referendum to protect our children's rights*".

And this with all the talk by self-righteous people—why did none of them ask the children? Why not?

THE BANKERS

On a lighter note, there is the application by Bank of Ireland to Judge Peter Kelly for permission of the Court to rename some of the Bank's reserves with the objective to enable Bank of Ireland to declare a dividend to its shareholders. It is difficult to see how this can stack up. The shares and reserves were to a large extent provided by taxpayers and it is reported elsewhere that the bank's reserves are still too small to cover their liabilities because full account has not yet been taken of their actual and potential bad debts. Are we to see Bank of Ireland paying out a dividend and then having to be further dug out by the taxpayers? As Fiona Muldoon told the Bankers, they need to forsake their old habits and get real about their bad and

doubtful debts. Leadership is needed and paying out dividends in the present state of Bank of Ireland's business is not demonstrating the sort of leadership needed.

USA PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Just a thought—Barack Obama was sworn in as President on The Bible, so where is Mitt Romney on this issue? Does he want to be sworn in on the Book of Mormon, seeing as he is a former Bishop of that Church? Is swearing in on the Bible a requirement of the US Constitution? If it is—it would be getting very difficult to alter it now because in addition to the huge

Baptist and Methodist communities, I understand that Spanish may now be the majority language in the USA and the Spanish speakers are mostly Catholic. Although in the Land of the Free (white Anglo-Saxon Protestants, that is) strange things happen such as Native Americans being banned from voting and criminals having no vote (and the Courts are entrusted with criminalising black people so that they cannot vote) and so perhaps there is some mechanism in place to incapacitate the Spanish speakers from voting?

Michael Stack ©

Oct. 6th Mr. Patrick Thompson, Finea, Co. Westmeath.

ASSASSINATED BY ENGLISH SOLDIERS

The following were assassinated by members of the English Army of Occupation who took them from their houses or murdered them in the street in cold blood. None was engaged in attack upon the troops. None was shot during such an attack. There were assassinated in pursuance of the official policy to attempt to break by terror the movement for independence:-

1920.
 July 29th Mr. Thomas Harris (Invalid) Bruree, Co. Limerick.
 July 21st Mr. Patrick Lynch, (aged 48) Hospital, " "
 Aug. 16th Mr. John O'Connell, Derrygallon, Co. Cork.
 Aug. 17th Mr. Henry Kelly, Dublin City.

Items From Irish Bulletin, October 1920. Part 15

VOL. 3 No.35 IRISH BULLETIN 19th October 1920

THE REAL MURDER GANG. All Forces of the British Crown in Ireland Engaged in Murder and Assassinations.

The pretence is being sustained in the English Press that it is the newly recruited English police who are responsible for the murders of innocent Irish civilians. In the following the SEVENTEEN murders and assassinations committed by the English armed forces in Ireland since the 1st January 1920 are analysed. It will be seen that every branch of the English military and police forces in Ireland has participated in these murders and assassinations. They are not the sporadic acts of one hastily-recruited undisciplined body. They are the acts of troops, regular police, auxiliary policemen and "Black and Tan" recruits, and represent, not indiscipline but an official English policy of organised terrorism with the avowed object of crushing the movement for National Independence of Ireland:-

ASSASSINATED BY ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

The following were assassinated by members of the Royal Irish Constabulary who forced an entry into their houses and murdered them in cold blood. None of these men was engaged in any way in an attack upon the police. None of them was shot during an attack. They were selected for assassination because it was thought, (often wrongly) that they held prominent positions in the Republican Movement in their districts. They were assassinated in pursuance of the official policy at attempt to break by terror the movement for Independence.

1920.
 March 20th Alderman Thomas Mac Curtain, Lord Mayor of Cork.
 " 29th Mr. James McCarthy, Thurles, Co. Tipperary.
 " 30th Mr. Thomas O'Dwyer, Bouladuff, Co Tipperary.
 April 17th Mr. Thomas Mulholland, Dundalk, Co. Louth.
 June 25th Mr. Cornelius Crowley (cripple) Bantry, Co. Cork.
 Sept. 26th Mr. John Gaynor, Belfast City.
 " 26th Mr. Edward Trodden, Belfast City.
 " 26th Mr. John MacFadden, Belfast City.
 Oct. 15th Mr. James Lehane, Ballymakeera, Co. Cork.

SHOT DEAD WITHOUT PROVOCATION BY ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

The following were shot dead in their residences or on the public streets by members of the Royal Irish Constabulary. None of there was engaged in any way in an attack upon the police. None of them was shot during such an attack. They were murdered by the police in pursuance of the official policy to attempt to break by terror the movement for independence:-

1920.
 Feby. 4th Mr. Robert O'Dwyer, Limerick City.
 Feby. 4th Miss. Helena Johnston, Limerick City.
 Feby. 14th Mr. James O'Brien, Rathdrum, Co. Wicklow.
 May 18th Mr. James Saunders, Limerick City.
 July 5th Mr. James Dunne, Ferns, Co. Wexford.
 Aug. 8th Mr. William Hartnett, Emly, Co. Limerick.
 Aug. 17th Mr. Andrew Hynes, (aged 70), Shanagolden, Co. Limerick

SHOT DEAD WITHOUT PROVOCATION BY ENGLISH SOLDIERS.

The following were shot dead in their residences or in the public street by members of the English Army of Occupation. None of them was engaged in any way in an attack on soldiers or police. None of them was shot during such an attack. They were murdered in pursuance of the official policy to attempt to break by terror the movement for independence:-

1920.
 March 22nd Miss. Ellen Hendrick, Dublin City.
 March 22nd Mr. Michael Cullen, Dublin City.
 April 14th Mr. Patrick Dowling, Co. Wicklow.
 June 8th Mr. Thomas Brett, Drombane, Co. Tipperary.
 July 8th Mr. Thomas Ferry, (aged 70) Ballycommon, Kings Co.
 July 18th Master John O'Brien, (aged 18) Cork City.
 July 18th Mr. William McGrath, Cork City.
 July 21st Master Daniel McGrath (aged 18), Coracunna Cross, Co. Cork.
 July 21st Mr. Thomas McDonnell, Coracunna Cross, Co. Cork.
 July 21st Mr. James Cogan, Oldcastle, Co. Meath.
 July 29th Master Patrick Duggan, (aged 10) Bruree, Co. Limerick.
 Aug. 10th Mr. Thomas Farrally, Dublin City.
 Aug. 20th Mr. Patrick Kennedy, Annascaul, Co. Kerry.
 Sept. 5th Mr. Patrick Hegarty, Ballyvourney, Co. Cork.
 Sept. 5th Mr. Michael Lynch, Ballyvourney, Co. Cork.
 Sept. 11th Mr. Patrick Gill, Drumo[a?]na, Co. Leitrim.
 Sept. 14th Mr. James Connelly (aged 70) Kinlough, Co. Leitrim.
 Oct. 2nd Mr. Hugh Conway, Cullen, Co. Tipperary.
 Oct. 6th John Clifford, Derry City.
 Oct. 10th Mr. Michael Griffin, (aged 60), Cork City.

- Oct. 15th Mr. Joseph Corringham,
Dublin City.
Oct. 15th Master Patrick Carroll (aged
15), Dublin City.
Oct. 17th Mr. Michael O'Rourke,
Dublin City.

**ASSASSINATED BY "BLACK AND
TAN" RECRUITS TO THE ROYAL
IRISH CONSTABULARY.**

The following were assassinated by "Black and Tan" recruits to the Royal Irish Constabulary who forced an entry into their houses or murdered them in the street in cold blood. None of them was engaged in any way in an attack on the police. None of them was shot during such an attack. They were selected for assassination because they were believed (often wrongly) by the assassins to held prominent positions in the Republican movement in their districts. They were assassinated in pursuance of official policy to attempt to break by terror the movement for independence:-

1920.

- Sept. 9th Mr. James Quirke, Galway City.
Sept. 20th Master J. Healy (aged 18),
Abbeyfeale, Co. Limerick.
Sept. 20th Mr. Patrick Hartnett,
Abbeyfeale, Co. Limerick.
Sept. 21st Mr. James Lawless, (aged
49), Balbriggan, Co. Dublin.
Sept. 22nd Mr. Thomas Connole,
Ennistymon, Co. Clare.
Sept. 22nd Mr. Patrick J. Linnane,
Ennistymon, Co. Clare.
Oct. 3rd Mr. John O'Hanlon, Skagh,
Co. Galway.

**SHOT DEAD WITHOUT
PROVOCATION BY THE "BLACK &
TAN" RECRUITS TO THE R.I.C.**

The following were shot dead by the "Black & Tan" recruits to the Royal Irish

Constabulary. None was engaged in any attack on the police. They were murdered by the police in pursuance of the official policy to attempt to break by terror the movement for independence.

1920.

- Sept. 8th Mr. John Mulvey, Galway City.
Sept. 16th Mr. Joseph Athy, Cranmore,
Co. Galway.
Sept. 22nd Mr. J. Sammon, Ennistymon,
Co. Clare.

**ASSASSINATED BY THE R.I.C.
AUXILIARIES -- EX-OFFICERS OF
THE BRITISH ARMY.**

The following two men were assassinated by the Auxiliary Corps of ex-officers attached to the Royal Irish Constabulary. Mr. Lynch was selected for assassination because he held a high position in the Republican movement for East Limerick. He was purely a political and not a military leader. Mr. O'Carroll was assassinated because he refused to disclose to the Auxiliary Corps the whereabouts of his sons:-

1920.

- Sept. 22nd Mr. John Aloysius Lynch of
Kilmallock, Co. Limerick.
(Assassinated at the Royal
Exchange Hotel, Dublin.)
Sept. 16th Mr. Peter O'Carroll, (aged
50), Dublin City.

**SHOT DEAD WITHOUT
PROVOCATION BY ENGLISH
MILITARY AND POLICE.**

The following were shot dead in the public street by English military and police acting together. They were not engaged in any way in an attack on the police. They were not shot during any such attack. They were murdered in cold blood in pursuance of the official policy to attempt to break by terror the movement for independence:-

1920.

- April 14th Mr. James O'Loughlin,
Miltown-Malbay, Co. Clare.
April 14th Mr. Patrick Hennessy,
Miltown-Malbay, Co. Clare.
April 14th Mr. Thomas O'Leary,
Miltown-Malbay, Co. Clare.
July 4th Mr. Richard Lumley, (aged
60) Rearchcross, Co. Tipp.
July 4th Mr. Michael Small,
Upperchurch, Co. Tipperary.

**PRISONERS MURDERED WHILE IN
THE CUSTODY OF THE
ENGLISH MILITARY.**

The following innocent men were murdered by English troops who had arrested them without any charge named. They were safely in the custody of the troops when they were murdered:-

1920.

- July 18th Mr. James Burke, bayoneted
to death in cork City by English troops
who had taken him prisoner.
Aug. 16th Mr. Patrick Clancy of
Derrygallon, Co. Cork, bayoneted to
death by English troops who had taken
him prisoner.
Aug. 27th Mr. John Buckley, shot dead
by English troops who had taken him
prisoner.
Aug. 28th Mr. George Walker, (cripple)
first shot and then bayoneted to death by
English troops who had taken him prisoner.
Sept. 30th Mr. John Connolly, Bandon,
Co. Cork, arrested at his residence and
taken to the Military barracks at Bandon.
On October 1st the military authorities
informed his father who went to visit
him that his son had been released. On
October 16th his dead and decomposed
body was found partially buried some
distance from the barracks. He had been
shot dead.

**MURDERED IN OTHER WAYS BY THE
ENGLISH POLICE & MILITARY.**

In addition to the above the following were murdered by English Military and police:-

1920.

- Jany. 20th Mr. Michael Darcy, Coora-
clare, Co. Clare, who was wounded by
members of the Royal Irish Constabulary
and fell into Cooraclare river. The police
lined the banks of the river and fired
upon those who attempted to rescue him.
June 4th Master Michael Walsh,
Cappaquin, Co. Waterford, aged 131/2
years, crushed beneath a military motor
lorry driven deliberately into a peaceful
public meeting.
July 1st Miss. M. Counihane,
Limerick City, killed by "Black and Tan"
police who bombed her residence and
mortally wounded her.
Aug. 15th Mr. Edward Paget, Limerick
City, beaten to death by a patrol of
members of the Royal Irish Constabulary

LAUNCH All Welcome

Irish Bulletin

Dáil Éireann's official paper with war reports, first reprint

Volume 1, 12th July 1919 to 1st May 1920. 514pp

Aubane Historical Society lane.jack@gmail.com

Paperback €36,£30; hardback €55,£45

available at reduced price at launch

Friday, 16th November, at 8pm

Ireland Institute, 27 Pearse St., Dublin

Nora Comiskey, President, 1916-1921 Club, Hosting

Dr. Brian P. Murphy OSB, Historian, Launching

Philip O'Connor, Chairing Discussion

GUILDS continued

"those of the tanners or curriers and cordwainers; of skimmers and glovers; of leather-sellers, which included makers of different leather goods; and the large companies established in the smaller communities by gathering together all the leather crafts.

"Curious mixtures sometimes resulted. At Ipswich the metal crafts were indiscriminately jumbled with many others under the patronage of the tailors; the Dorchester (Dorset) fishmongers' company also comprised not only the victualers but groups of building crafts; at Lancaster the weavers, fullers and dyers were combined with gardeners and salt-sellers, and the barber-surgeons were united with the plumbers, glaziers, saddlers, whitemiths and cutlers. Finally, in at least two towns—Faversham and Wallingford—merchants and handicraftsmen were all gathered into one guild. It must have been very difficult to exercise effective control over such groups, and some explanation of their heterogeneous nature must be sought. It is at least feasible that the smaller guilds could not be choosers, and since it was dangerous to try to stand alone, they had to amalgamate with whom they could.

Workers have witnessed the same tide of amalgamations in the Trade Union movement over the last 40 years, with many incompatible marriages of different trades and skills, and an unfortunate deficit in the democratic account of super Trade Unions.

The movement towards 'unity' of the craft Guilds, of course, was neither uniform nor entirely harmonious. The cloth-making Guilds, for instance, seem to have been especially slow to amalgamate; while occasionally a reverse movement is discovered, in which Guilds previously amalgamated are parting company. Moreover, while men in an expanding trade or handicraft were forming new Guilds, others (like the armourers, bowyers and fletchers), who saw signs of a definite decline, would be eager to join hands with other Guilds. Although they would show a united front to non-members, such as itinerant artisans and alien merchants, the Guildsmen quarrelled constantly among themselves, and the majority were not above committing, for their own profit, the very trespasses which were the grounds of their complaints against others.

Moreover, the whole position was greatly complicated by privileges, concessions and special exemptions granted, usually for a consideration, by authorities from the King downwards, often in clear conflict with general policy and statute law.

In her third study Dr. Kramer shows how desperately, but unsuccessfully, the Guilds struggled to maintain their monopolistic hold upon local trade and industry. Certain local authorities aided them: some indeed went so far as to ignore the statutes authorising discharged soldiers and sailors *"to set up and exercise, without let or molestation from any person whatsoever, such trades as they are apt and able for, even though they had not for the space of seven years served an apprenticeship to the trade"*. But others encouraged outsiders, at least so long as the interests of the whole community seemed to require it; or, uncertain of their powers, they took no action either way. At last the Guilds themselves grew doubtful of the legality of their attempts to exclude or coerce non-members, for in a court of law they were liable to be defeated by the doctrine of restraint of trade. Furthermore, not only outsiders but Guildsmen began to flout Guild authority, especially in the eighteenth century.

"Gradually, by reason of abuses, lack of zeal, loss of confidence and efficient sanctions, the guilds' powers of search weakened and fell into misuse; while widespread failure or wilful neglect to enforce apprenticeship regulations brought masters and journeymen into bitter conflict. Anyone who regrets the passing of the guilds will find the chapter on "Some Last Acts of the Guilds" melancholy reading" (*ibid*).

"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. Dr. Kramer's researches also re-emphasise the importance generally assigned to the competition of non-gildsmen working outside "the liberties" as a cause of the guilds' decay" (Plummer, *ibid*).

There is barely a mention of the economic effects of the Reformation in these publications, not even reference to the *History Of The Protestant Reformation* by William Cobbett (1824-26).

In the December issue, attention will be paid to the refutation of Dr. Kramer's claim that "governmental hostility and repression" had relatively little to do with the demise of the Guilds in an article by Lilian Knowles (1870-1926) of the School of Economics, London, in a 1905 review of Kramer's *The English Craft Guilds And The Government*.

Press Releases

McGrath Resigns As Chairperson Of The Dail Technical Group

Deputy Finian McGrath has confirmed that he has stepped down as Chairperson of the Dail Technical Group. *"Quite frankly, I am completely fed-up with the actions of Deputy Wallace who is distracting people from the real political issues of this Country"*, said McGrath.

"I am also appalled at the procedures in Dail Eireann which rules force a group of Independent T.D.s to have a member that the vast majority don't want", added the Dublin Bay North T.D.

Deputy McGrath also outlined his other reasons:

- * Wallace's media comments on *"Loyalty"*—loyalty to what? Tax evasion? Pension Fund Scam?
- * His recent remarks on the use of a *"hitman"*. This remark is outrageous for a member of the Oireachtas particularly in the current crime crisis.
- * Deputy Wallace agreed to withdraw from the Technical Group and now wants back. He showed a complete lack of respect to his Independent colleagues.
- * All TDs should be accountable to the Dail and citizens of this state.

Deputy McGrath said that he wants to send a strong signal of disapproval to the public and also in the interest of all hardworking Independent TDs, Senators and Councillors. He also said that he will continue to make his contribution to the Technical Group and he is waiting on a formal written response from the Ceann Comhairle.

McGrath thanked the rest of the Technical group for their great support and friendship while he was chairperson. He will make his final decision on his membership after the ruling by the Ceann Comhairle.

Finian McGrath TD (IND)
Dublin Bay North. 16.10. 2012

Fuel Costs:

On 28th August Deputy McGrath called for the recall of the Dail, as fuel costs were damaging small businesses:

"We have Ministers going around ranting about jobs but when an opportunity comes up to save jobs they run away".

"This Government needs to act on fuel costs before thousands of other jobs go. Our people are hurting and this Government is whistling passed the graveyard. We need common sense politics to deal with the huge issues facing our country".



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 30 No. 11

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

Mondragon, Part 13

Guilds And The Law

The American sociologist, Dr. Stella Kramer, devoted a huge amount of study to the Guild System. She wrote *The English Craft Gilds And The Government* around 1905. She also wrote: *The English Craft Gilds: Studies in their Progress and Decline* in 1927, amongst other studies on the subject. The present writer was unable to obtain any further information on this woman but T.H. (Thomas Humphrey) Marshall, the British sociologist, most noted for his essays such as the essay collection *Citizenship And Social Class*, wrote the following in a review of her book:

"{This article has been inspired by Dr Stella Kramer's recent book, *The English Craft Gilds* (Columbia University Press, 1927), and is, in fact, an inquiry into it. In this, her second work on the subject, she has dealt with the last phase, from the middle of the sixteenth century to the middle of the eighteenth. Her material is drawn principally from the published records of towns and gilds, of which she has made so thorough an investigation that any one who has the temerity to follow in her steps will have an unprofitable task. To one who, some years ago, covered a fraction of the same ground with the same object in view and arrived at some tentative conclusions, the temptation to use Miss Kramer's exhaustive study to test and amplify those conclusions is irresistible.}"

In the above book, Dr. Kramer gives us three studies which have grown out of her earlier researches into the relations between the Government of England and the Guilds. Such important and interrelated aspects of Guild history as the causes and significance of the amalgamations among the mercantile crafts and the handicrafts; the conflicts between them; and the course and chief causes of their final decline are dealt with in considerable detail; the main thesis being that hitherto historians have not realised the importance and extent of

the amalgamation movement among English Guilds.

Dr. Kramer maintains that in many places the Guild merchant had practically ceased to function by the latter part of the fourteenth century, and that the merchants who were prominent members of such bodies, seeking to carry on some of their traditions, took the lead in the amalgamation movement. Various forms of organisation were adopted. In London and certain large boroughs it was possible to maintain several distinct Guilds of merchants, differentiated according to the type of commodities sold; but "*the great majority of English towns encouraged but one organisation for their pure traders*".

Thus, early in the fifteenth century, consolidated mercers' {a dealer in textiles} and merchant companies, often comprising grocers, apothecaries, drapers, haberdashers, ironmongers and goldsmiths, were becoming common. Smaller absorptions or amalgamations also took place, as when the haberdashers absorbed the hatters and cappers and later joined with the

feltmakers; but this did not necessarily mean complete loss of Guild identity. Very often each craft reserved the right to appoint from its own ranks a warden to watch its special interests.

"Dr. Kramer asserts that "by the middle of the sixteenth century, if not indeed much earlier, amalgamated trading gilds were the rule in the English commercial communities, and there continued in active force" (pp38,97). Neither Dr. Gross nor Professor Unwin took this view. The former thought that they were not very numerous; the latter, that they were not a general feature of English industrial organisation. Dr. Kramer suggests that Dr. Gross's under-statement is due to the distinction he drew between mercers' companies and companies of merchants; and that Unwin's distinction between companies of merchants and drapers' companies seems to have led to the same result. One imagines that the source of such differences of opinion may be discovered in the selection of certain small groups of gilds as typical" (*The English Craft Gilds: Studies in their Progress and Decline* by Stella Kramer. Review by: Alfred Plummer *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 38, No. 152 (Dec., 1928), p640-643).

"For instance, Dr. Gross discusses as typical merchant companies those of Carlisle and Alnwick, while Dr. Kramer, following up her criticism of Unwin, writes: "If conditions in Beverley and Shrewsbury can be considered typical of those which prevailed in the other English boroughs, the relations existing between the drapers and the other dealers seem to have been far more harmonious where drapers maintained their membership in the general mercantile society." But, when all is said, is it possible to place a finger upon typical gilds?" (ibid).

The handicrafts soon followed the example of the merchants. In the leather industry Dr. Kramer distinguishes four leading kinds of craft amalgamations, namely—

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