

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

October 2012

Vol.27, No.10 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.26 No.10 ISSN 954-5891

Political Resolution Of The Euro "Step By Step"

It is said that, in the current crisis of the Euro, power has shifted to the bankers. The appearance is of a technocratic monetary policy dictating political developments, which is hardly surprising in a technical monetary crisis. But it is only an appearance, as what is being resolved through what modern jargon might call technical-monetary "adjustments" is the unresolved political contradiction at the heart of the Euro project since its launch.

In mid-October the leading foreign policy functionary of the Austrian State, Stefan Lehne, is addressing Brendan Halligan's Institute of International and European Affairs (IIEA). He will, apparently, tell the gathering of Irish officials and foreign policy academics the basic facts of life of the current crisis and the three possible "scenarios" of how it will develop: "prolongation of the crisis; the end of the crisis with a durable accommodation between the UK and the EU; and a massive deepening of integration in the Eurozone", with the outcome being determined by the actions of the 'Big Three' Member States: France, Germany and the UK.

And there is the rub. For a "massive deepening of integration in the Eurozone" means its political integration and, as Lehne has pointed out in papers he has written for the Brussels "Carnegie Europe" Institute, this "might weaken and even destroy the EU's overall coherence" and marginalize the UK. Earlier in the Summer the IIEA discussed the role Ireland might play in keeping the UK involved in the resolution of the Euro crisis or, as *The Irish Times* put it, acting as a "bridge" between the UK and Europe. The current Dublin regime seems enthralled by the notion of the "political leverage" it might gain by making itself a pawn of Britain in this regard, with issues such as opposition to a Financial Transaction Tax, defence of low Corporation Tax rates and defence of financial derivatives trading all seen as "common interests" with the UK. This, in our view, would place Ireland at the reactionary end of the Eurozone, minimizing its integration by retaining UK influence.

As regards the political resolution of the Euro crisis, in the judgement of one who should know, the future of the Euro is now secure. That is the reluctant conclusion of the

continued on page 2

Future referendums on 'Europe'.

John O'Hagan, Professor of Economics at Trinity College Dublin, had an agonising piece in the *Irish Times* on how future referendums on EU Treaties should be handled. It is a topic over which our Europhiles are losing sleep. He wrote:

"The European Central Bank and German constitutional court have calmed the waters in relation to the euro crisis for now. Such calm though will not persist for long unless very significant action is taken at a political level to deal with the longer-term issues that the crisis has thrown up. In particular many EU treaty changes are very likely in the coming years" (*Irish Times*, 14 September).

He goes on:

"Here a treaty change supported by the vast majority of the democratically elected representatives can be rejected via the vagaries of a referendum. This is particularly worrying when many may have voted in the referendum on some aspect of Irish government policy totally unrelated to the EU issue on the ballot paper. Given the extreme seriousness of the present euro zone banking and

continued on page 3

Armistice Day

At the beginning of the year the *Irish Times* reprinted from its Archives "An Irishman's Diary" from November 1951, believed to have been written by Bertie Smyllie, its Editor from 1934 to 1954. The Diarist waxed indignant and lyrical in turn, as he described being called an Imperialist So-and-So by a young Dubliner for wearing a Poppy on Britain's Remembrance Day, and the pride with which he recalled wearing it ever since its first outing on Remembrance Day 1919, and of the

British Empire's unbroken record of defending the weak against the strong in the years between.

On the original Remembrance Day in 1919, Ireland's capital city, Dublin, was treated to the spectacle of massed tanks, terrestrial Dreadnoughts or land battleships paraded past a saluting base at the Bank of Ireland. The tanks were at the service of the British Government and their role was to Shock and Awe the citizens of Ireland.

The Bank of Ireland was, as the British well knew, as iconic as the Rock of Cashel in Ireland's consciousness, having housed

an Irish Parliament up to 1801. It is why the building was used as the backdrop for British Army recruiting posters and postcards. One such chocolate-boxy postcard was in danger of giving *Schmalz* a bad name.

It showed rosy-cheeked gossoons, virgin soldiers in British uniform, being cheered by winsome, rosy-cheeked virginal colleens as they marched off to rescue the equally virtuous Little Catholic Belgium from the lustful grasp of the Hun. The return of the Bank of Ireland to

continued on page 9

CONTENTS

	Page
Political Resolution Of The Euro, "Step By Step". Editorial	1
Future Referendums On 'Europe'. Jack Lane	1
Armistice Day. Donal Kennedy	1
Readers' Letters: A Question Of Finance. Ivor Kenna	3
Socialism: Utopian Or Incoherent. Joe Keenan	4
Shorts from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (Bank Guarantee Again; <i>The Irish Times</i> And Germany; Germany And Greece);	8
Queen Of Supermax. Wilson John Haire (poem)	9
Statement From John Young. Report on Eve Morrison and Kilmichael Ambush	10
Goal! Gush Shalom (A Palestinian Poem, contributed by David Morrison)	11
A Land War Leader, The Bard. Jack Lane	12
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (British Embassy Party; Summer Book Launch Party; Irish Studies Journal; The TCD Connection; The Marriage Foundation; Colm Tóibín, Vargas Llosa And Roger Casement)	13
An Irish Anti-Fascist RAF Volunteer And Some Other Soldiers. Manus O'Riordan (Part 3)	15
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Children's Rights Referendum; Abortion Legislation; Constitutional Law And Children)	22
Items From Irish Bulletin, September 1920. Part 14	23
Team GB—The Anglo-Saxon Is A Sport! Philip O'Connor The Captains And The Kings, poem by Brendan Behan	24

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

Fanfani And The Guilds

Mondragon, Part 12

(back page)

Trade Union Notes:

Accidents; Earnings; Trade Surplus; Jobs Market; Tax on Workers

(page 25)

man who bet against the Exchange Rate Mechanism in 1992 and won. George Soros' long article in the September edition of the *New York Review of Books* is a denunciation of Germany, but a spectacularly successful finance capitalist cannot allow his prejudices to obscure the reality of things. Following the Draghi announcement of "*unlimited bond buying*" by the European Central Bank, he prefaced his article just before it went to print with a statement reversing the judgement of the article itself, concluding:

"The Euro crisis has entered a new phase. The continued survival of the Euro is assured..."

Since his billions are dependent on it, he has taken the trouble to understand the European project, and it shows:

"The process of integration was spear-headed by a small group of farsighted statesmen who practiced what Karl Popper called piecemeal social engineering. They recognised that perfection is unattainable; so they set limited objectives and firm timelines and then mobilised the political will for a small step forward

knowing full well that when they achieved it, its inadequacy would become apparent and require a further step. The process fed on its own success, very much like a financial bubble. That is how the Coal and Steel Community was gradually transformed in the European Union, step by step."

In other words, it is a political process, and Soros' description also applies precisely to how the project for the Euro currency was conceived. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union Francois Mitterrand feared that the impetus for European Union would be lost as Germany prepared for unification. Already the deepening of European integration had gone into reverse, a victim of British influence. According to his biographer, Jacques Attali (*C'était Francois Mitterrand*, p. 306), Mitterrand supported German unification on the following four conditions, none of which German Chancellor Helmut Kohl would have balked at:

- 1) recognition of the Polish border;
- 2) a united Germany foregoing nuclear weapons;

- 3) the launch of a single currency;
- 4) the launch of European political union.

European integration had been derailed by British influence and the Federalists were on the back foot. But the Euro would create a "*fact on the ground*" which would eventually impel a new momentum towards political integration. This was the case put to Mitterrand by Jacques Delors, the great architect of "Social Europe". The momentum of the currency was understood at the time by its chief engineers. Lehne quotes from Commission President Romano Prodi in the *Financial Times* in December 2001 as follows: "*I am sure the Euro will oblige us to introduce a new set of economic policy instruments. It is impossible to propose that now. But some day there will be a crisis and new instruments will be created.*"

It could be said that Mitterrand failed in the sense that "*perfection*" was not achieved. The arrangements were—as Prodi stated—inadequate and, as Mitterrand well knew, the contradictions would have to be resolved by a future generation of politicians when, to paraphrase Soros, "*its inadequacies became apparent*".

But he would not have been disheartened. *Au contraire!* He always said that it was sometimes necessary to provoke a crisis in order to arrive at a political solution.

In the current crisis political leadership has passed from France to Germany. Angela Merkel is now demonstrating the statesmanship of Mitterrand ... "*step by step*". The moves towards fiscal integration have been determined and consistent since the "Merkozy" initiative launching the Fiscal Compact and the exit of Britain from the process at the end of 2011. From the very start—as reported exclusively (in Ireland) by this journal—Merkel has brought the Eurozone with her in a strategy to construct an integrated monetary and banking regime, that will also ultimately deliver debt resolution (see '*Yes vote vindicated!*', in *Irish Political Review*, July 2012).

President of the ECB Mario Draghi has been allowed "*do whatever it takes to preserve the euro as a stable currency*". This leap forward has been described by the Anglo-American press as a "*defeat*" for Germany and a "*turnaround*" by Merkel. It is no such thing. There will, Draghi declared, be unlimited purchases of the Government Bonds of debtor countries—up to three years in maturity and provided they reach an agreement with the European Financial Stability

Facility and *put themselves under the supervision of the Troika—the executive committee of the European Union, the European Central Bank, and the International Monetary Fund*. The ECB bonds will not rank in preference to other bonds.

In explaining the initiative, and the opposition of the Bundesbank (which Merkel had overruled), German Finance Minister, Wolfgang Schäuble, said—

"German fears of 'unlimited' ECB bond-buying were understandable but based on a misunderstanding. The fact that the ECB doesn't name a [ceiling] is because, if they did, it would be an invitation for speculators'." (*Irish Times*, 15th September).

The *Financial Times*, the organ of finance capitalism that has consistently promoted "solutions" that would have fatally weakened the euro and disabled its largest member economy, has been reduced to incoherence. Its editorial of 15th September is a pathetic attempt to stoke up imaginary Greek grievances against Germany.

Merkel's intervention was decisive. She overruled Bundesbank President, Jens Weidmann (who shares the conservative monetarist views of the German business class), and made sure that the German Government representative on the ECB board, Jörg Asmussen (a Social Democrat), supported Draghi.

The question arises as to why all of this was not done earlier. The reason is that the conditionality attached to unlimited bond buying could not have been imposed earlier. It was only as the crisis was prolonged that political acceptance emerged in Europe, and in the Member States directly affected, to take on the refusal of affluent Greeks to pay taxes and the inordinate privileges enjoyed by higher public servants and professional elites in Ireland. Bond buying without conditionality—as previously advocated by the *Financial Times*—would of course have destroyed the Euro.

The *Financial Times* and the political forces across Europe that share its view of the world initially advocated as a solution to the crisis the printing of cheap money and the flooding of debtor states with it. This was later replaced by a clamour for stricken banks (in Spain) to be refloated by the ECB without conditionality on the States in which they operated and which were therefore responsible for regulating them. Finally the neo-liberal solution shifted again, to a demand on Germany either to bankroll the debtor states or leave the Euro altogether—the initial position

A Question Of Finance

I refer to Michael Robinson's article on Regional Pay in your August issue.

Mr. Robinson quotes from a report entitled "An Analysis Of The Social And Economic Impact Of Loss Of Jobs In Northern Ireland" as follows:

"Growth in input and jobs has tended to be in relatively low value added areas, which has resulted in average wages remaining significantly below the UK.

"The economy has historically been under-represented in higher value added sectors such as finance and business services".

People working in finance and business services often like to refer to themselves as adding value.

Actually, all that these people are doing is making lots of money for themselves and their employers.

Finance and business services do not produce commodities. These services are non-productive. They do not add value.

Finance and business services are a deduction from values that have already been created. They are, to a large extent, parasitic on agriculture and industry.

Efficient industry pulls in far more money per employee than efficient agriculture.

Efficient financial and business services pull in far more money per employee than efficient industry.

Labour Market Overview, quoted by Mr. Robinson, shows that, although Northern Ireland children are brighter than those in the rest of the United Kingdom, many of the brightest have to leave Northern Ireland to partake in the money-spinning financial and business services.

Ivor Kenna

10th August 2012

of Soros, parroted locally by Mary Ellen Synon in *The Sunday Times*. Any of these developments would, of course, have collapsed the currency. But a new benevolence towards Germany then swept across the neo-liberal press of Europe, which produced a clamour to the effect that it was in Germany's *best interests* to leave the Euro as otherwise it would "*ruin itself*" in financing the saving of the currency out of a sense of duty arising from wartime guilt (thus Richard Sulik, leader of the Slovak neo-liberal 'Freedom and Solidarity' Party, writing in *Die Zeit*, 19th August).

Of course debt resolution will be on the agenda when a banking and monetary union are in place. As far back as January 2012—as reported in this journal—this was admitted even by German Finance Minister Wolfgang Schäuble.

The solution announced by Draghi remains inadequate. Banking and its logic are temporarily and necessarily shaping the development of things, though within an overall political framework of a consolidation of the currency zone. And the Fiscal Treaty is silent on the question of private debt. But a solid basis for a resolution of the crisis has been put in place which allows the Eurozone—in the

words of George Soros—to progress "*step by step*" towards resolution.

Europe

continued

sovereign debt crisis, it seems extraordinary that the democratically elected government of the day is so constrained in responding to the crisis in a timely and effective way."

The problem with all this is that it assumes the EU goes on as before and it just needs amendments and updating to its Treaties.

But the EU is now only the mood music, at best, of what is happening in Europe. At worst, and increasingly, it will become a dangerous charade. Dangerous because it will be used to hinder the development of the Eurozone. Britain has led the way in this by creating two European entities—the EU and the Eurozone, and counterpoising one against the other. This is all legally correct.

There are interconnections between the two but these will wither over time. The one that matters is the Eurozone. When O'Hagan and others agonise about future EU Treaties they are dealing with political shadows. The last referendum was not

about the EU—it was an inter-Governmental Treaty and that is the pattern of the future.

The Pringle legal challenge to that referendum is legally arguable because there is an obvious conflict between the new inter-Governmental reality and the redundant EU structure enshrined in our Constitution and laws. The law has not caught up with political realities. The EU Treaties and their ramifications should be left wither on the vine like the EU itself and all the concerns about passing EU referendums despite Crotty, McKenna, Coughlan and Pringle can be forgotten about. If these legal fetishes are given a

central role it is will only make sense to lawyers and lead to a total discontent with the electorate. The last inter-Governmental referendum was on a real issue that mattered to people, the future security of the currency.

Any inter-Governmental Treaty would also inevitably be on a real issue and people could relate to it. They will not relate to more Lisbon type gobbledygook and amendments to such gobbledygook and that is all that future EU referendums can be about. It all belongs to the proverbial dustbin of history.

Jack Lane

A Reply To John Martin and Philip O'Connor's *Road To Recovery*, in *Irish Political Review* (September 2012)

Socialism: Utopian or Incoherent

When last we met here, I was hymning *Sancta Simplicitas*, singing the praises of Holy Simplicity. That was an attempt to cut through theories based on immutable economic laws and relying on inexorable geopolitics, in order to point instead to a political strategy for the working class that required nothing more than human vision and human effort in the day and daily here and now.

I described the attempt as Utopian, and so it was, and so it remains. So, to begin again, some more of that.

The thing about Utopianism in the context of these politics is not at all that it is unrealistic or unrealisable. The thing is, that it stands at an opposite pole to Engels' Scientific Socialism.

Given that Engels' science was the dialectic which required distinct stages of historical development to run their full, inevitable, immutable and predetermined course: given that Engels' science, in all its dialectical majesty, required the universal establishment of the most thoroughgoing form of Capitalism before Socialism could be realised: given all that, is there anything else for a Socialist to do but find some utterly opposite pole and take a stand there?

It is the simple thing to do. Rather than await the final victory of Capitalism at which point it will dialectically be transformed into Socialism; just work to achieve however much, or little, of Socialism we can together establish here and now.

Socialism itself is a simple enough thing. In any situation at all, it is the working class interest in that situation. Never anything more or less than that,

never anything ironic or paradoxical or dialectical, just the working class interest. Simply that.

What I mean by simplicity in all this is contained in the words of the Shaker hymn that is the centrepiece of Aaron Copeland's *Appalachian Spring*:

"'Tis the gift to be simple. 'Tis the gift to be free.
'Tis the gift to come down where we ought to be,
And when we find ourselves in the place just right,
'Twill be in the valley of love and delight.

"When true simplicity is gain'd,
To bow and to bend we shan't be asham'd,
To turn, turn will be our delight,
Till by turning, turning we come 'round right."

Freedom is the gift, to which simplicity is key, and a gift in its own right.

It's a key and a gift, but simplicity is not easy.

Reducing whatever of this, that, and the other to the simple of itself can be hard work.

THE LAW OF LAWS

Take law, in the sense in which John and Philip have been using it in their editorial of last August, and in their reply to me.

First came the appeal to "*certain immutable economic laws*" which reduced to just one silly law of double-entry book keeping, then a truculent admission that "*The choice of the word 'immutable' may*

be unfortunate...", followed by this:

"While markets might be restrained and the laws of the market 'bucked' as it used to be said, the laws themselves remain the same. The law of gravity does not determine human action, but it does set its parameters. Ignoring or denying the law of gravity, let alone claiming it can be overthrown, does not eliminate or even extend those parameters by the slightest degree. In fact the opposite would tend to be the case. By understanding the law and utilising it, the scope of human action is increased." (*Irish Political Review*, September, 2012)

Two things. First, what kind of socialism is it that stands in the full glare of a public debate and declares that the laws of the market are eternal; that however the market may be "*bucked*", whatever that is, the "laws of the market remain the same"? Just like the law of gravity.

And that's the second thing: economics is not a science like physics or chemistry, nor is politics such a science.

Economics is an abstract product of the human mind which has no existence independent of human will and human intelligence. It has conventions and rules and generally accepted procedures which by analogy are called laws, though they are not laws in the way that mindless, inorganic, utterly physical processes are laws. When humanity has passed, and human will and human intelligence are no more, the universe will proceed as it always has and the law of gravity will "remain the same". Say's law of markets will no longer apply, because Say's law is not a law.

Really, the best analogy for a law such as Say's would be all those laws against homosexuality, against drunkenness, against Sunday opening, or for banning Sinn Féin; all of which have been swept away by waves of public outrage, or tilting balances of power, or changes in fashion.

And to answer my earlier question: what kind of socialism is it that declares the laws of the market to be eternal; let's be charitable, and just say it's an incoherent kind of socialism.

Finally on this; in the great school of the social "sciences", if there be any logical structure at all in the building of it, economics is housed in a small room, perhaps a closet, of the great hall of politics. Politics sets the questions, marks the test papers and awards the diplomas that all the competing economic theories and economists contend for.

And should anyone say; "All right then, go ahead and try to abolish the eternal

laws of the market, just try and see where that gets you!"; we'll answer them simply, "That's what the politics we hold to are all about, it's what we ourselves are for, just that and nothing more!"

NO ANSWER BUT ABUSE

In my initial response to the August editorial I took up the argument it presented, that:

"The main lessons from engagement with the Troika loan programme would seem to be that the only given is that deficit reduction targets be met. This is meant to be achieved by a combination of savings and revenue raising measures, and by 'structural reforms' in line with long established EU policy which, under EU Competition Policy, particularly the Services Directive, can (though must not necessarily) include elements of privatisation. This element was proposed by the Irish government itself. What is clear is that the choices made in terms of tax policy, service cuts, welfare and minimum wage rates etc., are all determined by the political forces within a programme state."

I simply asked what the details of this "long established EU policy" are.

John and Philip did not reply to that question. Instead they resorted to shouting abuse at me; incoherent, unfounded, juvenile abuse comparing me to the *Irish Political Review's* long-time number one hate figure, Eoghan Harris.

"Like Eoghan Harris's charlatan dismissal of Paddy Heaney for his historical account of what happened 90 years ago at Coolacree because he did not produce 'documentary evidence' for his statements—though Paddy was of course subsequently vindicated by the documentary record—Joe demands 'details' for statements such as that above concerning the position of the Troika."

The sentiment there is clear enough; the sense of it has to be worked at, but only a little.

It is well known that under pressure people's fears in respect of their own position are often expressed as insults directed towards others. Given which, I wasn't entirely surprised to learn that Eoghan Harris's views on Germany and Keynesianism are not a million miles removed from those of John and Philip. In the *Sunday Independent* on 4th., March 2012, Harris wrote:

"Last Wednesday, Derek Scally of the Irish Times spelled out a fundamental difference between Irish and German thinking. Our liberal elites are Keynesians who believe in throwing borrowed money at a problem.

"By contrast, Germans are 'ordoliberal' who believe in living within a budget, and that by and large the state should

stand back from the economy, only stepping in to control cartels and cream off enough surplus wealth to run a robust welfare state. I believe that too."

I hope that's an end to trivial school yard shenanigans.

In any event, as John and Philip would not provide me with a coherent answer to my questions on the position of the Troika regarding the elements of Neo-Liberalism—Free Trade, Free Movement of Capital, Monetary restraint and budgetary austerity, Labour Market Flexibility, Privatisation and The Replacement of Welfare by Workfare—I had to go looking for such information on those areas as I could find for myself. I looked first in the foundation documents of the European Union which set the terms of the activity of the European Central Bank and the European Commission. This is what I found.

EUROPEAN UNION & NEO-LIBERALISM

Article 3 (f) of the original Treaty of Rome committed the (six) members of the European Economic Community to "*the institution of a system ensuring that competition in the common market is not distorted*".

What was then meant by "*distortion*" was nothing more than tariffs and quotas. Free movement of capital and services and labour flexibility were not considered, or at least not considered seriously, outside of England, until 1986 when Articles 13 and 14 of the Single European Act added these provisions to the EEC Treaty:

"ARTICLE 13

"The EEC Treaty shall be supplemented by the following provisions:

"ARTICLE 8a

"The Community shall adopt measures with the aim of progressively establishing the internal market over a period expiring on 31 December 1992...

"The internal market shall comprise an area without internal frontiers in which the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital is ensured in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty.

"ARTICLE 14

"The EEC Treaty shall be supplemented by the following provisions:

"ARTICLE 8b

"The Commission shall report to the Council before 31 December 1988 and again before 31 December 1990 on the progress made towards achieving the internal market within the time limit fixed in Article 8a.

"The Council, acting by a qualified majority on a proposal from the Commission, shall determine the guidelines and conditions necessary to ensure balanced progress in all the sectors concerned."

That Single European Act institutionalising the single market for free movement of goods, persons, services and capital was given force in the period during which Russian liberalisation measures climaxed in an unravelling of the Soviet Union. Once the Soviet threat was gone the central motive for Capitalist relaxation of its pressure against Labour in the class struggle was removed, and we returned to something resembling the state of nature with confident Capitalism moving against the working class much more vigorously than in the past 40 years, most assuredly "red in tooth and claw".

And, beyond a doubt, England on-board as an anti-European pioneer of neo-liberal political economy was a determining factor. As was the very substantial influence of the United States.

Cutting a long story short of the treaties of Maastricht (which came into force in 1993), Nice (2003) and Lisbon (2009), and the process which began with the Delors Report (1989) of Economic and Monetary Union; we come to the provisions of the latest version of the foundation documents of the E.U, the Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (from Official Journal of the European Union, 30 March 2010 - this and other relevant documents can be downloaded from <http://www.atholbooks.org/europeansources/documents.php>).

Well, dear reader, I did say that simplicity could sometimes only be arrived at through hard work. Sorry and all that, but, take a deeeep breath, and here goes:

Article 26 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union echoes the Single European Act, stating:

"1. The Union shall adopt measures with the aim of establishing or ensuring the functioning of the internal market, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Treaties.

"2. The internal market shall comprise an area without internal frontiers in which the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital is ensured in accordance with the provisions of the Treaties.

"3. The Council, on a proposal from the Commission, shall determine the guidelines and conditions necessary to ensure balanced progress in all the sectors concerned."

This then is taken up in Article 119:

"1. For the purposes set out in Article 3 of the Treaty on European Union, the activities of the Member States and the Union shall include, as provided in the Treaties, the adoption of an economic policy which is based on the close

coordination of Member States' economic policies, on the internal market and on the definition of common objectives, and conducted in accordance with the principle of an open market economy with free competition.

"2. Concurrently with the foregoing, and as provided in the Treaties and in accordance with the procedures set out therein, these activities shall include a single currency, the euro, and the definition and conduct of a single monetary policy and exchange-rate policy the primary objective of both of which shall be to maintain price stability and, without prejudice to this objective, to support the general economic policies in the Union, in accordance with the principle of an open market economy with free competition.

"3. These activities of the Member States and the Union shall entail compliance with the following guiding principles: stable prices, sound public finances and monetary conditions and a sustainable balance of payments."

Article 21 of the European Union Treaty is essentially about foreign policy. It is entitled "*General Provision's On The Union's External Action*". Article 21.2e states that the Union shall...

"...encourage the integration of all countries into the world economy, including through the progressive abolition of restrictions on international trade..."

And Article 206 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU, under Part Five, Title II, "*Common Commercial Policy*", makes its commitment to the global establishment of this absolutely free market, all the more glaring:

"By establishing a customs union in accordance with Articles 28 to 32, the Union shall contribute, in the common interest, to the harmonious development of world trade, the progressive abolition of restrictions on international trade and on foreign direct investment, and the lowering of customs and other barriers."

This is why the August editorial did not go into the details of the "*long-established EU policy*" which is the substantial core of the Troika's being in the world. Its reason and its rationale are Neo-Liberal. Free competition, free movement of capital, monetary restraint and budgetary austerity are at the heart of "long established EU policy". An understandable, from their point of view, reluctance to draw attention to these details is why John & Philip refused to answer the questions I asked in the September *Irish Political Review* and instead resorted to vulgar abuse.

THE IMF ON LABOUR FLEXIBILITY
Labour flexibility is essential to the

anti working-class pro-market reforms the Troika is aiming at. It is the crux of the matter to which the August editorial referred when it welcomed the commitment of the European Central Bank, the European Commission and the International Monetary Fund to "*structural reforms*". The IMF is a non-EU part of the Troika which hasn't been considered so far in this article. So, let's consider the IMF views on Ireland as a suitable case for structural reform of the labour market, for labour flexibility.

This month (September) the IMF published its Country Report No. 12/264. This is titled: "*Ireland: 2012 Article IV and Seventh Review Under the Extended Arrangement—Staff Report; Informational Annex, Staff Supplement; and Public Information Notice*". Just for completeness' sake I should mention that the Report carries a disclaimer to the effect that the Executive Board of the IMF doesn't necessarily stand over every word of the document.

I don't really think Christine Lagarde *et al* will have any difficulties with what their staff on the ground have to say here:

"39. Enhancing resources to help the long-term unemployed get back into the workforce is also needed. Staff strongly supported the direction of reforms of activation policies under the Pathways to Work initiative and encouraged sustained implementation effort in this area. Reform of welfare payments to avoid unemployment and inactivity traps, and reviews of PRSI on low-incomes and of minimum wages, also warrant consideration to maximize the employment benefits of economic recovery. In particular:

"Private provision of employment services. The number of employment services staff with case worker training is low relative to the number of unemployed, which may impede more active engagement, so additional well trained case workers are needed. Involving private sector firms with the provision of activation services should be considered, especially for the long-term unemployed, though international experience indicates careful design of such arrangements is crucial.

"Principle of mutual obligation. To ensure jobseekers meet their obligations to actively seek employment and improve their skills and qualifications so as to reenter the labor market, it is critical to strictly apply the system of sanctions for jobseekers that are not complying with activation and training requirements.

"Welfare benefits. The flat structure of unemployment payments results in replacement rates for the long-term unemployed that are high by international standards. The highest replacement rates affect those also receiving housing benefits, resulting in unemployment and

inactivity traps that lower exit rates from unemployment, making it especially important to reform to reform the structure of social payments in this area.

"Labor costs. Almost 9 percent of the work force, or over 60 percent of the unemployed, have been out of work for over a year. In these circumstances, it is important to maximize opportunities to regain access to the job ladder. One step would be to retain the reduced rate of PRSI for the lowest pay beyond 2013 if the planned evaluation of this measure shows it to be effective. While there are relatively few workers employed at the National Minimum Wage (NMW) of €8.65 per hour for adults, this has a broader impact through wage setting in EROs and REAs which cover almost one quarter of employment. A reduction in the NMW should be considered given the broad fall in consumer prices including rents in recent years, and because it is notably above the minimum wage in Northern Ireland and the United Kingdom despite the highly integrated labor market. Nonetheless, with jobseeker payments at about 62 percent of the NMW (assuming a 35 hour work week), there are limits to reductions given the need to ensure the NMW provides adequate incentives to take up employment.

"40. The authorities consider the reduction of unemployment a core priority. The Pathways to Work project is a major endeavor across a range of government bodies, and the authorities emphasized their full commitment to making the sustained effort needed to achieve a modern and effective approach to engaging with the unemployed and addressing their training and other needs to help them return to work. At the same time, they had no immediate plan to materially reform Community Employment, which played an important role in local communities. Regarding resources for employment services, they were considering how these needs could best be met, including the potential role for the private sector, where they had researched experience in Australia and the United Kingdom. The authorities noted they had identified issues in the structure of welfare payments, which are limited to a relatively small group of long-term unemployed also receiving housing supplements, and that the Housing Assistance Payment would address those incentive concerns. The authorities noted that as a share of average and median wages, Ireland's minimum wage was not so high when compared with other countries, and that both coalition partners in the government had agreed to reverse an earlier reduction in the national minimum wage, so the authorities were not planning to review this matter."

That is a substantial chunk for readers to take on board, but I don't see how I could have reduced it without distorting, or at least downplaying, the full import of

it. It is important to note that "*The authorities*" in para. 40 and elsewhere are the Irish Government. That paragraph seeks to show the "*authorities*" as hard negotiators who are resisting the schemes of the IMF. So, the "*authorities*" have "*no immediate plan to materially reform Community Employment*" and are not currently disposed to reduce the national minimum wage. But the IMF is not terribly concerned with the minimum wage, which has to provide "*adequate incentives to take up employment*" and while the Community Employment scheme may not be being "*materially reformed*" it is certainly being downgraded.

Those matters to one side, the important aspects of this IMF plan for Ireland can be summarised in its own words:

"...Reform of welfare payments to avoid unemployment and inactivity traps...Private provision of employment services...involving private sector firms with the provision of activation services should be considered, especially for the long-term unemployed...Principle of mutual obligation...it is critical to strictly apply the system of sanctions for jobseekers that are not complying with activation and training requirement...The flat structure of unemployment payments results in replacement rates for the long-term unemployed that are high by international standards. The highest replacement rates affect those also receiving housing benefits, resulting in unemployment and inactivity traps that lower exit rates from unemployment making it especially important to reform the structure of social payments in this area."

The clear aim of these measures is to harass and demoralise the unemployed element of the working class, the reserve army of labour, in order to make the employed majority more amenable to Neo-Liberal pressure.

Nevertheless it should be remembered that this IMF report on Ireland is written with an eye to local opinion. It is not altogether red in tooth, and its claws, to an extent, are sheathed. When the IMF is writing more directly for itself it is even more open about the thinking behind its activity.

In November 2010 an IMF document on "*Lifting Euro Area Growth: Priorities for Structural Reforms and Governance*" was prepared under the direction of Ajai Chopra; a former head of the Irish bailout programme, currently deputy director of the IMF's European Department. The document is entirely open about this being exactly the right time to make Neo-Liberal hay while the Crisis is hot, and this is what it has to say about the "*Political Economy of Structural Reforms*":

"Large-scale growth-enhancing national reforms seldom happen without the specter of a crisis, involve compromises, and take time.

"EU-driven reforms have been more successful where national authority was delegated but failed when relying on peer pressure.

...

"EU driven reforms have succeeded when accompanied with clear powers, but failed when reliant on peer pressure. The Single Market Program, coordinated by the European Commission, has been successful in opening product market access and leveling the playing field. By contrast, labor market and social policy reforms, left to national authorities, and subject only to peer pressure, have proceeded gingerly. One reason may be technical, as harmonization in most product market areas was relatively straightforward to achieve in a top-down approach, whereas labor market institutions are country-specific, more complex to reform, and changes also need to reflect (country-specific) preferences. Still, soft coordination methods—such as the Lisbon Strategy process—failed to deliver the appropriate incentives to reform: the creation of the euro area did not generate an impetus to reform labor markets, and paradoxically, the absence of immediate pressure on exchange rates in the currency union made reforms to sustain competitiveness less compelling."

And so there you have it, not as brief as I would have liked, but as brief as I could get it: the Troika is taking advantage of the current fiscal economic crisis to further the Neo-Liberal project which Britain introduced into the politics of the EU and which, since the collapse of the Soviet Union, has been broadly unchallenged. Most particularly their own documents prove the EU and IMF to be engaged in Ireland, as elsewhere, in a phased plan (it will "*involve compromises*" and "*take time*") to reduce the labour market to a condition of flexibility; low-wage, deregulated, un-unionised workplaces staffed by a socially isolated, demoralised workforce faced with just the one alternative of, not a welfare safety net, but a workfare treadmill of petty regulation and drastic coercion.

That is where the immutable market laws of John Martin & Philip O'Connor, the "*long established policy of the EU*" and the IMF are leading the Irish working class; through the golden opportunity (for the bourgeoisie) of this once in an era crisis, to utter catastrophe.

It will, of course, be up to John and Philip themselves to explain how they reconcile their defence of the Troika with their Socialism. For myself I look forward to their doing so, in the simple expectation

that all this argy-bargy will prove to have been nothing more than a confused little storm in a metaphorical little tea-cup (something we'll look back on in later life, and then, oh how we'll laugh!).

There are many matters of dispute between myself and John & Philip that have not been touched upon in this article. Had we but world enough and time they would have been. Not to mention paper enough and ink. But given all those constraints I've done my best to at least present what are to my mind the major points at issue, in the process of, I hope, providing sufficient documentary material to form the basis of future, more informed, discussions.

AND IN CONCLUSION, THE NEW EUROPE

I just want to mention one final matter which has been referred to quite obliquely over recent months by several writers in this magazine; the idea that since Cameron has isolated Britain from a developing European fiscal union that will as a matter of course become a new European polity, all is really right with the world and we should positively welcome the necessarily harsh actions of the Troika in the problem economies of the Eurozone as the birth pangs of The New Europe (from which England will be excluded, to which England need not apply—and rightly so).

No doubt that notion will be expressed much more eloquently over coming months and I may find that I have misunderstood it completely. In the meantime I would just like to point out that the constitutions of new polities do not emerge peacefully from a quiet state of nature. Assuming the peaceful establishment of The New Europe, it is most likely that its constitution will be an adaptation of the currently applying European treaties that have been considered in this article. That is, it is most likely that the economic aspects of the yet to be written constitution of the yet to be mooted New Europe will be as Neo-Liberal as the current documents.

Assuming that The New Europe is established peacefully it is most likely that its political economy will be a continuation of that of the body from which it is emerging, that is the political economy upon which the European Central Bank, the European Commission and the International Monetary Fund are acting to destroy the prospects of peace, happiness and a decent life for all of the the Irish working class.

What use is any of that to any of us, Socialists all, whose only political commitment is to that simplest of things, the working class interest?

Joe Keenan

Shorts

from
the Long Fellow

BANK GUARANTEE...AGAIN

The Irish Times reports (8/9/12) the Central Bank Governor Patrick Honohan as saying that Ireland should have been allowed to impose losses on Senior Bondholders. However, the effect of the Guarantee was marginal since Europe would not have allowed us to impose losses on Senior Bondholders in any case.

In recent times a view has been expressed by ESRI economist John Fitzgerald among others that Anglo Irish Bank was saved because an immediate collapse would have been a disaster for the European banking system. Nothing is said about the consequences for the Irish banks which Honohan in his report on the Guarantee in June 2010 said would have been catastrophic.

If the Irish State can convince Europe that it made sacrifices for the greater good of Europe the Long Fellow can only wish it the best of luck. But he does not feel that it was unjust for the Irish State to underwrite the liabilities owed to Senior Bondholders.

Ireland has benefitted from the global game. She has attracted multi nationals to this country and taxed the income of such companies which has resulted from the Research and Development expenditure that was incurred elsewhere.

The German Depfa bank operating out of the IFSC incurred a 100 billion euro loss, for which the German tax payer had to pick up the tab.

We experimented with a neo-liberal approach to banking regulation. Billions of euros flooded into the country from wealth that was created elsewhere. This generated economic activity which would not have occurred otherwise. It also generated massive windfall taxes for the State from taxes on property transactions. For a brief period we thought we could have the tax system of Texas and the Social system of Sweden. And Charlie McCreevy lectured the rest of Europe on the virtues of free market capitalism before the whole house of cards came crashing down in 2008.

In 1914 V.I. Lenin called on Russian communists to turn the international conflict into a civil conflict. But the left in this country is incapable of that kind of thinking; even that element that is most

fond of quoting Lenin. The West Brit element in the media decided to blame the Germans and the left could only follow. Gerry Adams couldn't resist uttering his *cupla focail* of German in the Dáil.

The effect of focussing on the bondholders was that attention was drawn away from the massive transfer of wealth that did occur. For every property developer who lost by buying at the top of the market, there was someone else who made massive windfall gains. The political energy which should have been expended in taxing (by legislation with retrospective effect) such windfall gains was dissipated in a rush to blame the EU (really the Germans).

THE IRISH TIMES AND GERMANY

The Irish Times completely lost the run of itself during the period of the boom with its property supplements and disastrous purchase of myhome.ie. When the economic crisis began it reverted to its traditional view that the State had failed and gave over its opinion pages to proponents of that view such as Morgan Kelly and Brian Lucey. It was as if the world economic crisis did not exist. When the Troika was called in, its editorial invoked the memory of 1916 to show how the State had failed. It was as if no other country had ever called in the IMF (e.g. the UK in 1976).

Fintan O'Toole is still banging on the "failed State" drum but the *Irish Times* as an institution cannot afford to remain detached from reality if it is to remain relevant. The resolution of the euro crisis will result in closer economic and political ties with continental Europe. Accordingly, the newspaper had a series of articles on Germany and our attitudes to that country. It found that the hostility of some media commentators to Germany was not reflected among ordinary Irish people. In the Long Fellow's opinion most Irish people admire the Germans and feel that we can learn from that country.

One of the interesting facts revealed in the series was that 7 per cent of Irish school leavers become engineers whereas the corresponding figure for Germany is 37 per cent. Only 30 per cent of German school leavers go to university compared to over 50 per cent in Ireland. It appears that in Ireland there is an overemphasis on academic qualifications as a means of entering the professions and not enough emphasis on good technical qualifications. The reason for this may be that the professions in this country are overpaid. The middle class in this country has too much power. The Long Fellow can only hope that the Troika will continue to put pressure on the Government to tackle the restrictive practices of the professions.

GERMANY AND GREECE

It is quite amusing to see the right wing press in Britain support the underdog; it would be remarkable if the anti Europe agenda were not understood. But even the *Financial Times* (15.9.12) had to quail at the latest Greek attempt to extract concessions from the Germans. A Greek parliamentarian, Manolis Glezos, is claiming 162 billion euro from the Germans for Nazi crimes committed 70 years ago. Unfortunately Greece signed a Treaty with Germany in 1990 agreeing that no more was due.

The *Financial Times* suggests a different tack:

"But if Athens wants to parry German accusations of feckless Greeks taking the money of hard-working Europeans, there are better ways to score points. Instead, pose the question of where all the money paid out in structural funds and bailouts actually ends up. Most of the investment in Athens' gleaming underground system, for example, returned to northern Europe via national champions such as Siemens and Alstom. Don't bother mentioning the war. Just follow the money."

What exactly is the *Financial Times* suggesting here? The Germans provide infrastructure for the Greeks in part financed by EU structural funds, which are in turn largely financed by the Germans. So the Germans should be grateful to the Greeks for allowing them to do so? In a reversal of normal commercial practice the producer should compensate the consumer? As Lenin advocated: "*from each according to his ability; to each according to his need*"?

As it happens the Greeks have already thought of that approach. The *Daily Telegraph* reports that the German company Siemens has been found guilty of bribery in connection to infrastructure projects for the Olympic Games in Athens in 2004. It has to write off 80 million euros that the Greek State still owes Siemens. The terms of the deal also oblige Siemens to invest another 250 million euro in infrastructural investments in Greece. This will consist of 90 million in Government infrastructure (including medical equipment and university research); 100 million to ensure that Siemens remains in Greece; and 60 million on a new plant employing 700 people. On top of this Siemens will have to pay for its own and the Greek State's legal bills.

It is interesting that 8 years after the Athens Olympics German companies still have not been paid. The story does not indicate if there was any sanction against the Greek State officials who were bribed.

CHINA AND AMERICA

It is not easy to assess Chinese economic conditions. A lot of Western commentary is based on wishful thinking. Nevertheless it appears that Chinese economic growth is about to slow. She may even enter recession. Wages have increased and production is moving to cheaper locations such as the Philippines, Vietnam and Burma. This is, of course, a symptom of success as China moves up the value chain.

Clifford Coonan suggests another challenge for China (*The Irish Times*, 10.9.12). There is a shift back to manufacturing in the US. Last year 237,000 jobs were created in the US manufacturing sector and this is expected to keep growing.

The article has the following surprising quote from the *China Daily*:

"Given that the US is on the threshold of a new technological and industrial revolution, China should change its manufacturing strategy in order to overcome its insufficient technological innovation capacity and low competitiveness".

About 30 years ago there was a neo liberal view that money was the measure of all value; and that it did not matter if money was made in manufacturing or services. The effect of this was to completely undermine manufacturing in the UK, but it appears that the manufacturing base of the US was never destroyed.

Armistice Day continued

an Irish Parliament was the bait that lured tens of thousands of gullible Irishmen to dusty, muddy and briney deaths.

That same Remembrance Day in Dublin, British Crown Forces arrested John O'Mahony, MP for Fermanagh South, John Hayes, MP for Cork West, Frank Lawless, MP for Dublin North and Diarmuid Lynch, MP for Cork, South East. In common with 69 other Sinn Fein candidates in the General Election of the previous December they had been elected on a mandate to establish an Irish Parliament to serve a Sovereign Republic for Ireland. As the party thus had 73 of all the constituencies in Ireland it set about keeping its promises. The MPs named were sentenced to two months' imprisonment for being members of Sinn Fein and for illegal assembly, as both Dail Eireann and Sinn Fein were deemed illegal by the Shocking and Awesome British Government. Other officers of the Dail and of the

Republic's Army were also arrested and jailed with them.

On 10th November 1920 the 73 years old Parish Priest of Dunmanway, Co Cork, Canon Magner, received a threatening letter demanding he ring his Church bell on the following day, the anniversary of the Armistice. He ignored the threat, and was murdered in broad daylight by an "*Auxiliary Police Cadet*"—in fact a British Army Officer and Great War veteran named Harte, who had just murdered a young man, Timothy Crowley, whilst Crowley was speaking with the Priest. By this time the British had suppressed Inquests in Ireland, a suppression which has been a boon to a school of charlatans posing as historians which has been assiduously promoted in recent years by the *Irish Times*. Pre-eminent amongst the charlatans was the late Professor Peter Hart, whose "*The IRA And Its Enemies*" brought to History the same standards as "Police Cadet" Harte brought to Policing.

The immediate trigger to the suppression was the Inquest held on Tomas MacCurtain, Lord Mayor of Cork, murdered by Royal Irish Constabulary men led by District Inspector Swanzy, which named as the perpetrators not just Swanzy, but also British Prime Minister David Lloyd George, Lord French, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Acting Inspector General Smith and Divisional Inspector Clayton of the RIC', whose policy Swanzy was implementing when he murdered MacCurtain. For many decades *The Irish Times* annually commemorated Swanzy in its Roll of Honour.

Armistice Day 1920 was a very busy day in Westminster. In Whitehall a stone Cenotaph, or symbolic empty tomb was unveiled in Whitehall by King George V, who that day also attended a solemn ceremony in Westminster Abbey when the mortal remains of an Unknown Warrior who had died wearing British Uniform in the Great War was interred there. That same day the Better Government of Ireland Bill, partitioning Ireland, had its Third and Final Reading in Parliament, to become law when King George gave it his Royal Assent some weeks later. Not one of the 29 Irish MPs (23 Unionists and 6 Nationalists) voted for the Bill, and as the remaining 73 repudiated British rule altogether, the Bill had no Assent in Ireland. Is it too fanciful to imagine that the Unknown Warrior was an Irish Home Ruler, or some honest Briton who thought that his sacrifice would promote the cause

of justice, and that his remains were spinning in his grave at the Blasphemy of manipulating propagandists and black-guard politicians? Is it too much to suspect that the Cenotaph is not empty, but stuffed with the empty promises of those who did well out of the War?

Skipping some unpleasantness we come to Remembrance Day in Dublin in 1931 when the British Legion is accompanied in its commemoration by the Dublin Branch of the British Union of Fascists, without any sign of dissension between them. Then to 4th March 1933 when the *Irish Times* hailed (*Heiled?*) the accession of Hitler to power in Germany, as "*Europe's standard-bearer against Muscovite terrorism*". A couple of years later, after the accession of Smyllie to the Editor's Chair, the paper lamented, on the death of Edward Carson, that the Unionist leader had been born forty years too soon, for otherwise "*he might have been a Mussolini, or even a Hitler*".

Smyllie's people nearly eighty years later seem to have no difficulty in emulating the feats of a late German Minister of Propaganda, replicating his real habits and mimicking the shortcomings attributed to him in the British army marching song.

For I fear they have *No Balls At All*.
Donal Kennedy

QUEEN OF SUPERMAX

Abu Hamza-al-Mastri annoys Liz, commander-in-chief, British Armed Forces.
head of the C-of-E, and drones of course, her grandson, wealthy, full of champagne fizz, goes on safari to bag an Afghan, or two. A family wardrobe of uniforms makes marriage, as an act of war, the norm.
Prompts killing, this Imperial clan. A preaching imam threatens their privileges?
For Liz to care you must hold a rifle but to resist murder is sacrilege, every voice of resistance is stifled with threats of US Supermax tutelage. Her Maj watches the Islam soul recycled.

Wilson John Haire,
26th September, 2012

Statement From John Young

{Note by *Spinwatch*: The statement below is from the son of an Irish War of Independence veteran who fought at the Kilmichael Ambush of 28 November 1920.

It arises from claims in a controversial 1998 Oxford University Press book, *The IRA and its Enemies, Violence and Community in Cork, 1916-1923*, by Peter Hart (who died suddenly in 2010 aged 46). That book was based on Hart's 1993 Trinity College Dublin PhD thesis of the same name.

In the book Hart wrote that he spoke to thirteen Irish Republican Army veterans of the conflict, anonymously. Hart said he did this because some of the veterans he spoke to requested anonymity.

This created particular problems in Hart's treatment of the 28 November 1920 West Cork Kilmichael Ambush. Seventeen of eighteen British soldiers were killed in action there (the last was left for dead). They were from the notorious counter-insurgency Auxiliary Division of the RIC.

In his *Guerrilla Days in Ireland* (1949), Ambush commander Tom Barry asserted that the Auxiliaries had engaged in a 'false surrender' trick, resulting in two of three IRA fatalities. According to Barry the false surrender justified his decision to order that all the Auxiliaries be killed outright. Hart disputed this, calling Barry and liar and a 'political serial killer'. Hart's claims received media publicity in Ireland and Britain, as well as numerous academic accolades.

As evidence for his view, Hart claimed to have spoken to two Kilmichael Ambush veterans in 1988-89 when just one veteran, Edward, 'Ned', Young, was alive. Indeed, Hart claimed to have spoken to one of his two anonymous interviewees on 19 November 1989, six days after Ned Young died on 13 November 1989, aged 97. Ned Young's death was reported in the widely read West Cork Southern Star newspaper on 18 November 1989, with the headline, *Ned Young—last of 'the Boys of Kilmichael'*.

Troubled History, a 10th Anniversary Critique of The IRA and its Enemies (2008), by Niall Meehan and Brian Murphy, published a sworn affidavit by Ned Young's son, John Young, in which John Young stated that his father suffered a stroke in late 1986.1 It "*made [Ned young] incapable of giving an interview,*

having virtually lost the faculty of speech". Peter Hart did not respond to *Troubled History*, apart from stating in *Times Higher Education* that he had not acted improperly.²

In 2012 Eve Morrison, also a TCD PhD graduate, defended Hart's Kilmichael analysis in her contribution to *Terror in Ireland 1916-23*, edited by Professor David Fitzpatrick. The book, a product of the TCD History Workshop, was dedicated to Peter Hart's memory. Niall Meehan critiqued the work for *Reviews in History*. Fitzpatrick and Morrison responded. Morrison claimed in her response that she had telephoned John Young on 4 July 2012 and that he told her, "*his father's mental faculties were not impaired and that he could speak perfectly clearly*".³

John Young rejects this account of the telephone call and asked *Reviews in History* to carry his statement to that effect. *Reviews in History* replied that as an academic journal they are not, after publishing a review and response, a forum for publishing "additional pieces". Young's statement was partially reported by Justine McCarthy in the Irish edition of the *Sunday Times* (26 August 2012).⁴

For that reason, in the interests of transparency, *Spinwatch* reproduces John Young's statement here in full. }

Letter, John Young, son of Edward ('Ned') Young

22 August 2012

Dear *Reviews in History*,

I take very strong objection to Eve Morrison's claims published on your website, in which she reports entirely inaccurately a short confused telephone 4 July 2012 conversation with me. Her remarks were never checked with me for accuracy. I wish you to publish on your website after her remarks the following attached statement, dated 22 August 2012, which I am copying to Niall Meehan, to whom Eve Morrison took exception for accurately reporting the contents of an affidavit I swore in December 2007.

You may contact me to verify the contents of the statement if you wish, and for that purpose alone.

Yours sincerely,
John Young

(son of Edward 'Ned' Young)
Dunmanway, Co. Cork

Statement by John Young

{Edward, 'Ned', Young was the last surviving veteran of the 28 November 1920 Kilmichael Ambush. He died 13 November 1989, aged 97.}

22 August 2012

A response to claims by Dr Eve Morrison (TCD Modern history Department) at the Institute for Historical Research, Reviews in History website,
<http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/1303>

I am a son of Edward, 'Ned', Young, last surviving veteran of the 28 November 1920 Kilmichael Ambush. Ned Young died on 13 November 1989, aged 97.

In a response (16 August 2012) to a review by Niall Meehan of *Terror in Ireland 1916-1921* (edited by Professor David Fitzpatrick), the author of a chapter on the Kilmichael Ambush, Dr Eve Morrison, reports a 4 July 2012 telephone conversation with me. I have not spoken to Eve Morrison before or since. I have never received any other communication of any kind from Eve Morrison.

I refute Eve Morrison's report of that conversation in its entirety.

The telephone call lasted approximately five to ten minutes. I attempted at the outset to ascertain who or what Ms Morrison represented and the purpose of her call, without success. Members of my family witnessed my end of the conversation with Eve Morrison. After the somewhat puzzling telephone call I dismissed the subject from my mind.

That pales into insignificance in comparison to claims Eve Morrison makes in her recently published report of that conversation, brought to my attention by a family member.

Morrison defends the late Peter Hart's analysis of [the 28 November 1920] Kilmichael Ambush in *The IRA and its Enemies* (OUP, 1998). That analysis was based on alleged anonymous interviews with two Kilmichael veterans in 1988 and 1989, at a time when my father was, I repeat for emphasis, the sole surviving ambush participant. Meehan noted in his review that Hart's claim to have interviewed my father anonymously in April and June of 1988 was undermined by an affidavit signed by me on 21 August 2007, sworn with witnesses on 14 December 2007 (first published, in full, as an appendix

to *Troubled History*, 2008, by Meehan and Brian Murphy). Peter Hart made no response to my affidavit that stated, *inter alia*,

If Peter Hart is referring to my father, Ned Young, with his made up reference (of "A.A."), his claim that he interviewed my father in April and June of 1988 is totally untrue as, at that stage, Ned Young was wheelchair bound having suffered a stroke sometime previously (circa late 1986). As a consequence, it made him incapable of giving an interview, having virtually lost the faculty of speech. He was constantly attended day and night by family members and full-time professional carers. On my instructions to my mother and the carers, the only people allowed into my parents home were family members, i.e., his nephews and nieces, grandchildren his doctor, Dr. Jim Young (his nephew), and the priests of the parish.

Despite this, Eve Morrison claims in her response to Meehan that on 4 July 2012,

[John] Young confirmed that his father's mental faculties were not impaired and that he could speak perfectly clearly. I asked him this twice, and he said he was willing to go on the record on this point.

This, her statement is—I repeat emphatically—palpably untrue. I wish to go on record to refute Eve Morrison's claim. My August 2007 affidavit stands in its entirety because it is true and immutable.

I am surprised if Eve Morrison's behaviour is regarded as acceptable academic practice in Trinity College Dublin. Is a short, hurried, and confused telephone call between strangers on a serious matter a proper basis for making historical claims? Does Eve Morrison consider me so light minded as to reverse a sworn considered statement about my own father, in the course of a brief conversation on the telephone with someone I have never met? Why did Eve Morrison not attempt to confirm with me in writing her mistaken interpretation of our conversation before publication? She had over forty days prior to publication in which to do so.

Eve Morrison's other claims with regard to how my father was cared for are equally without foundation and equally upsetting to me and to my family. Two carers under my direction were required to nurse my father after he suffered his stroke in late 1986. Ned Young rarely ventured out in public during the period in question, an exception being attendance at the annual

Kilmichael commemoration. I was the family member in overall charge of my father's care and well-being. I reiterate what is stated in my affidavit, that, apart from designated family members, his doctor and parish clergy, no one was permitted to speak to my father without my express permission. Eve Morrison's insulting remarks to the effect that because I was not present 24-7 Peter Hart could have slipped through this mutually agreed family net is specious and unworthy of serious consideration.

I have a specific reason, not before revealed, why I am confident in making this assertion:

During the late 1980s a man with what my late mother described as a "foreign accent" called to her door asking to interview Ned Young. She reported to me that she explained to him directly that Ned Young was a sick man in bed who would not be granting interviews, not least because he was incapable of doing so. I do not know if the man was Peter Hart. However, I am aware that the late Jim O'Driscoll, SC (Orwell Road, Dublin), drove the then PhD researcher Peter Hart and deposited him at my mother and father's address during that time frame. Jim O'Driscoll, who I knew well, was one of the witness signatories to my affidavit sworn on 14 December 2007, referred to above. If, as seems likely, the man in question was Peter Hart, it makes his subsequent behaviour all the more inexcusable and inexplicable.

Eve Morrison's suggestion that my father was not the last surviving veteran of the Kilmichael ambush is nonsense. Morrison makes this claim because Peter Hart reported interviewing a second anonymous 'Kilmichael veteran' six days after Edward, 'Ned', Young, my father, died.

My upset at being presented with Eve Morrison's claims is only surpassed by my incredulity at the publication of untrue and unchecked claims by Morrison.

I am equally astonished by the revelation that Father John Chisholm possessed a forty-year-old tape-recorded interview with my father he released to Eve Morrison. I wrote to Fr Chisholm in 2008 asking if he had such a tape recording. He replied,

I greatly regret having to inform you I have no recording of an interview with your father, though I remember him with affection as a man of real character.

I agree with the suggestion that Fr. Chisholm deposit tapes of interviews with War of Independence veterans (which he obtained on the basis of research for Liam Deasy's 1973 book, *Towards Ireland Free*) in a public archive. That is the expressed view also of Liam Deasy's eldest daughter, Maureen, who typed her father's manuscript. I demand that a copy of Fr Chisholm's interview with my father should be given to me without further delay.

John Young
22 August 2012

1 *Troubled History* available at, <http://gcd.academia.edu/NiallMeehan/Books/75341/>

2 John Gill, *Troubles and strife as IRA historian draws peers' fire*, available at, <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storyCode=402611§ioncode=26>

3 Meehan review and Fitzpatrick-Morrison response available at, <http://gcd.academia.edu/NiallMeehan/Papers/1877653>.

4 Available at, <http://www.indymedia.ie/article/102322>.

5 An article critical of Hart in the *Southern Star* of 5 July 2008, of which Jim O'Driscoll was aware, makes reference to that fact, <http://www.southernstar.ie/News/Kilmichael-veterans-son-challenges-Hart-846.htm?id=846>. Jim O'Driscoll died suddenly in 2009. His *Irish Times* obituary, 21 March 2009, refers to the controversy, <http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/obituaries/2009/0321/1224243193986.html>).

Also (related): <http://www.politics.ie/forum/history/134386-peter-hart-dies-21.html#post5713837>

A Palestinian Poem

Goal!

Mahmud Sarsak
Of the Palestinian National
Football Team
Was detained without trial
And went on a three-month
Hunger strike.

International footballers
Demanded his release,
And suddenly
The "security considerations"
Evaporated into thin air.

An own goal
By Israel.

Gush Shalom

[*Irish Political Review* is indebted to David Morrison for bringing this poem to our attention]

A Land War Leader, *The Bard*

A biography of someone called 'the Bard' would no doubt mean only one thing to most readers—another biography of the '*the Bard of Avon*'. However, the subject of this book was known as the '*Bard of Millstreet*' and could hardly have been more different. He was a legendary leader of Moonlighters in North Cork during the Land War and public enemy number one for a decade. Yet he did have something in common with his namesake from Stratford.

There is no evidence that either of them ever wrote a poem or a play. And both had the title of Bard thrust upon them.

Our 'Bard' got his nickname from the second syllable of his middle name in Irish, Riobaird, (Robert). Having the rather ordinary and nondescript name of John O'Sullivan it was felt necessary to give him a more exotic title because of his distinctive characteristics and activities. So 'the Bard' was chosen for this purpose. His descendants gloried in association with him and the name Robert became a family nickname and one of them who was a schoolmate of mine was known as 'Bobby Robert'—a sort of double insurance that he would not be mistaken for any other of the O'Sullivan clan.

The author, Barry Keane, is a great grandson of the Bard and he has written the first biography of the man and interweaves family, local and national history into a well-told story. It's lucky for us that Barry got there first with his biography because if the Bard had first 'got the treatment' from our modern academes he would no doubt be classified and dismissed as just an arch terrorist. The authorities of the day believed so and were so convinced of it that he received a sentence of 24 years hard labour at a show trial in Nenagh in 1891. Keane does not forget the plight of his wife with six children in this situation. To survive she broke stones by the roadside to fill potholes in pre-tarmac days.

He was released when the Liberal Government came to power in 1906 through the efforts of D.D. Sheehan,

William O'Brien and the All For Ireland League MPs.

His arch enemies were a very successful local self-made Catholic businessman, Jeremiah Hegarty, who used 'credit crunch' tactics (and the traditional supplementary tactics now out of fashion in these situations) against tenants in financial difficulties and thereby acquired their land; the other was the local Catholic Parish Priest, Canon Arthur Sands Griffin, who orchestrated a long and well thought out campaign against the Land League, locally, nationally and internationally. The two were a formidable combination and with all the powers of the State and the Establishment actively supportive of them they seemed invincible. Hegarty was made a Justice of Peace with the purpose of hounding the Bard. The ensuing conflict made Millstreet known as the 'cockpit of Ireland' for a while. It was not a pretty sight and not for the faint-hearted. That conflict resonates to this day and remains part of the DNA of the area.

But a most interesting aspect of him is that he became an 'All for Irelander'. After his release, he became constitutional in his politics, became a farmer and showed every sign of adapting very positively to the situation where his war, the Land War, had been won. He was not and never could be a rebel without a cause. The same went for the vast majority of his peers. He and they were not looking for another war after they had just won their own war. His extended family became upstanding and model members of society which they have remained down to the present day. They turned up in large numbers at the launch of this book and spoke vividly and proudly of their ancestor.

Why then, only about a decade after his release did he live to see a bigger war in his area than he had ever experienced and one he could hardly have ever imagined despite being the very personification of a war himself?

Did something come over the people to go to war? Reading modern historians this becomes a mystery. The farmers had their land, the labourers had their cottage and an acre, the town tenants became owners of their homes and business, older people got their pensions, churches were built, the Catholic Church also got its University, schools and hospitals, *Ne Temere*, and

other privileges, the Gaelic League was flourishing, etc., etc. Democratic County Councils were established. The list goes on. The people were nearly killed with kindness. There was a relationship with Britain that our modern revisionists would die for, it was their paradise. The people volunteered to join up in their hundreds of thousands to fight and die for the consolidation of this in the form of Home Rule. And then they revolted! As the Editor of the Irish Times said on a later occasion: '*What sort of people are we?*'

The fact is the people did not change. The Irish, despite any claims to the contrary, are fundamentally a conservative people as they believe they have more to conserve than discard—and they are right in this. It is Britain in its wisdom that changed the rules of the game—the one constant in its politics. It said, essentially, fight and die for us in our war, wait for Home Rule (after waiting for over 30 years), and after you voted for what you believed you had fought and died for—'*the freedom of small nations*'—we will treat it as a bad joke and shit on you with the Black and Tans.

People can get upset about things like that. The Irish continued to believe in what they had fought for—the freedom of small nations—except that they now found they had to fight at home for what they thought they had fought for, and won, abroad.

The Bard himself was not in a position to fight again but he celebrated the victory and his spirit and example helped secure that victory.

Jack Lane

TU Notes

concluded

period—but their take-home pay has dropped to just €36,273.

People on €100,000 are paying an extra €2,177 in income tax and other charges, despite their gross earnings falling due to pay cuts. Again, this is largely due to the universal social charge.

Back in 2008 there was no universal social charge, but workers had to pay a health levy of 2% of their gross income. This amounted to €1,000 for someone earning €50,000.

"After the health levy and income taxes, the €50,000 worker was left with €41,578, calculations by Cathal Maxwell of Paylesstax.ie show. Tax and other deductions amounted to €8,422." (*ibid.*)

But a likely pay cut of 10% has left this private sector worker with a gross salary of just €45,000.

The take from the universal social charge is close to €2,500.

+++++

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

es ahora *

BRITISH EMBASSY PARTY

There has been no end of grousing this Summer about the weather and all sorts of things. But we have had the best GAA hurling and football matches that I can recall for a long long time with Jim Mc Guinness and his Donegal team upping their game to standards once reminiscent of the old Kerry teams of the 60s—and the 70s. The one bad note was as usual provided by the Dublin crowd who, when someone was taking a free, whistled and cat-called and behaved in a generally odious fashion like one sees in English soccer matches. While over in the British Embassy, there was the *muted* arrival of that old war-horse Sir Dominick Chilcott as the new Ambassador. Sir Dominick—for those of us who remember—was previously the Ambassador in Teheran but for reasons best known to the British themselves was recalled with the rest of his team from Iran and found that his next posting was to our fair isle. Anyway he threw his bash on the 6th of September 2012 and he had a most *special* surprise for his elite gathering. Queen Elizabeth 11 had *granted him the permission* to have the clothes she wore on her state visit to Ireland to be flown over to the Embassy and once they were put on mannequins, they were displayed so that those invited guests "*filed past them*", as reverentially reported in *The Irish Times*, 8th September 2012—and this gesture was greatly appreciated by the guests. (I remember when the reliquaries of St. Theresa of Lisieux were brought to Ireland and everywhere were met throughout the land with great crowds and devotion and *The Irish Times* was "*embarrassed*" by such fervour and claimed that it was reminiscent of former peasant devotions!) But the Queen of England's dresses and hats—now that was a different story altogether.

The Ambassador made much of the fact that the film director Danny Boyle, who had done the £27million opening ceremony of the British Olympics, though "*born in Lancashire had a mother who came from Galway and all four of his grandparents were Irish*". This gave Sir Dominic the idea that he was someone who "*straddled the Irish sea in a spirit of kinship*" and he called on his guests "*to sing 'Danny Boy' to Boyle and to what he represents in British-Irish relations*". And

indeed "*everyone sang in unison*", much to the joy of the new Ambassador. The *Irish Times* then carried a list of those who attended. The Minister for European Affairs Lucinda Creighton, Fine Gael, was there with her former campaign manager Tom Ponsonby. His partner was Rebecca Wardell who works for the British Embassy. The Fine Gael strategist Frank Flannery and his wife were seen talking to Olivia Mitchell. Mr. Justice Paul Carney "*surveyed the gardens and Fianna Fail's Éamon Ó Cúiv left early*". Amongst the other named guests were the chief of staff of the Defence Forces, Lt. Gen. Sean Mc Cann, former Taoiseach Liam Cosgrave, Canon Bob Reed, the preceptor of St. Patrick's Cathedral "*who was the epitome of sartorial elegance in his panama hat*", the papal nuncio Archbishop Charles Brown, Ethna Fitzgerald of Rotary International in Ireland, PwC's Fergal O'Rourke, son of Mary O'Rourke among many others.

SUMMER BOOK LAUNCH PARTY

The launch of Gerard Hogan's book *The Origins of the Irish Constitution 1928-1941* at the Royal Irish Academy brought out the elite of the law in Ireland and from the names there according to *The Irish Times*, 15th September 2012, there seems to be in my opinion a lot of nepotism being practised in that arena. The book was launched by the Taoiseach Enda Kenny, Fine Gael, who "*read extracts from letters and memos*" from His Grace, Archbishop "John Charles McQuaid to Eamon de Valera:

"I am deeply grateful for the draft, it is such a joy to see it in print... I beg to enclose a copy of the work I have been at, rummaging in the heads of the last few Popes. I hope it is what you want."

(Obviously as these were the only extracts quoted, it follows on *The Irish Times* campaign of attrition against the formidable Archbishop who obviously was reading through former papal encyclicals with an aim to help de Valera in that area but from the words written there was *no attempt* to interfere or terrify (as if!) the then Taoiseach, as is the usual canard put out by the revisionists in academia or the media for that matter. The language is friendly and informal confirming the true nature of the friendship between these two men with the Archbishop acknowledging how truly grateful he was to receive the draft and "*to see it in print...*")

The guest list included former Chief Justice Ronan Keane and his wife Irene Garavan-Keane, former Chief Justice Thomas Finlay, former Taoiseach Liam

Cosgrave, Finlay's daughter Ms. Justice Mary Finlay-Geoghegan and his son-in-law, the former Supreme Court judge Hugh Geoghegan, and the former Supreme Court judge Catherine McGuinness. Also there were Siobhan Brady, wife of the late former Attorney General Rory Brady, judge Colm Mac Eochaidh, Éamon Ó Cúiv, Fianna Fail TD, Alex White TD, former judge Hugh O'Flaherty and former Editor of *The Irish Times*, Geraldine Kennedy. The author Gerald Hogan is himself a High Court judge and I would have thought that there was a clear conflict of interest in him writing this book and then practising law at that high level. Can you imagine bringing a case before him and disagreeing with his *interpretation* of the Constitution—where would that leave your case? I think it sets a dangerous precedent as the constitution itself is our primary text and even the best-intentioned *study* of it brings into play subjective bias that no amount of scholarship can conceal.

IRISH STUDIES JOURNAL

Reading the Jesuits' Studies, Spring 2012, Vol. 101, No. 402, I came across a book review of *A Small State at the Top Table. Memories of Ireland on the Security Council, 1981-82* by Noel Dorr: Institute of Public Administration, 2010. It was reviewed by a Dr. Michael Kennedy who is according to the end blurb: "*Executive Editor of the Royal Irish Academy's Documents on Irish Foreign Policy series. He has published widely on twentieth century Irish diplomatic and military history.*" No daw then until one reads his review of Dorr's book which left me almost speechless with shock and for anyone who knows me that takes a rare old fright! First there was a *brief* account of our time at the League of Nations, then the United Nations and our occupancy of the Security Council for a half term in 1962, in 1980-1982, and again in 2000-2002 which were both two year terms against stiff opposition according to Dorr. In this book—which is Dorr's second volume of United Nations memoirs, Noel Dorr "*covers this two-year term and explores the three crises that occurred during this period from an Irish perspective*". First there "*the mounting tension over Namibian independence (1981), the Israeli invasion of Lebanon (1982) and the Anglo-Argentine war over the Falkland Islands (1982)*". (Throughout the name of the Malvinas Islands is given inexplicably as the Falkland Islands and so to be true to the book I will have to use the latter.) Kennedy avows:

"The Irish angle and Dorr's personal perspectives are, nevertheless, the key dimensions in this most readable text."

Taking up over half the book, the reviewer states that:

"the most important chapters cover Ireland's and Dorr's handling of the Falkland War of April to June 1982. Following the sinking of the Argentine cruiser *General Belgrano* by a British submarine on 2nd May, Ireland's strongly republican Minister for Defence, Paddy Power, publicly attacked Britain as the aggressor in the Falklands conflict. This outburst did considerable damage to British-Irish relations".

I urge readers to look at the language used by Dorr/Kennedy alleging the "outburst" which suggest an intemperate response rather than the calculated one of a senior Irish Minister. As far as I remember the 'Belgrano' was not engaged in conflict at the time of being hit but was returning to base and had communicated that to the British who responded by firing Exocet missiles from one of their warships which had the result of sinking the ship with over 1,300 sailors on board. (A war crime if ever there was one!) None of this is in the review and so I would conclude that it is not in the book either. But what really riled both Dorr and Kennedy was that upon the UK media frenzy of war triumphalism that greeted this outrageous act that the Taoiseach Charlie Haughey, Fianna Fail, having formerly accepted an UN resolution calling for Argentine withdrawal from the Falklands, now issued a press release on the 4th May:

"drafted, it would seem, by Haughey's advisors in Dublin which arrived at the Irish Permanent Mission to the United Nations in New York via the Irish embassy in Washington calling for an immediate meeting of the Security Council to prepare a resolution calling for an end to hostilities"

—which sounded utterly reasonable to me. But that was not how Dorr saw it and of course there is the matter of how Dorr himself was bypassed in this process by the press release being given first to the Irish Embassy in Washington.

"Whether through a desire to see England's difficulty as Ireland's opportunity, or a short-sighted attempt at improving his domestic popularity, Haughey forgot a key maxim of Irish foreign policy, enshrined by his predecessor as Taoiseach Eamon de Valera: Ireland would never let itself be used as a base from which to attack Britain. In fact, as Dorr has put it, England's difficulty is Ireland's responsibility (p.240, footnote 3). **And it was on Dorr's own initiative that Haughey's *démarche*, which cast Ireland in an anti-British light internationally and as the first chink in ending the European Union sanctions against Argentina, was brought to a soft landing that deadened, as best as Dorr could,**

its negative impact on British-Irish relations and on Ireland's position at the United Nations."

So here there is clear evidence of a civil servant of the Irish Government going against the stated intentions of the democratically elected leader of the Irish state. And doing so on the totally spurious grounds of following de Valera's policy during WW2 which he endorsed for the safety of this country during that event but which was rolled into our Neutrality which itself became the doctrinal litmus test of our freedom as a State and has still not been abrogated. According to Dorr, "*Haughey's actions removed any 'honest broker' role that Ireland might have played on the Security Council over the Falklands*", which in my opinion is utter *ráméis*. According to Dorr too we were "*hobbled by the Taoiseach's actions*", which begs the question how successful was Dorr's own initiative? Kennedy allows that

"it might not have been the worst crisis for British-Irish relations for a generation as Dorr contends; it was ultimately a short term matter with few long-term consequences. But, coming after the 1981 hunger strikes and in the context of deteriorating personal relations between Thatcher and Haughey, it is not hard to see why Dorr has cast it as such from the perspectives of New York."

The cold stark truth here is that our Taoiseach was undermined by his own officials who broke their pledge to the Official Secrets Act and colluded with another country which makes this *cold treason*.

Kennedy also makes the very pertinent point—that Michael Lillis of the Department of Foreign Affairs also made—and that was that Dorr and Secretary of the Department of Foreign Affairs Séan Donlon should both have resigned over Haughey's so-called *démarche* (*Dublin Review of Books* December 2012). But no sooner does he say that but jumps immediately to negate it and goes on to suggest that "surely this would have been counter-productive and *provoked Haughey into wilder and more damaging actions?*" Can anyone imagine a more dispiriting view from so-called experts on Irish Foreign policy? For Haughey—how incapacitating it must have been for him to see him now cast as a rather mad man of public actions. This of course is the image these *scuils* want to cast about Charles Haughey but they were far from the reality. Charlie was stubborn but very pragmatic and left a legacy that one day will be recognised when these bird-brains are long gone. And then Dr. Kennedy notes:

"the tradition of *selfless* public service that radiates from Dorr's memoirs."

Well Dr. Kennedy if that's how you see it—then God help us all.

THE TCD CONNECTION

Kennedy goes on to state in his review in *Studies* that

"at a witness seminar held on 13th April 2012 by the Centre for Contemporary Irish History at TCD, Dorr was one of half-a-dozen senior British and Irish figures who took part in the events of thirty years ago who reassembled to discuss Ireland's reaction to the Falklands War. He (Dorr) explained to the audience that he was 'not inclined to apologise for whatever efforts we made in our time to try to avert the war' and this is also the central theme of the Falklands section of his Security Council memoir."

Where did this nonsense come from? It was Haughey who called for an UN resolution "*to end hostilities*" and it was Dorr himself who stated he did everything possible to stall his Taoiseach's order and who sided with the British position. Just imagine if it was Prime Minister Thatcher who was the one who was being disobeyed by her diplomats and shown such disloyalty in a sneaky fashion by allaying themselves with the policy of another country at that—she would have their heads for treason to the State and justly so. The pity of it is that it seems that such treasonable activity is admired here at home—especially in the enclaves of TCD and *The Irish Times* and of course by the present reviewer Dr. Michael Kennedy of the Royal Irish Academy. In the final paragraph Kennedy extols Dorr and says he:

"has written a primer for students of international relations on the operation of the Security Council. He shows what a small state can do... when given a chance: he has also shown the nightmare scenario of what happens when, through a *clumsy desire* for *personal political advancement*, the senior member of the home team seeks to direct policy. Dorr may not admit it, but he was fire-fighting on two fronts in May 1982."

When that senior member is the Taoiseach of the country who never courted political advancement to the peril of our state, it is outrageous to suggest that he didn't have the right to "*direct policy*" when that was *his and his only* right to so direct.

THE MARRIAGE FOUNDATION

In last month's *Irish Political Review*, I related how there is a new attempt in the UK to make marriage a more favoured response to setting up home rather than just living together which statistically

attracts more breakdown—here at home there was the welcome news that marriage is on the up and up. Co-habitation is falling in popularity. Now comes the news from the USA that:

"Growing up with married parents vastly increases a child's prospects of escaping poverty. A stable home was found to raise a child's chances of escaping the poverty trap by 82% { which is a quite staggering percentage!} When equally well-educated families were compared, marriage increased a child's chances of living above the poverty line by 75%. The US research also found that just 7% of children in families below the poverty line has two married parents. Study author Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, a think-tank based in Washington DC said: "Being married has roughly the same effect in reducing poverty that adding five to six years to a parent's education has. Marriage remains America's strongest anti-poverty weapon"."

**COLM TÓIBÍN, VARGAS LLOSA
AND ROGER CASEMENT**

In the *London Review of Books*, 13th September 2012, Colm Tóibín reviewed in a rather loose way Mario Vargas Llosa's *The Dream of the Celt*, a novel but, according to the author himself, based on quite an amount of research about Roger Casement. Though living superbly well as a London *literati* for many years now, Vargas Llosa came to Ireland and went on a research journey with the Casement historian Dr. Angus Mitchell. No evidence of such scholarship shapes Vargas Llosa's propagandistic treatment of Casement and it is obvious he went on to write this foul novel to once more with purpose to blacken Casement's noble nature and name.

Tóibín's praise for Joseph Conrad's fictionalised account of his journey to Africa *Heart of Darkness* (though his visit lasted little more than two months) completely over-shadows the greatness of what Casement accomplished but that is all grist to the English mill and this very English review journal. When Casement was facing his execution and Joseph Conrad could have made *some* protestation on his account, the latter despicably wrote against him stating:

"He was a good companion; but already in Africa I judged that he was a man, properly speaking, of no mind at all. I don't mean stupid. I mean that he was all emotion... A creature of sheer temperament—a truly tragic personality: all but the greatness of which he had not a trace. Only vanity. But in the Congo it was not visible yet".

Tóibín then goes on with typical revisionist cant:

"Casement was a fanatical Irish nationalist... He worked to help to colonise the Congo, implicating himself in the very activity of which he later became a formidable and public enemy. He was an energetic and meticulous campaigner against the abuse of the Congo and the Amazon Basin; he also kept a diary in which he noted his sexual adventures with native young men, many of whom he paid."

So we are left with the picture of a man who brought huge publicity to the abused natives of Africa and the Amazon—yet he himself partook of this abuse and his many enemies didn't watch him—we are led to believe—only when he stood up for his own colonised country and faked *fac-similes* of his diaries were produced by the British State and shown to influential people whose murmurs of sympathy became more and more muted so that Casement's hanging was assured. Tóibín's rush to implicate Casement in what was then deemed deviant behaviour—after all the fall of Oscar Wilde was fresh in everyone's mind—is shown by his shameless quotation of the fiction of Vargas Llosa:

".. while lying beside one another in

the dark, Mayta" (Casement) "moving closer and closer to his innocent and sexual prey ..."

According to Tóibín:

"Casement... had many lovers for a price—dozens, perhaps hundreds—and not a single loving relationship. Pure sex, hurried and animal."

Tóibín himself believes that those of us who know Casement as the great patriot and humanitarian cannot allow ourselves to believe in the so-called Black Diaries because they show him to be a widely promiscuous homosexual with some paedophile proclivities. The British Government have never published the diaries and have yet to accede to the request to do so. Certainly, when Taoiseach Eamon de Valera brought home the remains of our murdered martyr, neither he nor his people who thronged the streets of Dublin for his final fitting funeral believed the slurs and arrows that were rained down on him—then or now. It will still take a lot more than imperial lies to disturb Roger Casement's peaceful grave in our honoured State cemetery—Glasnevin.

Julianne Herlihy ©

Part Three

An Irish Anti-Fascist RAF Volunteer And Some Other Soldiers

Derry Kelleher's personally motivated slander—that Cork Communist Kevin Neville had joined the RAF because of a supposed hostility to Ireland's wartime neutrality on the part of the Curragh Internment Camp's Connolly Group—was both quoted and refuted in Part Two (August *Irish Political Review*). This malicious allegation in respect of Neville—against whom Kelleher held a grudge originating from their shared IRA activities in Easter 1940—came on page 293 of his frequently bizarre 476 page tome, *Buried Alive in Ireland—A Story of a Twentieth Century Inquisition* (2001). On reaching page 293, however, the reader may well have forgotten by that stage that the dates from the earlier part of his book clearly demonstrated that Kelleher had no personal experience of anything that might have ever been debated within that Group. Kelleher had in fact signed out of the Camp at an earlier stage, for his own personal reasons:

"The writer's political metamorphosis ... may be extended beyond late September/early October in 1941—when I emerged from the Curragh Internment Camp, with a radically altered political

outlook from that which I had on incarceration on the 3rd June 1940—to resume my studies at University College, Cork" (p53).

Kelleher signed out more than three months after Nazi Germany's invasion of the USSR, and it is clear that that neither Kevin Neville nor anybody else had yet signed out by late 1941 for any anti-fascist political purpose whatsoever. Consequently, the following statement on the website www.irishlabour.com from Jim Lane's 2005 memoir *Miscellaneous Notes on Republicanism and Socialism in Cork City 1954-69* is as misleading on timing as it is on the "advice" supposedly given to Neville:

"Gerry Higgins told me that, following the invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941, Kevin Neville heeded the advice of leading socialist figures and sought and received parole from the Curragh Camp, going on to join the RAF. The advice given at the time was that all able bodied socialists should join the armies of the Allied forces in the fight against fascism and in defence of the Soviet Union." (p10).

Yet Kelleher's account in the earlier

part of his book is reasonably accurate as to both the dating and political resolve of the Connolly Group's deliberations in which he himself, however, had played no part. The pivotal figure had been Neil Goold—not, however, an IRA member himself, but a Communist who had spent the mid-1930s in the USSR before returning to Ireland. Goold was arrested at a Dublin unemployed demonstration in early 1940 and sent to the Curragh Internment Camp, only to be transferred out of it again to Mountjoy Jail, on account of the activities of the Connolly Study Group that he had set up in January 1942. Jim Savage, a member of that Group, was, for a change, reasonably accurate in the following excerpt from the narrative he supplied to Unseann Mac Eoin in 1997:

"I was finally arrested in 1941 and held for six weeks in the Cork Bridewell... then shifted to Collins Barracks for three weeks... (then) transferred for some weeks to Mountjoy... I received four months on a minor charge; but... with internment I knew I was likely to be in for the duration... {Meanwhile in the Curragh}—it being then the month of January {1942}—all of the Camp was drawing fuel for the stoves in each hut... However, I was not myself present at that time... {When transferred to the Curragh} I was in a hut which included Neil Goold... The Connolly Group had already been formed by Neil Goold and it became the basis of my further education. The Soviet Union had been violently attacked by Nazi Germany in June 1941, so we all felt we should support its war effort. Russia, being now drawn into the war, formed an inspiration to the Group. While the Group had numbers of Cork men in it, it was not however Cork inspired... All the time, however, we were supervised... The Staters {Irish Army camp guards—MOR} did not interfere. I am not saying they took notes but they listened carefully. They only wanted to split the IRA anyway. They shoved Goold into the Curragh when he should have been placed in Mountjoy for organising the unemployed and lying down on the streets, not indeed that that should be regarded as a crime. His offence was of course Mountjoy material pure and simple; not Curragh material. After a while (IRA internees leader) Pearse Kelly took alarm and wrote to the Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin... and whatever case he put forward, Goold, who had been almost three years in the Camp and was generally respected, was removed" (*The IRA In The Twilight Years*, pp 816-820).

The earlier part of Kelleher's book further related:

"The New Year (of 1942) saw the emergence of a Connolly Study Group... (which) had already been in gestation with the convergence of Spanish Civil

War veterans and... radically minded volunteers... such as Seamus Ronayne, Tom Murphy and Timmy Aherne from Cork City... The Curragh Socialist Group, recognising that the IRA had been bereft of any revolutionary potential... decided to take an irreversible step using the resource available for their release and enter the outside world to engage in flesh and blood politics. The Cork members who took this step were Michael O'Riordan, Jim Savage, Seamus Ronayne, Timmy Aherne, Kevin Neville, Donie Sheehan, the brothers Jerry and Tommy MacSweeney and Thomas Kavanagh... This Cork contingent decided to join the Labour Party... 'to follow in the footsteps of our hero dead' and so to form (in 1943) a Liam Mellows branch of the Labour Party {which Kelleher himself would later join—MOR}... Among those who flocked to join the new branch were Bill Nagle, Tommy Murray, Bernie Kennedy, Jack Madden, Dan Neville (brother of Kevin), Máire Keohane (the fiancée of Donie Sheehan), Maurice Savage (brother of Jim), Denis Cremin, Dan Looney, Anthony Hegarty, Paddy Tierney, Mick Ronayne (the father of Seamus, and a veteran Labourite) ... and a comrade of Terence MacSwiney, Jim Gray, veteran of the Black and Tan and Civil Wars and ex-secretary of Fianna Fáil in Cork City. {As an anti-fascist, Jim Gray enthusiastically backed O'Riordan's 1943 campaign against wartime anti-semitism within the Labour Party and continued to back him in his 1946 Cork Socialist Party election campaign. This was the same Jim Gray whose War of Independence record has him characterised as 'one of the city's most notorious gunmen' by Gerard Murphy in *The Year Of Disappearances—Political Killings in Cork*, 2010, p33. The front cover of Murphy's second edition proudly flashes the *Sunday Independent* review by John-Paul McCarthy on 7 November 2010, in which Murphy was praised for his portrayal—or should I not say character assassination?—of Miah and Jim Gray as "two notoriously cruel IRA men .. intent on .. sectarian massacre"—MOR} ... The Liam Mellows Branch also met committees of trade unions in Cork, not affiliated to the Labour Party, to remind them of the historically endorsed practical advantages of so doing, *so as to obtain appropriate trade union legislation through the Dáil* {My emphasis—MOR}" (pp 73-83).

The "apostasy" of the nine Cork Connolly Group members, as far as the IRA was concerned, lay in their recognition of the 26 Counties Dáil—and, by implication, de Valera's 1937 Constitution—and not in any supposed group enlistment in the British armed forces. Kevin Neville's enlistment in the RAF was the sole Cork exception that proved that rule. (When my parents spent their November

1946 honeymoon visiting IRA volunteers imprisoned in Britain for their bombing campaign activities, my father was upbraided by one prisoner, Joe Collins of Dunmanway, with the greeting: "I see you've gone Constitutional!" "Are you calling me a Redmondite?" "If the cap fits!" Their friendship survived!)

There was also to be a parting of the ways on that score with the Group's founder, Neil Goold. On its website at www.comunistpartyofireland.ie/s-goold.html the Communist Party of Ireland's portrayal of Goold says too much on one point and too little on another:

"The IRA leadership was irritated by his lectures on communism and also by the fact that he (among others) encouraged internees to apply for parole and to join the British forces so as to take their part in the war against German fascism... On his release from prison at the end of 1943 he was critical of the CPI for having suspended its activities in the South in 1941."

The CPI suggestion that Goold and some unnamed "others" (O'Riordan, perhaps?) were actively recruiting for the British armed forces is solely based on uncorroborated allegations made by IRA internees hostile to that Group. It completely ignores the fact that **not a single one** of the four Connolly Group members interviewed by MacEoin—namely, Fennell, O'Riordan, Ronayne and Savage—ever gave the slightest indication of any such activity. Moreover, Goold's principal criticism of the CPI in the South was that it had told its members to join the Labour Party. As for Goold himself, his own agitational activities after his release were not all concerned with Britain's war effort but became decidedly more Republican than ever before, getting him into trouble with the law yet again in 1944 for campaigning (unsuccessfully) to save the life of IRA chief-of-staff Charlie Kerins, following his Military Tribunal conviction and death sentence for the murder of Detective Sergeant Denny O'Brien.

Jim Lane's 2005 narrative of the 1954-69 years was quoted at length in Part Two, so what follows is commentary rather than unnecessary, repetitive quotation. It is its sins of omission that result in it being a particularly misleading account of the politics of many of the names that Lane drops throughout the course of his memoir. If his narrative is to be accepted at face value, one must conclude that he knew less than he thought he did about many of those he cites as close associates, whether or not it was a conscious decision

on their part that he was a man who should be kept in the dark about their other political affiliations.

I do not at all doubt Lane's word that Kevin Neville, Dan Neville and Liam Flavin were associated with him in the Irish Republican Forces activities of the early 1960s. But I remain mystified as to why his memoir stays silent on their concurrent membership of the Irish Workers' League (which became the IWP in 1962). But perhaps they never told him; no more than did the IRA's Cork Brigade Adjutant, Jim O'Regan. Lane's narrative makes much of having been informed by Gerry Higgins of "secret" communist meetings in Cork hotels with IWL General Secretary Michael O'Riordan during an earlier period, but he seems to know nothing of the semi-clandestine Cork Branch meetings of the IWL that were held in the Boreenmanna Road home of my maternal aunt, Máire Keohane Sheehan, where I would spend my childhood Summer holidays.

Both Jim O'Regan and Dan Neville I would have known from my infancy. Liam Flavin—another member of the Curragh Internment Camp's Connolly Group—I first met at the age of 8 when I was put sitting up on the side of the speakers' lorry at a mass rally of Cork unemployed workers in 1957. I subsequently became aware of the gatherings of O'Regan, Neville, Flavin and several others in my aunt's home, but I would be packed off to bed before the conversation turned too 'serious'. By the Summer of 1960, however, I was 11 years of age—too old to be sent to bed, but deemed too young yet to roam the streets. So I was allowed sit in on that 1960 meeting and yet another one in 1961. That these were formal IWL Branch meetings—and not *ad hoc* meetings convened just because my father was in town—was beyond doubt, with my aunt reading out the minutes of previous meetings, and with Jim O'Regan, Dan Neville and Liam Flavin among those present as IWL members. At one or other of the two meetings I attended, I also recall Jim Savage reporting back on his visit to the USSR, as a guest of the CPSU, on how Khrushchev's anti-Stalin campaign was developing.

Judging from Jim Lane's memoir, he was either ignorant of, or else did not wish to acknowledge, O'Regan's dual IRA/IWL membership. In the November 2010 issue of *Irish Political Review* I provided a detailed profile of O'Regan, when publishing for the first time Desmond Greaves's July 1939 diary account of his

political discussions with the two dual CPI/IRA members operating in Cork in that year—Jim O'Regan and Micheál O'Riordan—both of whom had also fought in defence of the Spanish Republic. It was made abundantly clear how much O'Regan had been opposed to Seán Russell's IRA bombing campaign, then underway in England. Yet O'Regan finally volunteered for that campaign, was arrested, and in October 1939 was sentenced by a London Court to twenty years' penal servitude, of which he would serve nine. Lane described O'Regan as "*an iconic figure*" in the Republican Movement, against whom he did not risk expressing a single word of criticism. Yet, in recounting how in September 1958 he himself had gone to the home of the IRA's Cork Brigade Adjutant—the same Jim O'Regan—to resign from that Army because of the Cork leadership's obstruction of local volunteers going North to fight in the Border campaign, it never seemed to have struck Lane to consider that O'Regan may well have been to the fore himself in such a policy of obstructionism, motivated by his own bitter experience of imprisonment from 1939 to 1948, and trying hard to protect and prevent young Cork Republicans from throwing away either their liberty—or, worse still, their lives—in what the architect of the IRA's Border campaign, Seán Cronin, would categorise at the close of his life as "*the failed campaign*".

How much Jim Lane really understood of Jim O'Regan's dual communist/IRA politics may be judged from his 2009 audio interview that has also been placed on the website www.irishlabour.com as an "*authentic historical record*" of Republicanism and Socialism in Cork: "*Jim O'Regan was on the (Irish Republican) Army Council in Cork. Riordan spent umpteen occasions trying to get Jim to go into the (Irish Workers') Party, but Jim wouldn't go.*" That Lane knew even less of the final decade of O'Regan's life is also evident from the following: "*I don't know when he died, but he died pre the Split, I think.*" As I pointed out in *Irish Political Review* in November 2010, it was in fact 1978 when Jim O'Regan died, almost a decade after the IRA had split into its Official and Republican wings in December 1969. But the Split had already been dramatically signalled before an assembly of fifteen thousand Republicans in Mullingar five months previously, as O'Regan gave the first funeral oration when the reburial took place in July 1969 of the repatriated remains of IRA volunteers Peter Barnes

and James McCormack. Both volunteers had been hanged in Birmingham in February 1940, following their conviction for the Coventry bombing of August 1939. Robert White, a sympathetic biographer of Ruairí Ó Brádaigh, first President of Provisional Sinn Féin in 1970 and subsequently of Republican Sinn Féin in 1986, has graphically evoked that occasion:

"In July (1969) the British government gave the traditionalists the opportunity to publicly challenge the IRA leadership {of Cathal Goulding}... The Barnes and McCormack Repatriation Committee... included Ruairí Ó Brádaigh (of Roscommon)... and Jimmy Steele, Jimmy Drumm, Billy McKee and Joe Cahill, all from Belfast {and all leaders of the Provisional IRA that was on the point of emerging—MO'R}. Their campaign was successful... On Sunday, July 6, thousands attended the funeral... The speakers included James O'Regan of Cork, a veteran Republican and socialist who was expected to support the new (Goulding/MacGiolla) political direction, and Jimmy Steele. The traditionalists, abstentionists and other dissidents were there to hear Steele, a living legend in the Belfast IRA... He had spent twenty years in prison for the cause. And he was primed. The Belfast people knew what was coming. As Steele rose to speak, Jimmy Drumm ... leaned over and suggested that Ó Brádaigh listen carefully... Steele spoke of Barnes and McCormack... They 'went forth to carry the fight to the enemy, into enemy territory, using the only methods that will ever succeed, not the methods of the politicians, nor the constitutionalists, but the methods of soldiers, the methods of armed force.' To shouts of 'hear, hear' and applause, he added, 'The ultimate aim of the Irish nation will never emerge from the political or constitutional platform.'... Steele stole the show. Tomás Mac Giolla {pre-Split President of Sinn Féin, and—following the Party Split at its January 1970 Ard Fheis—President of all of the subsequent metamorphoses of Official SF into SFWP and, later, the Workers' Party—MO'R}, who was sitting on the platform, 'could feel the tension'. Steele was summarily dismissed from the IRA; his remarks were contrary to {Goulding's} army policy" (*Ruairí Ó Brádaigh: The Life and Politics of an Irish Revolutionary*, 2006, pp 144-5).

Lane's recall proved amnesiac regarding O'Regan's platform presence during this Split high drama of July 1969, believing that he was already dead by this stage. What can be said of O'Regan, however, is that he subsequently appears to have stood aside from that Republican Split. My own last meeting and conversation with Jim O'Regan occurred six years later, when he came to Clonakilty in September 1975 for

the funeral of my maternal aunt and godmother, Máire Keohane Sheehan. When, however, it comes to describing his own central role in what, by comparison, was very much a minor drama, Lane's recall at first appears to be far sharper. A closer reading nonetheless leads to the conclusion that he knew far less of Kevin Neville (1921-1964) as a person than he seemed to suggest, while knowing far more of Neville's actual politics than he cared to shed light on.

In his audio interview Lane professed ignorance of Saor Uladh's politics, seemed bewildered as to how Neville set about joining Saor Uladh's Border campaign, and while knowing that he had participated in its first military action in which Connie Green lost his life, he seems not to have known that Neville was wounded during that same engagement, as Kevin himself related to my mother, Kay Keohane O'Riordan, on one of her hospital visits during the course of his cancer treatment. Of his own successful political *coup* in 1965, Jim Lane's memoir relates that when Máire Sheehan, as Secretary of the Kevin Neville Commemorative Committee,

"announced that the oration on the day of the unveiling would be given by Michael O'Riordan of the Irish Workers' Party ... the socialist republican element {a Lane self-description—MO'R} challenged this departure from basic democracy to successfully win over the middle ground and stop the O'Riordan oration" (p11).

Not wishing for controversy to cause any distress to the Neville family, my father absented himself from the subsequent unveiling ceremony. But a photograph of the occasion taken by Dan Neville—Kevin's fellow-IWP member as well as his brother—tells its own story. Those shown as present include Máire Sheehan, Jim O'Regan (wearing his customary black beret that he still wore when I last met him a decade later—MO'R), Liam Flavin and Gerry Higgins—along with Jim Lane hovering over the shoulders of Jim Savage who, as I remarked in Part Two, seemed to bring out the worst in each other. The centre piece is, of course, the Celtic Cross memorial itself, inscribed "*Kevin Neville, O/C Southern Command Saor Uladh, formerly of No 2 Coy 1st Batt, 1st Cork Brigade, Irish Republican Army*"—and, standing upright against the base of that memorial, a large laurel wreath from Kevin Neville's comrades in the Irish Workers' Party. I remember very clearly the conversations of that time between my

parents and my Aunt Máire, in which she related how Jim Lane had won over what he himself called the Republican "*middle ground*". He had played the abstentionist card: O'Riordan should be excluded because he had recognised Leinster House. On that score, O'Riordan and his fellow IWP members were undoubtedly "*guilty as charged*", as was to be colourfully underscored in that same year of 1965 by the funeral ceremonies of a Party founding member, Bill Gannon.

In his 1932 autobiographical account of Civil War imprisonment, *The Gates Flew Open*, Peadar O'Donnell recalled:

"It is a matter of speculation whether the executions {by the Free State of 77 Republican prisoners—MO'R} would have begun so soon but for the capture of Erskine Childers, who was hated with a deadly hatred by Churchill, and his associates in Ireland. Desmond FitzGerald, O'Higgins, and Churchill appear to have thirsted for the death of this frail, scholarly and courageous man, with a ferocity that has rarely been expressed, Churchill's speech in Scotland revealing what seems to me an almost insane hatred... The executions reverberated in Mountjoy... Its immediate effect was to darken the whole jail with a brooding spirit of vengeance that grouped men in cells. In prison men dream of rousing a people to tear down a tyranny and achieve freedom or they plan dark individual vengeance. Living close to the thoughts in the average prisoner I was sensitive to this tendency to create circles to wreck vengeance later on, and I had many opportunities to discuss it, for there were conflicting views: some did not oppose it for any reasons except political considerations, that the reforming of the stout mass of the people for another bid for freedom would be delayed by mere group terrorism; others approached it merely as a religious question and considered such proposed killings as murder. Then there was the view that all shooting of government agents is good and the terrorism of groups co-ordinated actually makes a revolutionary movement... The executions came so close that news of them struck the ear like the thud of falling bodies, and at every thud the jails darkened and passions rocked men's minds, so that only steeled obsessions to kill this person or that in black vengeance, remained. Soft and shallow minds that only meet the world on the highways will never get within hailing distance of the minds that were bruised in the prisons of 1922, and although the groups that swore to kill this one or that may have been dispersed, still the impulse that first drew them together has not been eradicated and gusts of it invade political life even yet. And I would say these impulses get their greatest impetus from the events of December

8th, 1922—the executions of Rory O'Connor, Dick Barrett, Joe McKelvey and Liam Mellows—in Mountjoy Jail." (1965 edition, pp 34-36).

Peadar O'Donnell, of course, had always known the identities of the three IRA free-lancers who would assassinate the Free State Minister for Justice, Kevin O'Higgins, in July 1927: one a pure-and-simple IRA gunman, another a dual member of Fianna Fáil who would have a FF Cumann named after him following his own assassination in January 1928 by a Free State informer (and have leading Fianna Fáiler and future Government Minister and pillar of the establishment Seán MacEntee promise that his death would be avenged), and the third a communist dual member of both the IRA and the short-lived Workers' Party of Ireland in 1927, who would later become a founding member of the Communist Party of Ireland in 1933. As the *Irish Times* reported on October 7, 1985:

"Mr Peadar O'Donnell, the last survivor of the IRA executive elected in the 1920s, said yesterday that the names of the men who murdered Kevin O'Higgins in 1927 had been given to the IRA Army Council by its intelligence section 'pretty promptly' after O'Higgins was shot down on his way to Mass near his home in Dublin... Mr O'Donnell said political assassination was not part of IRA policy at the time... Archie Doyle was one of the more shadowy figures in IRA activities over two decades... A single reference to him in J Bowyer Bell's book, *The Secret Army*, describes him as part of a skeleton staff still attached to Charlie Kerins, then Chief of Staff of the IRA, who was tried and hanged in 1944 for the murder of Sergeant Denis O'Brien of the Garda Special Branch in September 1942. Doyle was also involved in the O'Brien murder... Tim Coughlan, another of the men named, was according to Bowyer Bell, 'a member of Fianna Fáil and (it was assumed) the IRA'. He was shot dead in an incident in 1928 in which Sean Harling, a police agent, was fired upon and returned fire. The third man named as one of O'Higgins's assassins, Bill Gannon, died on September 12th, 1965, and was buried at Mount Jerome cemetery in Dublin with military honours accorded by an Army unit and bugler. His coffin was draped with a Tricolour and Red Flag, as Gannon had been a member of the Irish Workers' Party and the British Communist Party."

The *Irish Times* of 13th July 1987 also reported how Una Higgins-O'Malley had arranged a memorial Mass, on his anniversary, for both her father and his three assassins:

"Kevin O'Higgins was on his way to

Mass at the same church, 60 years ago, when he was shot dead... O'Higgins was regarded as the main author of the Free State Constitution, which was replaced in 1937 by the present one."

Gannon himself was to say of his role in the O'Higgins assassination:

"Seeing him and realising that it was not a mistake, we were just taken over and incensed with hatred. You can have no idea what it was like, with the memory of the {Civil War} executions, and the sight of him just walking along on his own. We started shooting from the car, then getting out of the car we continued to shoot. We all shot at him; he didn't have a chance" (Bill Gannon statement, National Archives, as quoted by Richard English, *Armed Struggle—A History of the IRA*, 2003, p44).

The Defence Forces, welded together to safeguard Ireland's neutrality during World War Two against all potential invaders, was a much transformed force from the Free State Army that Gannon had fought against during the Civil War, just as Dev's 1937 Constitution also represented a Republican dismantling of the British-imposed Treaty, inclusive of the Imperial Constitution so highly valued by O'Higgins. (It should also be noted that Gannon's funeral was itself marked by the healing of some Civil War wounds, with the attendance of a "Collins man" who had fought against Gannon in that Treaty War—Martin Walton, founder of Walton's Music Shops—in memory of when they had soldiered together as close comrades-in-arms during the War of Independence.) When Dev secured victory in both the 1932 and 1933 General Elections, his choice as Minister for Defence was Frank Aiken who, when Liam Lynch had been killed in action by Free State forces in March 1923, had succeeded Lynch as IRA Chief-of-Staff and was to bring the Civil War to a close two months later. The new Fianna Fáil Government froze recruitment to the Free State Army and in 1934 went on to establish a new Volunteer Force into which flocked many Republican veterans of the Civil War—if outnumbered by enthusiastic fresh recruits unencumbered by any such divisive legacy—and which rapidly achieved close to parity in numbers with the Regular Army itself, leading to the much transformed Irish Defence Forces of the Second World War years.

In his 1991 book, *A History of the Irish Army*, Lt. Col. John P. Duggan recalled how well both traditions would ultimately blend in rallying to the colours to defend this beleaguered State during World War Two:

"Frank Aiken's Volunteers soldiered enthusiastically side by side with (Free State) Civil War veterans, in the mobilised 10th (*Uisneach*) Infantry Battalion the author and other Volunteers served cheerfully under their platoon commander, Lt ('Score-Card') Larry Clancy, the man alleged to have shot Liam Lynch" (p179).

In January 2001 Duggan participated in a panel discussion with fellow wartime Irish Army officers for a 2004 book, *The Irish Experience During the Second World War—An Oral History*, compiled by Benjamin Grob-Fitzgibbon. He was, of course, contemptuous of those from among the IRA internees who had derided the Irish Army's wartime defence of this State:

"(Brig Gen Patrick Daly:) We had internment camps here, for British airmen. (Duggan:) Not only that, we had an internment camp for the IRA. And don't forget throughout the War, de Valera executed six IRA men, and had to do it, I remember them as a soldier in 1940-41 and they were a terrible crowd of bastards. Down in Tintown (the Curragh Internment Camp) they would be shouting insults up at you, as if you were a second-class Irishman." (p218).

Duggan was equally contemptuous of those who had deserted the Irish Army—in the hour of greatest danger to this State's very existence—in order to soldier with the British Army:

"We certainly had to draw demarcation lines here in Ireland. You're back into that '*Who are we neutral against?*' question. These islands are so complex. You wouldn't know who was planted where. There is an incestuous relation between the two islands. So many Irishmen fought with the British Army... which is why in 1922 the one thing they wanted in the Treaty was to keep this place as a recruiting ground. I'm sure all of you had the experience of fellows deserting our army to go to the British Army. (Brig Gen Patrick Hogan:) Oh yes. Not many, but two or three men in my company during the War deserted and went to join the British Army." (p202).

Duggan's greatest contempt, however, was reserved for the Trinity College loyalists who had **dodged** joining the British Army. In answer to a question as to his feelings on VE Day when the War in Europe was over, Duggan elaborated:

"The general feeling at that time was one of relief. But at the same time, a great annoyance at Britain... You had these pricks in Trinity College who had dodged the War and nevertheless went up on top of Trinity College and burned the Tricolour, which infuriated a number of

us. Like Charlie Haughey was down there in UCD and set fire to a British flag. I was on the verge of getting on a jeep myself and going up there and petrol bombing them. Thanks be to Jesus that I didn't. They dodged the bloody draft. It was mostly Northern Ireland people. Draft-dodgers. It's hard to explain the feeling at that time. But it was encapsulated in Churchill's talk about '*We were forced to come to close quarters with Éire*'. And everybody was aghast and there was great euphoria over Dev's reply" (pp 215-6).

But it was in his evocation of how the Irish Army had been transformed by the War that Duggan proved most enlightening:

"It was a turning point in the army. A real turning point... Because don't forget, in 1939 the Civil War was only barely 14 or 15 years since 1923. In the hand-over of 1932, it was touch and go, you know. I remember people who were friends saying '*Will we shoot or salute?*' But de Valera thought there were subversives in the army, and indeed when I say it was a turning point in the army, it was at that point that Dan Mc Kenna began to come into focus. He was changed into Chief of Staff (in January 1940)... He (Dev) had made up his mind then that Chief of Staff Brennan would go and that Dan McKenna would come in. There had to be an end to ambivalence as far as your oath was concerned, and you couldn't have a fifth column... (Commandant Owen Quinn:) I think there's one thing that can be brought up for our own personal point of view, from the end of our own Civil War of 1922-23, when we saw these old-timers united at last... (Duggan:) Very important. I would say that coming together was the first thawing of the Civil War bitterness. Coming into the army in the Emergency, together, in 1940, it was the first time they were united. Because, as you know, before that you had the 26th 'Old IRA' Battalion, and the 12th Murder Battalion, but now there was that coming together and it was the first thawing of the Civil War" (pp 205-6 and 220-1).

My father recognised that change from the outset. In February 1940 he was to be interned for the best part of four years before he had time to seriously weigh up the offer made to him of a commission in the Irish Defence Forces. And while he enjoyed highlighting the irony of how Terry Flanagan, a fellow International Brigade veteran of the Spanish War, had been one of the armed guards in a Curragh camp watchtower overseeing both himself and his fellow prisoners, he never held it against Flanagan that his response to World War Two had been to volunteer for the Irish Army. That both Bill Gannon and his Party General Secretary Micheál O' Riordan recognised that this was no longer

the old Free State Army was made unambiguously evident from the arrangements they joined together in making for the former's funeral. In his 1979 book, *Connolly Column—The Story of the Irishmen who Fought for the Spanish Republic 1936-1939*, my father further enthused about that funeral ceremony:

"In September 1936 a decision was taken by the very small Communist Party of Ireland that an Irish Unit of the International Brigades should be formed. The task of recruitment and organisation was given to Bill Gannon, a member of the Party who had considerable experience as a *Republican fighter in the war against the British Imperialists and the Free State forces*. Bill Gannon (1902-1965) was the son of a 1913 striker and a Fenian mother. He was a member of Fianna Éireann (Republican Boy Scouts), later joining the Irish Republican Army, being one of the first to be chosen for the Active Service Unit of the Dublin Brigade, taking part in all the engagements of that specially picked body of fighters against the Black and Tans. During the Civil War he was in the Republican Garrison of the Four Courts... With the fall of the Four Courts, he was imprisoned in Mountjoy Jail. After his release he resumed activity with the IRA and was associated with that body's formation of Saor Éire, a radical political organisation based on workers and small farmers. *On the occasion of his funeral on September 15th, 1965, his coffin, as he wished, was covered by both the National and Red Flags. At the graveside an honour guard from the 2nd Battalion, the Irish Army, Cathal Brugha Barracks, rendered military honours*" (pp 55 and 64; my emphases—MOR).

So, O'Riordan was quite clearly "guilty" of recognising the Leinster House Dáil, the political "crime" for which he had been "indicted" by Jim Lane in 1965. One does not have to agree with Ruairí Ó Brádaigh's life-long contention—that no Dáil after the Second Dáil should be accorded any legitimacy—to recognise that in his case the principle of Republican abstentionism has undoubtedly been maintained with an incorruptible integrity, however myopic. (Ó Brádaigh nonetheless found no difficulty in going out of his way to convey to me his personal condolences on the death of my father in May 2006.) But there was nothing principled about Jim Lane's abstentionist whispering campaign of 1965. It was furtive at that time, and it remained so in its retelling four decades later. For it is only hinted at in Lane's own passing expression of contempt for any "recognition of the partitioned parliaments" (p12)—by which he meant Dáil Éireann no less than

Stormont—and his endorsement of Gerry Madden's 1963 statement of denunciation that "it is only two years ago that all delegates from Cork to the Sinn Féin Ard Fheis, with the exception of myself, voted in favour of entering Leinster House, the Free State Parliament". (p26). Jim Lane's need for such nod and wink furtiveness should, of course, be obvious. To take up an abstentionist sniper's position from behind Kevin Neville's gravestone was to dishonour the man's memory with a vengeance. For Kevin himself, as O/C of Saor Uladh's Southern Command, was explicitly and enthusiastically committed to recognition of the 26 Counties Dáil.

Saor Uladh's approach to the Six Counties was, of course, a different matter, and an issue worth exploring in its own right. How is it that the two casualties of that first Border campaign offensive in November 1955—Kevin Neville, wounded, and Connie Green killed in action—were both World War Two ex-servicemen? (Neville serving in the RAF and Green as a British commando decorated for bravery in the Italian campaign). Neville, we know, had enlisted and demobilised as a Republican Communist. I don't know if Derryman Green had enlisted for anything other than economic reasons, but he did emerge from that War as a convinced anti-fascist, and perhaps a socialist to boot. Both Neville and Green would have been party to the radical debates that took place among the rank and file of British servicemen as the War drew to a close, and which took the form of what became known as "Forces Parliaments". It is worth looking briefly at some of these developments among the British forces in India.

Bert Ramelson (1910-1994) was the Industrial Organiser of the Communist Party of Great Britain from 1965 to 1977, and for most of this period was at loggerheads with the leadership being given by Jack Jones (1913-2009) as TGWU General Secretary from 1969 to 1978. This year has seen the publication of an adulatory biography by Roger Seifert and Tom Sibley: *Revolutionary Communist at Work—a Political Biography of Bert Ramelson*. On page 352 the authors cite my own 2010 Bevin Society pamphlet *The Vindication of Jack James Larkin Jones* for the first publication of evidence that Jones himself had been a CPGB member during the 1930s.

Since this pamphlet is available as a free download at <http://free-downloads.atholbooks.org/pamphlets/>

[Jack Jones Vindicated.pdf](#) there is no need for me to do more than mention that much of it is a critique of Ramelson's negative role in Trade Union politics. It is, however, his previous role in the anti-fascist and anti-imperialist struggles of the 1930s and 1940s that I here wish to acknowledge. Seifert and Sibley relate:

"In 1936 Ramelson took the decision to go to Spain to fight with the International Brigades in defence of the Spanish Republic... In the battle for Spanish democracy against the Franco fascist rebellion... Ramelson fought on the Aragon Front and in the Ebro Offensive. In both operations he was wounded... Franco's troops were vastly superior both in numbers and equipment, and were backed to the hilt by Mussolini and Hitler—unlike the democratic government they were seeking to overthrow, who were abandoned by other western governments... {BR's} main political conclusion was that this was a war against fascism, and that the overall aim of British and French diplomacy was to avoid confrontation with Hitler and to encourage the Nazi regime to look eastwards towards the military defeat of the Soviet Union" (pp 30-4).

What, then, of the Second World War? The authors continue:

"We have no record of Ramelson's personal reaction to the Hitler-Stalin Pact (August 1939), but we do know from a later interview that Ramelson had strong reservations about the anti-fascist nature of the war in its initial stages... 'And the nature of the Phoney War, and early part of it, confirmed us in that particular view... This was an imperialist war primarily' ... From this it is clear that Ramelson supported, as did many other British Communists, the Soviet view that the failure of the major European imperialist powers, Britain and France, to join a collective security pact with the Soviet Union indicated that if war were to break out it would not be an anti-fascist one. Ramelson's views changed as events unfolded—rather faster than those of the Party leadership. Once the Churchill-Attlee coalition was in place in 1940, clearly determined to defeat Hitler, Ramelson felt that the phoney war stage had finished and that the line should have changed to reflect this. In the event it was to take Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union (June 1941) to convince the CPGB as a whole that the war was an anti-fascist one, to be fought unreservedly... Ramelson was called up in May 1941 ... and posted to Cairo in October 1941" (pp 35-6).

The authors recount Ramelson's capture by the German Army, his experiences as a prisoner in both North African and Italian POW camps, and his escape and repatriation to the UK. Then:

"After two months leave Ramelson was trained as an artillery officer for a year... In August 1945 he was sent to India, where he was posted to Deolali as a legal officer... Deolali was in essence a large transit camp... It also had a Forces Parliament in which, not surprisingly, Ramelson soon became a leading force. In this Parliament the government was a left coalition (Communist and Labour) and around a thousand troops attended the twice-weekly open-air sessions. Ramelson recalled an incident involving John Saville who later became an influential Marxist history professor and for a while was a member of the Yorkshire District CP at the same time as Ramelson was the District Secretary. Saville passed through Deolali on his way back to Britain having been demobilised from Karachi. At the time a small number of British service people, including some CP members, were being court-martialled for mutiny after pressing for demobilisation now that the war was over. The question of Indian independence was also high on the political agenda and it was widely felt that demobilisation was being delayed in case of civil unrest erupting in support of claims made by Indian political leaders which the British ruling class was not yet prepared to concede. The two questions—demobilisation of British service people and Indian independence—were intertwined and the impatient Saville wanted to know from his fellow communist (Ramelson) what action he was going to propose to the troops at Deolali in support of the Indian people and the Karachi 'mutineers'. This seemed to Ramelson to be an adventurist position and pressed Saville for ideas as to how such a campaign could be launched and sustained with the prospect of success without exposing rank-and-file service people to the threat of reprisals from the authorities. When Ramelson, as Minister Without Portfolio in the Forces Parliament, suggested a debate in support of immediate and full independence for the Indian people, Saville pooh-poohed the proposal as idle talk when action was required... (having) little inkling of the political level of the troops in Deolali. The Parliament duly carried the independence motion by an overwhelming majority but within days and as a direct result of this resolution it was closed down by the British authorities... The British military authorities had become pretty fed up with the articulate lawyer (Ramelson) who had all the contacts and skills to raise difficult questions about their conduct with British MPs. (He raised with the MPs questions concerning independence and asked them to intercede to support his campaign to re-open the Deolali Parliament.) So a few months after the Deolali Parliament closure Ramelson was back in Britain, demobilised on 6 May 1946" (pp 41-3).

In 1998 John Saville wrote a foreword

to *Mutiny In The RAF—the Air Force Strikes of 1946*—it can be downloaded at www.socialisthistorysociety.co.uk/duncancontents.htm—which had been written by one of the CPGB leaders of the Karachi "mutiny", David Duncan. The May 2008 *Guardian* obituary of another "mutineer" recorded:

"Arthur Attwood has died aged 95. In 1946 he was imprisoned as a leader of the so-called RAF mutiny, a strike action involving up to 50,000 men in 60 British air bases across India and South Asia protesting at conditions and slow demobilisation following the end of the Second World War."

David Duncan himself related:

"Men in the forces are trained to obey. Parades, kit inspections, saluting, polishing boots and buttons may have other justifications, but all are used to accustom men to instant obedience to the orders of their superiors. How, then, could twelve hundred RAF personnel at Drigh Road, Karachi, in January, 1946, come to defy their commanding officer and take part in what was technically a mutiny? In general, the morale of British forces during the Second World War seems to have been surprisingly good.... Almost without exception, they knew that this was a war that had to be won. They would have expressed this in different ways—fighting for their country, standing up for democracy, opposing aggression or, for me and many like me, fighting fascism. We all wanted the war to be over, but only after victory. A few months after the end of the war the atmosphere had changed. Except for a few regular airmen, our paybooks showed that we had joined for 'DPE'—the Duration of the Present Emergency. {Yes! 'The Emergency' was not a WW2 term invented by Dev; it was a term also used in Britain's own wartime regulations—MOR.} And to us the emergency was over. The war had been won. It was time to get back to Britain and then into civilian life... And if we could not be demobilised for a while, why could we not go home and serve our time in Britain? The official answer was that there were not enough ships, but none of us believed that. Some men pointed out that plenty of ships seemed to be available to take supplies to Indonesia to help the Dutch regain their hold on that country... There seemed to be no official answers, and more and more men were convinced that we were being held in India as a matter of policy... The war was over, had been over for five months. To the men, that meant it was time to go home. To the top brass of the Air Force, that meant it was time for peacetime discipline. Early in January came the crucial blow. Station Orders announced that on Saturday, 19th January, the whole station would parade in best blue uniform, and the parade would be followed by a kit inspection."

The 'mutiny' resulted and was emulated:

"The Royal Indian Navy followed. Three thousand ratings mutinied in Bombay, the principal naval base, and many of them carried the flags of the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League when they demonstrated in the city. When some of the ratings ashore were involved in skirmishes with soldiers, the mutineers on board the ships in the harbour trained their guns on the city and threatened a bombardment... The Viceroy of India, General Wavell, held the RAF men guilty. Referring to the naval mutinies, he wrote: *'I am afraid that the example of the Royal Air Force, who got away with what was really mutiny, has some responsibility for the present situation.'* ... Many historians have presented the transfer of power in India as part of a grand British scheme to grant independence to the nations of the Empire. It was not like that. At the beginning of 1946 the future of India was still uncertain. Informed British opinion, shared by Prime Minister Attlee, was that, in the new post-war situation, Britain would not be able to hold on to India against the wishes of its people. So major concessions would have to be made. But would these concessions go as far as real independence?... The strikes of early 1946 made it clear that the British government had no choice. If the Indian forces were discontented, with many sympathetic to nationalism; if British forces recruited to fight Nazi Germany could not be relied upon to support the government's peacetime objectives, how could British control be maintained?... By the summer of 1947 the British were out."

There were, however, no threatened British forces "*mutinies*"—whether near or real—to help bring about civil rights and democracy in Northern Ireland. Connie Green would have to make up his own mind what to do about his native heath on returning to Derry following his British Army demobilisation. The Cork RAF veteran Kevin Neville would go on to connect with Green's resolution, and act accordingly as his comrade-in-arms.

(to be continued)

Manus O'Riordan



Does
It
Up

Stack
?

CHILDREN'S RIGHTS REFERENDUM

The Thirty-First Amendment of the Constitution (Children) Bill 2012 was introduced on 17th September 2012 by Minister Frances Fitzgerald, Fine Gael. On the face of it there does not seem to be much done for children except to introduce the concept of adoption for children whose parents are still alive. The Bill states:

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

Up to now children who were suffering deprivation or harm in a dysfunctional family could be placed by the State in foster care, a procedure which is thousands of years old and which in most cases will provide as well as possible for the needs of the child. Applying the "adoption" formula is the principle thrust of the proposed change to the Constitution. Why "adoption"? No official explanation has been given for this choice. The Explanatory Memorandum published with the Bill is specifically misleading and deceitfully tendentious. The official Memorandum says:

"The proposed introduction of dedicated provisions for children 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)."

That statement is blatantly untrue. The new provisions propose two things—firstly to delete existing Article 42.5. The new wording reads:

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

There is no reference to parents in the new Article 42A.1, whereas the existing Article 42.5 provides quite reasonably that where parents—

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

Surely the most basic right of a child is to have parents. The existing Constitution recognised this right. The new proposed wording does not appear to recognise this basic right and temporises around it. Also the new proposed wording completely ignores the rights of parents to have children and the rights of children to have brothers and sisters. The family is not mentioned at all in the Bill.

The second set of outright and blatantly deceiving statement in the official Memorandum is to do with giving the impression that "the recommendations of many experts over the years..." are being delivered now in this Bill. They are not.

In Volume 10 of the report of the All Party Oireachtas Committee on the Constitution (2006 (p.88 et seq) a fairly wide selection of expert views is given. Most of the views are not reflected in the Bill. Nor are the views of the Committee. The Committee expressly stated four basic rights, none of which is mentioned in the Bill. In particular, the Bill does not state:

"the right of every child, as far as practicable, to be cared for by his or her parents."

The report of the Joint Oireachtas Committee on the Constitutional Amendment on Children (2010) made nine specific recommendations, most of which are ignored in the Bill.

The main purpose of the Bill seems to be to appear to be doing something about children and to appear to show that this Government is reacting positively to the revelations in recent years about child abuse and to interfere with the concept of the family. The Bill is a piece of sticking plaster to put on the social wound of child abuse. But child abuse has a long history and was well known about (read *Oliver Twist* by Charles Dickens and *Kidnapped* by Robert Louis Stephenson for example). Laws were there to prevent child abuse. In fact the State of Ireland actively engaged through the Courts and the Department of Education in the same child abuse and policies which were inherited from the British regime. But even they were as nothing compared to the 'Report of the Independent *Child Death* Review Group', where the litany of brutal deaths and appalling street life of children were exposed by our new State response in the last number of years by the Health Services Executive (HSE). And this time—not one person ended up in prison for their part in this new *progressive* engagement with the issue of vulnerable children.

The Constitution as it is at present has all the provisions necessary to protect

children. In a recent *Irish Independent* article the retired Supreme Court Judge Hugh O'Flaherty stated: "we don't need a referendum to protect our children's rights" and he continued:

"...the important engine to implement rights should come in ordinary legislation. That can be enacted and amended speedily if found wanting. Working towards a constitutional referendum seems a cumbersome way of doing business."

A Constitutional referendum on children's rights is unnecessary, expensive and troublesome. But there must be big money in it for some organisation/s. Why the concentration on adoption and what is "voluntary adoption", as referred to in proposed Article 42A.3? It is not explained anywhere. Who does the volunteering? The Father? The Mother? Or the Child? What about a brother or a sister? There are so many things that do not stack up in what seems to be at first glance 'a good thing' but which is anything but a good thing when we look deeper into it.

ABORTION LEGISLATION

The need for abortion legislation seems to be expressed by those who wish to demonstrate their liberal credentials. The Labour Party is for abortion legislation, as also are very vocal Gay Rights and some Feminist organisations. Credible reasons for their positions are not produced. What does not stack up at all are the views of people who are against child abuse yet who are at the same time shouting for legislation for abortion on demand. Rather oxymoronic really?

It is a fact that in many countries of the world that the most dangerous place for a baby to be is in its mother's womb. In Ireland, a mother's womb is a safe place for a baby and Ireland is a world leader in providing safety for women in pregnancy as even the abortion minded WHO statistically proves.

It is a fact that in Ireland women in pregnancy get all necessary treatment—even when the death of the baby unavoidably and regrettably occurs. It is a fact that the European Court decision has **not** called for Ireland to legalise abortion. The European Court asked for Ireland to clarify our laws where there is a medical emergency in the case of pregnant woman. Presently, the rule is that for example, if a pregnant woman has cancer of the uterus, the uterus is surgically removed. The procedure has to be done, the death of the baby is not intended, but the mother is saved. The European Court asked for Ireland's law to be clear and specific, the Court did **not** say there should be intentional abortion as such. Ireland has

the legal right to insist to the Council of Europe that we will maintain best medical practice and not introduce abortion. Minister James Reilly, Fine Gael Minister for Health, has set up an expert Committee to examine the issues raised by the European Court. The Committee is heavily balanced, presumably intentionally, towards legalising abortion. Minister Reilly put on the committee two prominent pro-abortion advocates and also the lawyer who instigated the first Right-to-Abortion case against Ireland. Not only that, but Minister Reilly publicly steered his committee by stating that he himself favours legalised abortion in Ireland. I think it is fair to note that the Minister has two of the biggest medical practices here and is a multi-millionaire beneficiary of state imbursements for medical card treatments. Of course he has had to hand over to managers his two GP practices while he is Minister in the Government but there is no doubt that he will return to practice once he leaves front-line politics.

We do not want legalised killing in Ireland. The people do not want it, as the people showed by voting for Fine Gael TDs who like Minister Reilly signed undertakings to uphold Fine Gael policy against legalised abortion. Fianna Fail has taken a firm stand against legalised abortion. Party leader Micheál Martín said the party did not favour a "right to choose" in relation to pregnancy termination. Minister Pat Rabbitte disgraced himself and the Labour Party on RTE's This Week programme when he declared that the leader of the Catholic Church in Ireland should not be involved in any political debate on the issue and it would be a backward step to return to the days of senior churchmen dictating to public representatives. Cardinal Brady was not dictating, he might be described as lobbying. Do Labour Party rank and file members believe that democracy should be closed down for non-members of the Labour Party? This Labour-Fine Gael government are displaying a visceral and automatic hatred for the Catholic Church. The Labour Party and the Fine Gael Party will never be other than minority parties with this minority attitude to a major humanitarian issue. Legalised Abortion is uncivilised and is up there with ethnic cleansing, capital punishment and euthanasia which are abhorrent to any decent human being.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND CHILDREN

A very important matter is raised by the draft of Article 42A proposed by the referendum Bill introduced by Minister Frances Fitzgerald. It is the proposed

heading "*Children*" and the use of the words "*child*" and "*children*" in the proposed draft.

In the Gaelic version and it is this version in Gaelic which will prevail if it is passed in the referendum to be held on 10th November 2012, the words used are "*Leanaí*" and "*leanbh*".

"*Leanbh*" in Gaelic means a small child. A child of an age to need protection, and so it is the correct word in these circumstances. The English and American language are possibly the only languages with no word for an adult child i.e. a son or daughter. Maybe, it should be said, no specific word for an underage child. In ordinary American, the words "*kid*" and "*kids*" are used but these slang words beg the questions, who are the goats? Or the old goats? "*kids*" will hardly do in our

Constitution. "*Infant*" is the correct legal term and the legal meaning of "*infant*" is quite exact. It may not be a direct equivalent of "*leanbh*" but it is near enough. Why is "*infant*" not used? Why does a proposed amendment to the Constitution have to use conversational English? As in "how many children do you have?" "I have two children—one is a doctor in Dublin and my daughter is a nuclear physicist in Bern." The word "*child*" could be subject to misinterpretation and has no place in the Constitution of Ireland unless the word is defined by referring to a particular age-group. Would it be too much to ask that the word "*child*" be defined in the Constitution? But lawyers need to be fed and lack of precision in legalisation is one sure way of feeding the solicitors, barristers and judges.

Michael Stack ©

Part 14

Items From *Irish Bulletin*, September 1920

VOL. 3. No. 5. IRISH BULLETIN 7TH SEPTEMBER, 1920.

"THIS IS TO WARN YOU AS MAN TO MAN"

THE SYSTEMATIC DESTRUCTION OF CO-OPERATIVE CREAMERIES IN IRELAND.

During the last five months the following creameries have been destroyed by British Military and Police in Ireland:

Co-operative Creamery at Kilcommon, Co. Tipperary.
 Co-operative Creamery at Kilronan, Co. Tipperary.
 Co-operative Creamery at Knockfune, Co. Limerick.
 Co-operative Creamery at Reiska, Co. Tipperary.
 Co-operative Creamery and Cheese Factory at Newport, Co. Limerick.
 Co-operative Creamery at Newcastle West, Co. Limerick.
 Co-operative Creamery at Garryspillane, Co. Limerick.
 Co-operative Creamery at Rearcross, Co. Tipperary.
 Co-operative Creamery at Upperchurch, Co. Tipperary.
 Co-operative Creamery at Killea, Co. Tipperary.
 Co-operative Creamery at Loughmore, Co. Tipperary.
 Co-operative Creamery at Castleiney, Co. Tipperary.
 Co-operative Creamery at Pallas, Co. Limerick.
 Messrs Cleeve's Creamery at Lackamore, Co. Limerick.
 Co-operative Creamery at Shanagolden, Co. Limerick.
 Co-operative Creamery at Hospital, Co. Limerick.
 Messrs Cleeve's Creamery at Knocklong, Co. Limerick.
 Messrs Cleeve's Creamery at Killeskilly, Co. Limerick.

This systematic destruction of one of the chief food producing industries in Ireland has been believed by those not conversant with the facts to be the result of sporadic outbreaks of British troops and police and not an organised system of sabotage directed by the commanding officers in the military districts in Ireland where such incidents have occurred. The following notice served upon Mr. John Nunan, Manager of the Co-operative Creamery at Freemount, Charleville, Co. Cork, by a British dispatch carrier on August 16th, 1920 shows that this sabotage is carried out by British troops and police acting under the direction and with the sanction of British Commanding officers:

"John Nunan,

This is to warn you as man to man, that should any attempt be made on the life of an officer or his men of my Regiment in Liscarroll, your life will be forfeit, and I will bring men and destroy the house in which you live in the village—you or your relations. My detachment have received threatening letters. You now know what to expect if anyone attempts to carry them out.

D. C. Boles for O.C. 17th Lincs. 16/8/20"

Team GB—The Anglo-Saxon is a sport!

Coverage of the Olympics on British TV was a relentless cheerfest for 'Team GB'. And sure why wouldn't it be? This was THE English Olympics after all. (Though surely it should have been "Team GB & NI" to reflect the actual name of the state?)

It was a spectacle to beat all spectacles—sport of the highest order, accompanied by the best of pop, and all wrapped in the glowing friendly stripes of the Union Jack of Blair's *'Cool Britannia'*. Commentators swooned and enthused at the light shows, the parades of athletes, the natural patriotism, the heroic host nation, all surpassing *Beijing 2008*—indeed nothing quite like it had been seen since Albert Speer and Leni Riefenstahl gave us *Berlin 1936*.

And it was Blair's Olympics. The approach to spotting and nurturing talent to produce gold medal winners was adopted as a national strategy after Britain returned with just one gold from Atlanta in 1996. The first British gold this time, I hear, went to a woman rower, who on BBC Radio 4 revealed that she had never been in a boat in her life until a trial that led her to being picked and nourished over four years, funded by the state, including an annual allowance of £44,000 per athlete which amounted to an income. While the Chinese performance was derogatively dismissed as simply a result of *'Soviet model'* hot-housing, it was in fact Britain which employed the Soviet model with such success. Despite the extraordinary sporting achievements of Team GB, however, it was notable that their successes were much more in individualist sports than team sports—itsself a fitting tribute to the memory of Blair, the man who vowed to return British Labour to its progressivist liberal roots, and de-socialised it.

Over on RTE there was a very peculiar phenomenon. While Irish hopefuls were covered lovingly, in the many sports where they were absent our RTE commentators seem to have caught the Team GB fever. The atmosphere of the games, we were told, was *"absolutely buzzing"*. It was *"London's time"*. At every swimming, field, track and other event, our RTE commentators got caught up in that atmosphere. Personal information on the

British (and derivative Australian, Canadian etc.) athletes were covered in great and admiring detail, as were to some extent the Americans, while the rest of the 'foreigners' were given perfunctory treatment, even when they won (*"The Russian it seems will take it"*). Sports without empire participation were largely ignored.

Of course by the end of it all we had RTE exclaiming *"Team Ireland"* and—a little nervously—lauding Katie Taylor. Taylor was the working class fighter from the Oldcourt estate in Ballywaltrim, Bray, whose religious convictions—Pentecostal—will ensure she will not become the malleable star the media like in athletes. And her class background was also an issue—one RTE reporter betrayed his ignorance when he said it was his first time in Oldcourt not reporting on some criminal event or social calamity. Taylor's rootedness in Bray, and in her Church, threw an interesting light on those old Protestant undercurrents which have always been there in Dublin working class culture and which, undergoing something of a revival over the last ten years, contribute to a vigorous and healthy community life.

But what is it about Britain and sport? It seems that Britain invented it. Or rather, when Britain was at its zenith, with its 19th century empire on which the sun never set, it unselfconsciously described itself as the new Roman Empire, and promoted eulogistic histories of its alleged Greek and Roman precursors, portraying them as glorious trial runs for the real thing that had finally come to pass: Britannia ruling the waves! The cult of sport was resurrected in the second half of the nineteenth century in conscious reflection of the cults of sport that had been central to those empires of antiquity.

But all things have their day and must finally fade. Brendan Behan provided this swansong for empire, and its sense of sport (to hear it at its best, find the late, great Ronnie Drew singing it on Youtube):

THE CAPTAINS AND THE KINGS Brendan Behan

I remember in September, when the final stumps were drawn,

And the shouts of crowds now silent when
the boys to tea had gone.
Let us, oh Lord above us, remember simple
things,
When all are dead who love us, Oh the
Captains and the Kings,
When all are dead who love us, Oh the
Captains and the Kings.

We have many goods for export, Christian
ethics and old port
But our greatest boast is that the Anglo-
Saxon is a sport
When the darts game they are finished, &
the boys their game of rings
And the drafts and chess relinquished Oh
the captains and the kings
And the drafts and chess relinquished Oh
the captains and the kings

Far away in dear old Cyprus, or in Kenya's
dusty land,
We bear the white man's burden in many
a strange land.
As we look across our shoulder, in West
Belfast the school bell rings,
And we sigh for dear old England, and the
Captains and the Kings.
And we sigh for dear old England, and the
Captains and the Kings.

In our dreams we see old Harrow, and we
hear the crow's loud caw
At the flower show our big marrow takes
the prize from Evelyn Waugh
Cups of tea and some dry Sherry, vintage
cars, these simple things
So let's drink up and be merry, for the
captains and the kings
So let's drink up and be merry, for the
captains and the kings

As I wandered in a nightmare all around
Great Windsor Park,
Now what did you think I found there as I
wandered in the dark?
It was an apple half-bitten, and sweetest of
all things,
Five baby teeth had written of the Captains
and the Kings.
Five baby teeth had written of the Captains
and the Kings.

By the moon that shines above us in the
misty morning light
Let us cease to run ourselves down and
praise God that we are white
And better still are English, tea and toast
and muffin rings
And old ladies with stern faces and the
captains and the kings
And old ladies with stern faces and the
captains and the kings.

Philip O'Connor

"Weber's explanation is therefore inadequate, and we must ask whether there were not other ways in which Protestantism either encouraged or restrained the capitalist spirit—which has always existed in man in an embryonic state; which, opposed and held in check by Catholicism, became a social force when, in the fifteenth century, Catholicism declined; and which was encouraged by humanism inasmuch as humanism weakened Catholic ties" (*ibid.*, p.200/205).

"IF ONLY . . ."

"In conclusion, Protestantism, as far as we are concerned, only marked a further stage in the emancipation of human action from supernatural limits. Working in this sense, it produced no new effects, but facilitated the manifestation of a movement that had shown perceptible signs of vitality before the Reformation, and which would continue its course after the Reformation, beyond what the Reformers intended, for, dreaming of a return to the Gospels, they never suspected what would be the fruits of their action" (*ibid.*, p.209).

The origin of this approach is noted by Fanfani when he argues that Weber got everything backwards: it wasn't a Protestant ethic, as distinct from a Catholic ethic, that prompted the "*capitalist spirit*" and led to the rise of capitalism, but instead it was the rise of capitalism that prompted a distinct and separate Protestant ethic that is, in many cases, pro-capitalist—but which was originally anti-capitalist.

TRADE UNION NOTES

Accidents

The average personal injuries payout last year was €21,339—with the highest single award totalling €829,444.

The total number of awards made by the Injuries Board in 2011 was 9,833 and overall compensation levels reached €210 million, according to its Annual Report.

Over 75% of the awards were as a result of injuries from road traffic accidents, with just over 8% coming as a result of accidents in the workplace.

A further 15% involved accidents in public places.

Since 2004, the Board has granted a total of 50,000 awards with an overall value of more than €1 billion.

Earnings

The average Irish worker is earning 74% more an hour in basic pay today than at the height of the boom.

Surprise figures from the Central Statistics Office (C.S.O.) show a higher average hourly rate of basic pay for the first quarter of 2012 compared with the first quarter of 2008.

However, the figures were skewed by the awarding of increments to civil servants—the majority of whom are given small pay rises for each year of service.

The CSO figures show that hourly pay—excluding bonuses and special payments—stood at €20.89 an hour in the first quarter of this year compared with €20.15 in the first quarter of 2008.

This indicates that those in lower paid sectors are most likely to have lost their jobs in the downturn, while at the same time those in the civil service have most likely increased their earnings.

"Experts say the figures indicate a number of trends taking place in the labour market since the crash including a concentration of job losses in lower income sectors; a preference in the private sector to cut costs by shedding jobs rather than reducing basic hourly pay; the wholesale removal of substantial bonuses and other benefits; and the boosting effect on the national average hourly rate caused by the controversial increment system in the public sector—which accounts for around one-fifth of the workforce" (*Irish Independent*, 17.7.2012)

As a result of increments many of the 300,000 or so public sector workers are likely to have increased rather than decreased their basic pay substantially since 2008.

A recent report claimed that increments had cost the Exchequer more than €250m last year—which works out at about €800 extra per civil servant.

"Had this amount instead been spread across the entire workforce of 1.6 million, it would have been enough to add an additional 7.8% an hour to everyone's rate in that year." (*Irish Independent*, 17.7.2012)

Average Industrial Wage for Quarter One, 2012 per week is €691.21 (CSO).

"Ireland had the third highest trade surplus among the 27 EU member states in July and the lowest increase in hourly labour costs across the region, according to official figures released yesterday." (*Irish Examiner*-18.9.2012)

The country's trade surplus was €20.9bn, which was behind Germany at €92.4bn and the Netherlands at €25.6bn.

The UK, in contrast, had the biggest fiscal deficit at €73.8bn.

Ireland saw an increase of just 0.4% in hourly labour costs over the second quarter of the year—making it the lowest recorded across the EU. Spain and the Netherlands were the next lowest on a 0.5% increase. Romania had the highest at 7.1% followed by Finland on 4.9% and then Bulgaria and Latvia on 4.8%.

Overall, labour costs increased by 1.6% over the second quarter of the year, compared with a 1.5% increase over the first quarter of the year.

The two main components of labour costs are wages and salaries and non-wage costs.

"GRAPHIC designers, computer software developers and medical devices engineers have emerged as the big winners in the jobs market—with substantial increases in pay since the onset of the recession.

"The big losers have been architects, civil engineers, sales executives, insurance underwriters, construction workers, teachers, nurses, and gardai, an *Irish Independent* investigation reveals.

"Our probe found candidates for the most highly sought jobs were enjoying pay hikes of more than 18%, while professions where work is hard to come by have had their wages slashed by up to 44%.

"Experts said the biggest opportunities were in the pharmaceutical and medical devices industries and the information and communications technology (ICT) sector. For example, consultants in business management software, known as SAP, are now earning €60,000, compared with €52,000 in 2008—a rise of over 15%." (*Irish Independent*-15.9.2012)

"WORKERS are paying vastly more tax since the start of the economic crisis in 2008 despite earning less.

"Stark new figures show that even those on incomes of €50,000 who have suffered pay reductions have ended up shelling out more.

"The universal social charge has been blamed for the higher burden on employees." (*Irish Independent*-8.9.2012).

A typical worker on €50,000 in 2008 is now earning €5,000 less because of pay cuts. This means the worker's annual gross pay has fallen to €45,000 in the four-year

ion of society, has never been identical with civilization. It is in a diverse manner of conceiving all the values of life that Catholicism is opposed to capitalism, not as a complex of instruments and means, but as an organization directing these means to a certain end. Catholicism finds no reason to object to mechanical looms or wireless. But so long as Catholicism remains Catholicism it can never accept a society like our own in which wireless and mechanical looms are the instruments for attaining quite other goals than those proposed by Catholicism.

"Anyone who strives to understand exactly the respective positions of Catholicism and capitalism cannot be surprised to find the two ideals in conflict, and the exponents of the one contending with the exponents of the other for the domination of society.

"It only remains for us to repeat that the Catholic ethos is anti-capitalistic; that Catholicism has opposed the establishment of capitalism, even if in certain ways it has favoured its progress in this or that direction." (Amintore Fanfani, *Catholicism, Protestantism, and Capitalism*, p.159)

THE REFORMATION

"According to Max Weber, Protestantism encouraged the development of capitalism by introducing into the world the idea of vocation, by which each individual was bound to devote all his powers to the field of work to which he was called, in the conviction that this was his sole duty towards God. In this we do not agree with Weber, although he is far more correct than those who declare that "compared with Catholicism, Protestantism in general perhaps gives greater encouragement to the spirit of individual initiative, since it confers on the individual direct and complete responsibility in the sight of God, and does not admit any intercession, neither that of the Saints, nor that provided by the prayers of others"..." (*ibid.*)

"Leaving aside this utterly erroneous opinion, we venture to say that Weber's solution is unacceptable for various reasons, above all because it does not admit that the capitalist spirit existed before the Protestant idea of vocation. It is true that Weber tries to anticipate the objection, that there were capitalistic manifestations prior to Protestantism, by attributing a different spirit to their authors and distinguishing between capitalism and the capitalist spirit, but though his evasion of the objection is skillful, it altogether fails to satisfy. Is it possible for the essence of a thing—and for Weber the capitalist spirit constitutes the essence of capitalism—to come into existence long after the thing itself?

CAPITALISM PRECEDED PROTESTANTISM

"We must nonetheless take Weber's theory into consideration if we are to understand the gravity of the true problem, which is quite other. And it is this: there were capitalistic "facts" before Protestantism, and if we admit that they could not be capitalistic unless they were produced by the capitalist spirit, we must conclude that the capitalist spirit existed before Protestantism. If we reason logically from the data with which Weber supplies us, we cannot fail to reach this conclusion. Therefore we cannot accept the idea of vocation as the origin of the capitalist spirit, or else we must say that it existed at an earlier date.

"On the other hand, we cannot grant that man never sought for gain in a rationalized manner before the idea of vocation. It is true that the idea of the rational is relative, but it is also true that the idea of the economically rational, the idea of the minimum means, though affected by later knowledge, was known before Protestantism. So much so, that at bottom those theorists are right who hold that, from the point of view of pure gain, and from the point of view of an economic rationality confined to scattered manifestations on the part of isolated individuals, capitalism has always existed."

CAPITALIST SPIRIT

"As against these, and against Weber, we would point out that man has an inborn instinct for gain; that he strives always to attain the minimum means as far as his state of knowledge allows; that external factors either check this instinct or encourage it. It is this instinct, this tendency, that is the germ of the capitalist spirit. Therefore, *in nuce* {in a nutshell}, the capitalist spirit has always been and always will be. But the capitalist spirit as a social force has not always been, nor will it always be. It is of this capitalist spirit that we speak and ought to speak. It is this that is the essence of capitalism as a social phenomenon; capitalism, so understood, has relations with the various religions, because these, in seeking to discipline the spiritual powers of man, can, in combination with other social phenomena, destroy it, check it, or stimulate it. They cannot bring it to birth, because it has been born already, or, rather, it is inborn in man.

"But Weber's text lends itself to further criticism. A few months ago Robertson {H.M. Robertson 1905-1984} proved that the idea of vocation, to which Weber attributes so great significance in determining the origin of the capitalist spirit, has not always implied what the German sociologist supposed. The Protestants of the sixteenth century, Latimer and Lever, for example, make use of the idea of vocation to combat those manifestations that Weber considers characteristic of the capitalist spirit.

"Even in the seventeenth century the very Baxter whom Weber believes to supply so many proofs in support of his thesis attributes an ambiguous significance to the idea of vocation, and only in the eighteenth century do we find among the Puritans a pro-capitalistic content to the idea of vocation. The exhaustive proofs brought forward by Robertson, and which gain an added value from the conclusions of a work by Beins, perhaps give him too great assurance, and he goes so far as to write that Weber's theory should be reversed and that the time has now come to ask whether it was not the predominance of a capitalist mentality in the middle classes that led to a slow but sure evolution of the social ethical code of Protestantism in a capitalistic sense.

"Robertson adds that no historian can be unaware that if the idea of vocation was the origin of capitalism, since this idea is identical in the Protestantism of the seventeenth century and the Catholicism of the fourteenth century, and in the Protestantism and in certain Catholic currents of the eighteenth century, we should have to conclude that Protestantism and Catholicism had an equal importance, in this respect, for the development of the capitalist spirit. Nor does Robertson's observation appear ill-founded, once we realize that the idea of vocation, attributed by Weber to the Protestants, was a living idea before the Reformation, and remained alive in the Catholic camp even after.

"Bourdaloue, Houdry, Feugère, Griffet, Massillon, have repeatedly assured the faithful in France in modern times, not only that to each one God assigns a post in the world, but that it is God's will "*que chacun soit dans le monde parfaitement ce qu'il est* {that each might be in the world exactly what he is}," since "*accomplir fidèlement tous ses devoirs,...s'occuper de travailler,...agir dans son état selon la volonté et le gré de Dieu, c'est prier* {to accomplish faithfully all his duties...to busy himself with work...to act within his station according to the will and desire of God, is to pray}," and that "*les devoirs d'état sont... en un sens de vrais devoirs de Religion* {the duties of state are... in one sense the real duties of Religion}" and "*l'état ou Dieu nous a places* {the station God has given us}" is "*l'unique voie de notre salut* {the only path to our salvation}"}. This most decidedly Catholic idea does not even lend itself to Groethuysen's recent reproach that Catholic teaching condemned men's efforts to better their position, for, since Gaetano's sixteenth-century interpretation of St. Thomas' doctrine, it is plain that a man who seeks to obtain that position in life for which he is qualified by his gifts and capacities is not rebelling against God, but striving to reach the post that God has potentially assigned to him.

FANFANI continued

overthrown, and all these are inconceivable in the Catholic conception ... There is an unbridgeable gulf between the Catholic and the Capitalist conception of life."

Private economic initiative, in his view, was justifiable only if harnessed to the common good.

Fanfani took on a succession of Ministries. He was Minister of Labour from 1947–1948 and again from 1948–1950; Minister of Agriculture from 1951–1953; as well as Minister of the Interior in 1953. As Minister of Labour, he developed the "Fanfani House" programme for Government-built workers' homes financed jointly by workers, the Government, and employers and put 200,000 of Italy's many unemployed to work on a reforestation program. As Minister of Agriculture, he set in motion much of the Christian Democrats' land reform program.

A strong supporter of the European Economic Community (EEC), Fanfani was Foreign Minister in 1965 and in 1966–68.

He was forced to resign at Foreign Minister in December 1965, after the premature disclosure of possible peace initiatives he had relayed to the United States from the North Vietnamese leader, Ho Chi Minh.

Fanfani died in Rome on 20th November 1999.

WORK AND WORKERS

"In June, 1946, Fanfani was elected to represent the Arezzo-Siena-Grosseto area in the Constituent Assembly which drafted a new Constitution effective January 1, 1948. The very first article of the constitution reflects Fanfani's work and philosophy. Staunchly anti-Communist, but socially progressive, Fanfani proposed an article which read: "Italy is a democratic republic founded on work." His proposal, which was eventually accepted, countered the Communist version: "Italy is a democratic republic of workers." By a seemingly harmless change in the wording he avoided the class implication inherent in the Communist formula" (*Encyclopedia of World Biography*, 2004).

BLESSED GIUSEPPE TONIOLO

A seminal influence on Fanfani was Giuseppe Toniolo (1845-1918). Toniolo was the great historian and admirer of the mediaeval Guilds, and their advocate as a modern solidaristic (and therefore non-capitalistic) economy. Toniolo had a big

influence on Pope Leo XIII in his defence and promotion of Catholic Corporatism in the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* (1891). Drawing upon the work of Toniolo inevitably meant, for Fanfani, a reference to refer to his vision of the Middle Ages.

Toniolo was beatified this year by Pope Benedict XVI.

A great part of the writings of Toniolo regard the history of the mediaeval economy, with particular reference to Tuscany. In the work of Fanfani, which was based upon, among other things, a direct and detailed consultation of the primary sources of Tuscany, the work of this famous historian of the University of Pisa represents an essential point of reference.

Of special importance in this respect is *Quadragesimo Anno*, written by Pius XI in 1931, and which represented for Fanfani—then at the beginning of his scientific research—a continuous point of reference, specifically in its powerful condemnation of the failure of Capitalism and the damage it produced, along with its suggestion that the Guilds were the ideal answer to the economic and social crisis of the period.

"The years which saw the drafting of Fanfani's 1934 work coincided with the after-effects, in Europe and in Italy, of the Wall Street Crash of 1929. With the majority of the Catholic (and not only the Catholic) intelligentsia of the period, Fanfani saw the Crash as a kind of "swan song" of Capitalism. It is no coincidence, therefore, that the Guild solution was advocated strongly in this period. Fascism had in fact enacted Guild legislation (though it was somewhat of an "admixture" of purely Catholic thought with Fascist ideology) that was intended to bring about the reconciliation of Capital and Labour, and to definitively overcome the problems of Capitalism" (Giorgio Campanini, Professor of the History of Political Thought, University of Parma, Italy).

CATHOLIC INSPIRATION

Fanfani's vision is based on the Catholic ideal. An understanding of that vision is important to have a full appreciation of what it argues against, and why! Fanfani saw the Guilds as an alternative to both Capitalism and Socialism.

"CAPITALISTIC SPIRIT"

The central thesis of Fanfani's argument in *Catholicism, Protestantism, and Capitalism* was: that the "capitalistic spirit" was not born in a Protestant area (as Weber thought, and with him not a small number of students of economic history), but rather it appeared first in

Catholic countries; and that it was not an essential result of the Reformation, but rather it developed as a result of the progressive decomposition of the original Catholic ethic. Neither was the pursuit of profit, nor pronounced activism (to note just two of the aspects typical of the Capitalism of Protestant countries) foreign to the Catholic culture of the late Middle Ages.

"In his work, Fanfani attempted, at once with regard to both Weber and Groethuysen, a twofold correction. On the one hand, he traced the origins of the "capitalistic spirit" to the late Middle Ages. On the other, he saw in this very same spirit not a development but an inversion, almost a degeneration, of the ethics of the Gospel. In substance, Capitalism was born, at least as a mentality if not a fully developed economic structure, in the merchant world of Florence, Flanders and the Hanseatic ports, particularly in the fourteenth century, as a secularized form of that Christian activism that aimed to transform the world.

"That Christian activity traced its roots to the "Prayer and Work" of the Benedictine Rule and the subsequent flowering of mediaeval monasticism, and to the elaborations of the great mediaeval theologians, first among whom is St. Thomas Aquinas; and it manifested itself practically in the enormous network of institutions—from the "credit unions" to the hospitals and orphanages—intended to redeem in some way the world of money from its essential dullness. From this point of view—as he would explain in a later work, thereby synthesizing much that had already been expressed in his 1934 study—"the weakening of influence of the social conception proposed and supported by mediaeval Catholicism is the circumstance which explains the manifestation and growth of the capitalistic spirit in a Catholic world"..." (Giorgio Campanini, Professor of the History of Political Thought, University of Parma, Italy).

FANFANI AND ANTI-CAPITALISM

"In the Middle Ages, by supporting the intervention of public bodies in economic life as a check to individual activity and to defend the interests of society as a whole; in our own time, by calling for State intervention for the same reasons, the Church has remained faithful to her anti-capitalistic ethics. Both during the predominance of the mediaeval guild system, and during that of capitalism, the Church, and those Catholics that listened to her voice, set or sought to set bounds not lawfully to be overstepped to the course of economic life—even at the cost of a sacrifice of mechanical and technical progress, which, in the Catholic concept-

continued on page 26



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 30 No. 10

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

Mondragon, Part 12

"Catholics, so long as they held closely to the social teachings of the Church, could never act in favour of capitalism."— Amintore Fanfani.

Fanfani And The Guilds

"The Corporation or Guild is typical of the period. It is the guardian of a system of economic activity in which the purely economic interests of the individual are sacrificed either to the moral and religious interests of the individual—the attainment of which is under the control of special public institutions—or to the economic and extra-economic interests of the community. Competition was restricted; the distribution of customers, hence a minimum of work, was assured; a certain system of work was compulsory; trade with various groups might be forbidden for political or religious reasons; certain practices were compulsory, and working hours were limited; there were a number of compulsory feasts; prices and rates of increase were fixed; measures were taken to prevent speculation. Food laws and sumptuary laws prove the impossibility and unlawfulness of an economic activity governed by standards of purely individual utility. Ecclesiastical and civil legislation forestalled such a possibility, and dealt with the just price and usury. Plainly, all these institutions, and many others that we could quote if the scope of the present work permitted, reveal the influence of extra-economic ideas and mark their paramount influence as principles of rationality, in the economic life both of the individual and of the community. And it is these institutions that guarantee that the means employed in economic life shall conform to such principles, even if individuals are unwilling to remain faithful to this order. But more often than not the true guarantee of the use of such means was provided by the triumph of the pre-capitalist spirit in the minds of the many." (Amintore Fanfani, *Catholicism, Protestantism, and Capitalism*, Unicorn Books, Sheed & Ward, London, 1939, p.49/52)

This was Amintore Fanfani's rejection of Max Weber's (1864-1920) argument that Protestantism, primarily in its Calvinist and then its Puritan form, played

a central role in the birth and development of modern Capitalism.

The victory of capitalism over socialism seems, at least for now, to have stifled the debate over the conflicts between Christianity and capitalism, to the point where capitalism has become a preconception, something that is accepted without any critical analysis of thought.

Fanfani's argument is that regardless of what spirit motivates a man, once he finds himself in a system which recognizes no rule limiting competition, he either competes or dies. His motive for competing may not be avarice; it may be mere survival; it may even be quite noble, like providing a livelihood for his family. But it is the economic structure—permitting the employment of all kinds of competitive means—that determines how he must behave to obtain that livelihood.

FASCIST TO DEMOCRAT

Amintore Fanfani (1908-1999) was one

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>

of the foremost Italian politicians after the Second World War, and a dominant figure of the Italian Christian Democrats.

He was the author of a number of important works on economic history dealing with religion and the development of capitalism in the Renaissance and Reformation in Europe. His thesis was published in Italian and then in English as *Catholicism, Capitalism And Protestantism* in 1935.

FASCIST AFFILIATION

He joined the Italian National Fascist Party (Partito Nazionale Fascista; PNF) supporting the corporatist ideas of the regime promoting collaboration between the classes, which he defended in many articles. "Some day", he once wrote, "the European continent will be organized into a vast supranational area guided by Italy and Germany. Those areas will take authoritarian governments and synchronize their constitutions with Fascist principles" (*Time Magazine*, US, 14.7.1958).

He saw the corporate state as the ideal, and in what he called a "temporary aberration" turned to Fascism. He never tried to hide his Fascist record; but unlike many of his countrymen, he freely admits that he was wrong.

POLITICAL CAREER

Following World War II, Fanfani was elected Vice-Secretary of the newly-founded Christian Democratic Party. He represented a particular ideological position, that of Catholics who favoured socio-economic interventionism.

"Capitalism requires such a dread of loss", he once wrote, "such a forgetfulness of human brotherhood, such a certainty that a man's neighbour is merely a customer to be gained or a rival to be

continued on page 27