

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

December 2013

Vol.28, No.12 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.27 No.12 ISSN 954-

Gerry Adams And Jean McConville

The attempt to connect Gerry Adams to the 'disappearance' of Jean McConville is very problematical. When Mrs McConville was done away with, Adams was living in Ballymurphy and was a fairly lowly operative in the (Provisional) Republican movement. He has said that he would probably have preferred to remain with the 'Officials', who seemed then more 'political'. His closest friend in the movement was Joe McCann the great hero of the Officials, shot by the Paras in 1972. He was persuaded to go with the 'Provos' (as the BBC called them—Provi was the street designation) for essentially family reasons

That was not an unusual decision in the early 1970s—the 'split' might have been heavily 'ideological' in Dublin—it meant very little in the North. Some areas had 'independent' units, the matter was not cleared up until the mid-'70s, when the Officials went on ceasefire, then lost nearly all of its members to the Provisionals over a period of some years. The Workers Party-to-be (meaning the whole of the 'movement': the military organisation, the Republican Clubs, the prisoners welfare groups) repudiated its prisoners and left them to their own devices; they were looked after by their families. The public in the North despised the Stickies, not because of the Ceasefire, but because of the hypocrisy of denouncing PIRA violence while engaging in robberies and brutal punishments of 'ordinary decent criminals', or often ordinary members of the public who got in their way. They lost control of areas they had dominated, mostly the traditionally strongly Republican ones like the Market, and Lower Falls / 'Pound Loney' area—which was where Divis Flats were built, just before the balloon went up in the late 1960s.

Gerry Adams lived in Ballymurphy and worked as a barman in Belfast city centre. He probably was not all that familiar with the Divis Flats complex. It probably had some people who preferred the Provis to the Sticks, but as noted above this was more of a 'consumer' choice before the latter went on an ideological binge, and probably had more

continued on page 2

'The Disappeared': *Scrapping The Barrel*

The political campaign, waged in humanitarian guise, to remove Gerry Adams from Southern politics and to undermine the Agreement in the North, was intensified during the month. The SDLP is increasingly co-operating with the Official Unionists and facilitating fundamentalist Unionist opposition to the Agreement in the Northern Assembly, and a joint British/Irish television prog-

ramme which attempted to connect Adams with the killing and/or burial of Jean McConville was broadcast in prime TV time in both states.

If either the SDLP or the UUP were to make very great gains against their opponents at the next election, it is probable that the Agreement would revert to being dysfunctional, as it was when the SDLP and the UUP were the major parties. If the SDLP revived by use of its present methods and overtook Sinn Fein, it is improbable that it could bring itself to work the system with the Paisleyites. And if the

Apprenticeship Review

must not miss the point

Last May, the Department of Education and Skills (under Labour Minister Ruairi Quinn) invited submissions to a review of the apprenticeship system.

Its "background issues paper" gave details on the Irish system and compared it with those of Germany, Switzerland, Norway and Finland. The tone of the paper was to highlight the narrow range of trades in which an apprenticeship could be pursued in Ireland compared to these countries. It implicitly promoted a large scale expansion of apprenticeship training on an industry-driven model combining in-work and school based training (the "dual system").

The Review seemed to have launched a major reform initiative aimed at expanding the apprenticeship system along German style dual system lines.

All this was accompanied by favourable comments by Labour Ministers and the press on the benefits of the German system and the need for Ireland to move in

continued on page 4

UUP were to overtake the DUP, what prospect is there that it would work the system with Sinn Fein?

The Anti-Adams TV programme, *The Disappeared* (8.11.13) centred on the Jean McConville incident because, as was explained in the course of it, it is thought that, for technical reasons, the case remains open in the South (where the body was found), and subject to Garda investigation. It is hoped that Adams can be connected with it and that charges can be laid against him. And Fianna Fail in particular thinks that would greatly boost its chances at the

To page 5, column 2

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Gerry Adams And Jean McConville. Seán McGouran	1
Apprenticeship Review Must Not Miss The Point. Philip O'Connor	1
'The Disappeared': <i>Scrapping The Barrel</i>	1
Cluane, Clancy, McKee Oration. Paul Mc Guill (Press Release, Irish National Congress)	3
Readers' Letters: Gilmore Does A Redmond. Donal Kennedy	3
German Model And Apprentices. (Report: Eoghan Harris)	5
With Friends Like That. John Morgan, Lt. Col.Retd. (Review of <i>Lethal Allies</i>)	10
Digging. Wilson John Haire (Poem)	12
Shorts from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (ACC Loan; Foreign Banks In Ireland; The Death Of Yugoslavia; Austerity Works; Political Implications; JFK Assassination; Dallas 1963; 25 Years Of Fintan O'Toole)	13
Anti-Semitism On The Increase? Nick Folley	14
the last word on the last survivor. John Young, Jack Lane	15
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (The Raj In The Rain, Part 2)	17
Did Borgonovo Miss The Point About The AFIL? Manus O'Riordan (Some Collinses And Somervilles, Part 4)	18
A Critic Emerges From Academia, <i>Michael Carragher.</i> Brendan Clifford	25
Whatever You Say . . . Pat Walsh	28
A British Undercover Unit. Wilson John Haire	29
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (The Banks; Public Servant Top-Ups; Irish Holocaust)	30
Labour Comment , edited by Pat Maloney:	
<u>Destruction Of The Guilds</u>	
Mondragon, Part 25	
(back page)	
<u>The Battle Of Clontarf</u>	
Finian McGrath (Press Release)	
(page 32)	
<u>Labour Problems</u>	
(page 32)	
<u>Trade Union Notes</u>	
(page 31)	

Due to pressure of space, the Index and other items are held over for the January issue

to do with which element 'approached' potential volunteers than anything else. The point of the above is that, while Divis was heavily 'Sticky', it was so because the local unit, in so far as there had been one prior to the Autumn of 1969, decided to stay with the Goulding/Johnston element in Dublin. (Most of those who crowded into the IRA and ancillary groups after the 'events' of August '69, and even after Bloody Sunday, in '71, probably did not know anything much about the personalities at the top of the movement.)

The Officials would have been the ones policing Divis in this period, even after the barricades came down. After the second split in the Officials, the area was called "*planet of the erps*" (erp = IRSP, Irish Republican Socialist Party, attached to the INLA -Irish National Liberation Army). I do not know how big the Provi presence was—but it was never really significant until the disintegration of the Officials.

The likelihood that Jean McConville

(who was a British Army informant) was done away with by the Officials is quite high. It may not have been the case—as at that point, the Stickies may not have been too anxious about who did what—but the policing of areas was the outer symbol of who was in charge. And it was expected of the group that was most favoured in a neighbourhood (which was not necessarily the one with the largest number of members: there certainly were large numbers of PIRA Volunteers in the Market for example.)

Gerry Adams, as noted above, was (probably) in charge of the Provisional movement (he was always 'political') in Ballymurphy. The 'murph' is about half a mile away from Divis Flats (a long way in the context of Belfast): it is extremely unlikely that he had anything other than the most casual, causal connections with the PIRA or Sinn Féin there. He probably only met them on a monthly or weekly basis on 'business'. On a personal level it is more than likely that he found, and finds, the whole business of 'disappearance'

distasteful.

But '71 to '73 was the most intense period of violence in the Thirty Years' War, and extremely unpleasant things happen in war. By no stretch was all the violence coming from the Republican side. Various 'spook' organisations (apart from anything else), seemed to be falling over each other—the 'Four Square' laundry scam comes to mind—and were stirring things up, while the Loyalist paramilitaries (sometimes manipulated by military and police spooks) were on a killing spree. Only the seriously foolhardy ventured out in Belfast after six in the evening. There were hundreds of grisly murders of innocent drunks, or people simply trying to get to or from their work.

(The Four Square 'laundry' is interesting in that it shows how transparent were some military scams. It was unmasked mainly because mere 'housewives' in Taig areas began to wonder at the unrealistic cheapness of the service—and brought the matter up with their 'local unit'. Boycott and a few well-aimed shots at the vans put a stop to all that. The laundry collected was taken to an actual laundry deep inside a heavily Loyalist area. The 'Brits' probably assumed that word would never get out to the 'RA—the view was that Prods were simply genetically programmed to be Loyalist. But it's likely that at least one or two in Prod areas may have been 'rebels', or even Taigs. (A friend lived with his girlfriend in hyper-Loyal Linfield Village: it was assumed his genetic inheritance was suitable, simply because he had a Ballymena accent.)

It is a pity Jean McConville was killed, and that her family were not in a position to give her remains a dignified interment. But the 'disappeared' business is something of a scam itself. The late David Ervine—accurately—described what happened in Northern Ireland "*a dirty, nasty little war*", and Mrs McConville was a casualty of that war. It is no favour to her memory, or to the feelings of her family, to use her as just another stick for the back of Gerry Adams.

Seán McGouran

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

Cluane, Clancy, McKee Oration

Today I would like to talk to you about heroes. You can tell a lot about a nation from whom it chooses as its heroes and whom it chooses as its enemies.

But I am not going to talk to you today about our heroes, about Conor Clune and Peadar Clancy from Clare and Dubliner Dick Mc Kee who were brutally murdered here 93 years ago. If You want to know more about their story then Sean O' Mahony has forgotten more than I will ever know.

Rather I want to talk to you about three British heroes. The three man most likely responsible for the deaths of Clune, Clancy and Mc Kee, namely Captain Jocelyn 'Hoppy' Hardy DSO & BAR & MC, Major Lorraine 'Tiny' King MC & BAR & DCM and Brigadier General Sir Ormond Winter KBE, CBC, MC & DSO.

We know that these three gentlemen were heroes from their glowing obituaries and the many honours awarded to them by the British State. But the British State is not alone in honouring these men, Irish people have honoured them also.

This September in Mount Argus cemetery, Dublin a commemoration was organised by Gerry Lovett, a former member of An Garda Siochana to commemorate deceased members of the Dublin Metropolitan Police and the Royal Irish Constabulary including the notorious Auxiliary division, to which these men belonged.

This ceremony was attended by 500 people including representatives of the British Ambassador, Garda Commissioner as well as our Junior Minister for Finance, Brian Hayes T.D.

Perhaps we should learn a little bit more about these three British heroes whom Irish people have chosen to commemorate.

Captain 'Hoppy' Hardy, his obituary in 1958 assures us, was a secret donor to charity, a dog lover, a keen polo player and Rolls Royce enthusiast. He made his fortune by writing a number of novels about his deeds of daring do. Two of these books were later made into films in the 1930's. He was captured by the Germans during one of the first battles of World War One and made 12 attempts to escape captivity before finally rejoining his comrades on the western front for one of the last battles of the war during which he lost his leg but gained his nickname.

Gilmore does a Redmond

I remember the days when Kevin Barry was commemorated by UCD students in November,

I marched with the FCA in Dublin to commemorate Brigadier Dick McKee, Vice-Brigadier Peadar Clancy and the civilian Conor Clune murdered in Dublin Castle on 21 November 1920 when veterans of their Dublin Brigade paraded also.

The State and, apparently UCD have abandoned such commemoration. In 1920 Michael Collins risked death to appear publicly at the funerals of McKee and Clancy and was photographed on the Pathe Newsreel, accessible on line.

When I was last in Dublin there were three barracks named after Collins, McKee and Clancy. In 1920 they were named after British heroes. I'm surprised they haven't reverted to their old names, but I imagine they will when they are offered back to the British Army in the near future.

Donal Kennedy

Eamonn Gilmore: "Over 200,000 people from all over the island of Ireland were in the First World War and many of them lost their lives. I think it's important that all of us, from all parts of the island, including the Irish government, commemorate those who died in the wars."

His comrade Major 'Tiny' King was three times married, a 6 foot tall brute who fought against the Boers in South Africa in 1901. He later joined the South African Police and Army to fight in Egypt and France in World War One.

After the war both men, for £1 a day, joined the notorious death squad 'F Company' of the Auxiliaries based here in Dublin Castle.

Michael Collins' spy in the police, David Nelligan, described Hardy as an insane Psychopath, more interested in beating prisoners to a pulp than in gaining information.

Ernie O Malley, who survived one of Major King's 'interrogations' recalled him screaming threats, beatings to the face, strangulation and mock executions.

Both men took part in the killing of Mc Kee, Clancy and Clune. In one of Hardy's books *Never In Vain*, he admitted as much. While King was acquitted by Court Marshall of these killings.

But these were not the only killings these men were involved in. While threatening the writer Pdraig O'Connaire in Howth, Hardy admitted being accused of torturing Kevin Barry. Both men were involved in the killing of IRA man Michael Magee in an ambush at St. Patrick's College, Drumcondra on the 21st January 1921 and the kidnap and execution of two members of Collins' squad, Patrick Kennedy and James Murphy, also in Drumcondra on the 9th February 1921. For this King was again tried and acquitted before being moved to Galway where he was involved in the sack of Tuam, a riot at a

Republican dance in Galway Town Hall, and the kidnap and murder of brothers Pat and Henry Loughnane in Ardrahan.

Sir Ormond Winter was a chain-smoking, monocle wearing, master of five Slavonic languages and expert at cards and horses who made his fortune by opening a racecourse in Calcutta. He was personally appointed as 'O' or head of British military intelligence in Ireland and deputy Chief of Police by Home Secretary, Winston Churchill. He had a merciless and draconian reputation and is believed to be responsible for the suicide of three of his subordinates. As a young officer in England he killed a 15 year old boy, Sidney Hawkins, with an oar because he had thrown stones at Winter's boat while rowing. A killing for which Winter was later acquitted. He was also accused of killing another man while on intelligence work in India and in Ireland he personally killed an IRA man during an ambush. During World War One he commanded an artillery battery on the Dardanelles and on the western front.

In Ireland he earned the nickname 'The Holy Terror' because he claimed that he feared neither God nor Man and had a deserved reputation for ruthlessness. He streamlined and oversaw British intelligence-gathering, such as police informers, prisoners seeking leniency, censorship of letters and phone calls, captured documents, along with interrogations such as that endured by Clancy, Clune and Mc Kee. He organised the 'Cairo gang', wiped out by Collins' Squad

on Bloody Sunday, and later the 'Igoe gang'.

After Ireland's independence he returned to England and became a member of the '*British Fascisti*' in 1924 which, under Brigadier General Blakeney, became the British Fascist League in 1928. This was however, no brief or youthful flirtation with Fascism. He was a leading appeasement advocate for non-intervention in Spain in the 1930's—not because he was opposed to intervening in foreign conflicts, for in 1940 at the age of 65 he fought alongside Germany's Fascist allies in their Winter war against the USSR. Winter survived World War Two to write his Biography, *A Winter's Tale* and died peacefully aged 87 in 1967.

If Irish people have this year chosen to honour the Auxiliaries, the torturers, child killers and Fascists and ignore the Volunteers, the drapers, seed merchants and printers, then so be it. In doing so they bring no dishonour on the reputation of Mc Kee, Clancy and Clune. We do not possess the power to dishonour the reputation of these three gallant Irishmen, rather we have only dishonoured the reputation of our own generation.

Mc Kee, Clancy and Clune laid down their lives so that we may be free and so that other men are free to wear the uniform of a respected and unarmed Police force or hold office in and draw a salary from a Government they helped to create.

Let me conclude by saying that so long as it is more politically expedient to honour the men who fought to deny us our freedom than it is to honour those who died to achieve it, then our revolution is unfinished.

Apprenticeship

continued

a similar direction. Countries with well developed systems have much lower rates of youth unemployment than those (including Ireland) that don't. But, as employers' body IBEC pointed out in its submission:

"The Issues Paper claims that a 'strength' of the current system is that apprenticeship 'provides a practical and attractive alternative route to higher education'. In fact, apprenticeships and VET do not share parity of esteem with traditional academic education routes amongst young people, their parents, employers or, indeed, Irish society. This attitude has been reinforced by government policy."

The Government's recent proposal to extend the franchise for the six Senate university seats to all third level graduates would tend to confirm IBEC's scepticism. As this journal pointed out in October, any reform of the Senate can only make it more powerful and even less democratic. This particular proposed 'reform' gives the lie to claims by Government to value workers with craft skills and qualifications equally to university graduates.

The apprenticeship review received over 70 submissions, many of them containing detailed and interesting proposals. Most came from industry, business groups and the training/educational sector. While many could be termed special pleading, all were agreed on the need for a significant expansion of work-based training and conceded the inadequacy of purely school-based education provision. After all, 50% of young people leave secondary school without undertaking any vocational or further training making access to the labour market very difficult for many young people. The main real difference of opinion in the submissions was on the extent of state supervision, the autonomy which employers should have in shaping the content, supply and duration of apprenticeships, who should pay, the extent to which lower level "traineeships" are adequate to need, and overall governance of the system.

Irish education and training expanded massively under Social Partnership. The signing of the first partnership agreement (1987) was accompanied by the Industrial Training Act which established FÁS. In 1992 the apprenticeship system was overhauled and given its current form. This dual system based approach, although confined to just 26 trades in the construction, motor, catering and engineering industries, has achieved internationally recognised high standards. Apprenticeship approaches are also common in the legal and accountancy professions. But combined these represent a small minority of the workforce.

The prejudice of public policy remains formal education. In 2012 just a little over 3,500 young people registered in apprenticeships (after reaching an all time high of over 8,000 in 2007). Over 60,000 entered full time college the same year. By contrast, in Germany nearly two thirds of young people enter apprenticeships (with a 90+% successful completion rate) and just a little over a quarter go to university. Irish school completion rates at 90% today are among the highest in the OECD, as is progression from school to

third level education (including apprenticeships)—at over 60%—and this now includes many sections of the population which traditionally had little involvement with colleges. During the era of Social Partnership the college system has also been greatly overhauled, with a far greater orientation towards technological training and industry needs, and far more young people attending Institutes of Technology and vocationally-orientated Colleges of Further Education than traditional academic colleges. But the system failure for many young people remains.

Apprenticeships and industrial traineeships are still largely regarded in Irish society as alternatives for people who are not academically 'gifted'. But many people produced by Irish universities emerge without industrial or commercially-useful skills and flounder around for several years in casual work before finding secure employment. The college bias has also in recent years seen a disconnecting of nursing and catering from workplace apprenticeship-style training in favour of academic degree qualifications.

This academic bias is a distorted view of things. In Germany it is quite common for top engineers in companies like Siemens to have qualified entirely and to the highest level through the apprenticeship system. Compared to the 26 trades in Ireland, apprenticeships in Germany cover over 350 trades from engineering to cleaning, cooking to office administration, and link to higher qualification systems where relevant (which in Ireland is prevented by the points system). While the German system is driven by industrial demand, it is overseen by local Chambers of Trades, tripartite bodies with their historic roots in the mediaeval Guilds, which also oversee the qualification process.

Of the approximately 70 submissions to the Review, only four were from Trade Unions—SIPTU, the craft unions group, two teachers unions (ASTI and TUI) and one from the umbrella ICTU. Unions which might be supposed to have a considerable interest—including UNITE and Mandate—did not make submissions, while ASTI seemed mainly concerned with defending the prestige of secondary school education. Both ICTU and SIPTU defend the integrity of the existing apprenticeships, seek the development of a dual system on the German and Danish model, and its extension to other trades in administration, green engineering, hospitality etc. They also seek tripartite govern-

ance across the VET system and propose the inclusion of a training levy as part of social insurance contributions.

What the Apprenticeship Review will produce will depend on political will. The proposed Senate reform reveals the prejudices in the political system against any real departure. In addition, the dismantling of tripartite governance systems in Ireland over the last three years will tend to favour an outcome slanted towards technocratic and business interests. The current Government abolished the tripartite FÁS Board in 2011, replacing it with Ministerial appointees. Even the 7-member Apprenticeship Review Group itself has several representatives of business and educational interests but only one Trade Unionist (Peter Rigney of ICTU). The education bodies replacing FÁS and the VECs—Solás and the "Education and Training Boards" (ETBs)—are similarly devoid of trade union representation.

Many business submissions to the Review seek a liberalising of training to enable them be shaped solely to meet business requirements. IBEC proposes exclusive business-education arrangements building on existing in-company and sectoral traineeship initiatives ("Skillnets"). It also will not seriously consider any additional employer training levies (currently at 0.7% one of the lowest in Europe). A joint submission by the leading relevant state agencies (Forfás, IDA) is similarly liberal in its orientation:

"{the new system} could be more akin to the current approach by FAS to the development of a new Traineeship rather than the complex consultative nature of the current apprenticeship regime.

Furthermore:

"The curriculum development resource is essential and may require to be contracted out to subject matter experts in conjunction with consultations with a group(s) for specific occupations with significant employer involvement, to advise on the scope and standards for the occupation, stages of design, development and implementation of the training course. Reviews/evaluations of courses should be systematically undertaken, informed by a combination of centrally devised initiatives, feedback from stakeholders such as course participants, employers, training providers, government policy, labour market trends, the economic environment, requirements of the economy and designed to the requirements of QQI {the quality control agency—POC}. Solás and the ETBs could manage the new programme and contract out the aspects to be delivered by the IOTs {=Institutes of Technology}, Skillnets or industry specialist providers

as appropriate."

Transferring the German "dual system" into Ireland is not a serious proposition—as is pointed out in several submissions—but the alternative need not be the total liberalising of vocational education and training being advocated by IBEC and several key state agencies. There are sound developments in workplace training (Skillnets etc.) which can be built on with an ideal of achieving broad provision of an industry based system. The German Government has offered to assist in developing this. But the marginalisation of the Unions by Labour in Government in this critical process of training reform—as well perhaps as some self-marginalisation by the Unions themselves—does not auger well.

Philip O'Connor

'The Disappeared'

continued

next Election.

The programme made no headway at all towards achieving this. That, no doubt, is why Noel Whelan, an almost Fianna Fail columnist in the *Irish Times*, wrote the next day:

"It may not be possible to prove things in a criminal court of law but in the court of public opinion... the expert evidence is overwhelmingly against them. Security sources and senior political figures in both sides of the divide and both sides of the Border have always placed Adams besides McGuinness at the senior levels of IRA management. Most journalists and academics who have specialised in study of the IRA have long disputed Adams' denials about such involvement. To these voices must now be added those of former leading IRA commanders who have spoken about the extent of Adams' knowledge and involvement... The Sinn Fein leadership, and a generation of voters with no memory of the IRA's campaign, must be repeatedly confronted with the stark and horrific reality of what the IRA did" (*Sinn Fein Leadership's Cavalier Relationship With The Truth*, 9 Nov.).

(Adams was charged, in Belfast, with membership of the IRA and acquitted. On his way back to West Belfast from the courts, he was shot when his car was stopped at a traffic light around the corner from Athol St. The media experts have lived all their professional lives on propaganda handouts from Government agencies. The former IRA commanders who give evidence against Adams are those who detest him for having ended the War.)

continued on page 6

Report

German Model & Apprentices

"Last week, we rightly rejoiced when Rob Heffernan won a gold medal in Moscow. But the media took no notice when Joseph Kelly won a gold medal at Leipzig last July. Thereby hangs a tale of class prejudice and crass stupidity.

Kelly won his gold for aircraft maintenance at the WorldSkills Fair in Leipzig. He was trained at the FAS Training Centre in Shannon as an apprentice. He is now employed by TransAero, an aircraft maintenance company based in Shannon.

To win his gold medal, Kelly had to be better than apprentices from all over the world. That included Germany, the home of apprenticeship skills. We also won a gold for plumbing. But this is the third time in five years that we won it for aircraft work.

The BBC carried British gold medal success at Leipzig on the main evening news bulletins. But RTE did not remark on Ireland's success. In fairness, RTE, and indeed the rest of the media, were only following in the footsteps of Ruairi Quinn and all education ministers before him.

Most of our ministers come from the college class. Practical skills pass below their radar. The FAS Shannon training centre, where the young lad was trained, did not even get a letter of congratulations from any government department.

... You can't get most jobs in Germany without serving a practical apprenticeship with an actual employer. One stark figure shows up the snobbery of the Irish political and educational establishment.

Ireland has 29 recognised trades. Germany has 342 recognised trades. Twelve times the number we have. And we are not just talking about plumbers and carpenters.

German apprentices range from bankers to opticians, from plumbers to hotel bed makers. The German dual system demands that apprentices spend up to 70 per cent of their time working in offices, on shopfloors, in foundries. The remaining 30 per cent is spent in classrooms.

That ratio of practical to theoretical is reversed in Ireland..."

Eoghan Harris

Sunday Independent, 18th August

'The Disappeared'

continued

The programme consisted chiefly of mood music—but not entirely. There was an interview with Nuala O'Loan, former Police Ombudsman in the North, who had investigated the McConville affair. She said quite definitely that McConville had not been an informer against the IRA. She was not questioned about how she knew that for a fact. Her statement was accepted as the truth.

But it gave the lie to the chief IRA witness against Adams, Brendan Hughes.

Hughes gave his evidence to the Boston College operation set up by Lord Bew of the Official IRA, and Ed Moloney, an English journalist who began his Belfast career in the utopian People's Democracy movement which helped to break open the old Northern Ireland system and provoke the backlash which gave rise to the War. Hughes' evidence was given in taped interviews conducted by Anthony McIntyre, a former Provisional who left because of the Peace Process.

Hughes gave his evidence against Adams on the condition that it would be kept secret in Boston College until he died, which he expected to do shortly. The evidence was used, without attribution, by Moloney in the writing of his best seller, *The Secret History Of The IRA* (2002). Extracts from the interviews were published, in 2010, under editing by Moloney, in *Voices From The Grave*, and with comment by him.

The TV programme was a joint BBC/RTE production. The BBC in Northern Ireland is a Government broadcasting station—the Government, of course, being Whitehall. On the 'mainland' the BBC has a degree of independence from the Government. Politically it is a service to the party system in Parliament and is required to be 'impartial' between Government and Opposition. But the British party system has always excluded Northern Ireland from its sphere of operations. BBC, NI has, therefore, always been an anomalous region of the BBC. Even in the days of the old Stormont, when everything seemed secure in the North, Whitehall never relinquished control of BBC, NI to NI. It is always controlled by the Whitehall Government of the day.

The Boston tapes, in which Hughes gave his evidence against Adams, were broadcast for the first time in *The Disappeared*, by grace of HMG. That is, we heard Hughes in his own voice saying

that Adams ordered McConville to be killed. But we did not hear him say that he discovered that McConville was an informer. And his testimony to that effect was not mentioned in the programme.

Here is his statement on the tapes, as given in the transcript edited by Moloney (dots and dashes being as they appear in the book):

"At that time Divis Flats still existed and it was a major source of recruitment and activity by the IRA . . . I'm not sure how it originally started, how she became . . . an informer [but she was an informer; she had a transmitter in her house. The British supplied the transmitter into her flat.—, watching the movements of IRA volunteers around Divis Flats at that time . . . the unit that was in . . . Divis Flats at the time was a pretty active unit. A few of them, one of them in particular, young ———, received information from ——— that ——— had something in the house. I sent . . . a squad over to the house to check it out and there was a transmitter in the house. We retrieved the transmitter, arrested her, took her away, interviewed her, and she told [us] what she was doing. We actually knew what she was doing because we had the transmitter . . . if I can get hold of this other wee man he can tell you more about it because I wasn't actually on the scene at the time. And because she was a woman . . . we let her go with a warning [and] confiscated the transmitter. A few weeks later, I'm not sure again how the information came about . . . another transmitter was put into her house . . . she was still co-operating with the British; she was getting paid by the British to pass on information. That information came to our attention. The special squad was brought into operation then. And she was arrested again and taken away" (*Voices From The Grave*, p128-9).

The programme broadcast a few sentences from that tape that come immediately after this in the transcript, saying that Adams ordered the killing. Perhaps it was considered morally irrelevant whether she was a British informer or not, but it can hardly be argued that it was causatively irrelevant

We must assume that the programme makers knew very well that they were broadcasting an assertion by O'Loan which was incompatible with the evidence given by Hughes, who was the man on the spot at the time, and chose to suppress Hughes' evidence in order to enhance O'Loan's.

The presenter of the programme, Darragh McIntyre, then interviewed Moloney, the organiser of the Boston College operation. He did not ask about the conflict between O'Loan's statement and Hughes' evidence. That was something viewers

should be kept ignorant of. What he asked him was the reason why Hughes recorded secret evidence against Adams, to be held in the United States until his death and then made public. Moloney replied that it was because Adams had told a lie. Suddenly we were in the *Kindergarten*.

The programme included a snippet of an interview with Adams. He was told that his former colleagues, Hughes and Dolours Price, had recorded testimony that he had ordered Jean McConville to be killed and buried [after she had been found to be spying on the IRA in Divis Flats].— Well, no, Darragh didn't put that last bit to him, and if Adams referred to that aspect of Hughes' testimony in his reply it was edited out.

His reply, insofar as it was presented to us, was that it should be taken into account that Hughes and Price regarded him as a traitor.

Within the terms set by the programme for itself, this came as a bolt from the blue. What! Adams, the IRA Commander with blood on his hands, regarded as a traitor by staunch Republicans, who on that basis were driven to give evidence against him to the Imperial State! How absurd!

Darragh did nothing to relieve the incredulity with which many of his millions of viewers must have responded to that statement by Adams. But the programme-makers knew very well that Hughes and Price had come to hate Adams because he launched a Peace Process that stopped the war.

Here is Adams' reply as broadcast:

"*Question:* Brendan Hughes has alleged that there was only one man who gave the order for . . . Jean McConville to be executed. That man is now the head of Sinn Fein . . . Did you give the order for the execution of Jean McConville?"

Adams: No, I had no act or part to play in either the abduction, the killing or the burial of Jean McConville, or indeed any of these other individuals. And Brendan is telling lies. You know himself and Dolours Price, opponents of the Sinn Fein leadership, opponents of our strategy, from their point of view, and obviously I profoundly disagree with them, they see us as having sold out. They see us as traitors. And they also have their own demons to deal with, and their allegations have to be set in that context."

Not all the people whose evidence against Adams figured in the programme were dead. There were two who were alive. Unfortunately they were also anonymous. Darragh confronted Adams with the evidence of one of these ghostly entities and he dealt with it appropriately.

A fifth appeared in person. There were two disappearances from Crossmaglen. Darragh introduced his witness about them as follows:

"Whatever you say, say nothing, is a local mantra. But there is one man who knows this place and isn't afraid to speak up. Martin McAllister is a former member of the IRA's South Armagh Brigade, with the scars and the prison terms to prove it.

Question: Who carried out these disappearances?

McAllister: It would have been the local IRA...."

McAllister's testimony began in the subjunctive, and so it continued. There was no factual detail. There was no who, why, when, and where. There was only speculation that the IRA must have been responsible, and that if Adams didn't know it was probably because he didn't want to know.

But the interview was not without interest. McAllister said the reason for the disappearances was—

"a very simple one. The community, the local community, the ordinary decent people would not have put up with it. So, no claim, no blame. Everybody was aware what had happened to them. The fact that they didn't leave them at the side of the road, so to speak, saved their own grace a little."

If everybody was aware of what had happened, what was it that the community would not have supported? Leaving bodies at the side of the road? Things had to be done discreetly.

The role of Crossmaglen in the War might have been dwelt on a bit. By the 1990s the IRA had been heavily penetrated by British Intelligence. It was rendered incapable of major operations everywhere except South Armagh. And, when the Peace Process was stalled in the mid-Nineties, it was given a fillip by South Armagh placing a very big bomb in the City of London.

There was in fact a sixth witness against Adams, live and not anonymous: Billy McKee, one of the founders of the Provisional IRA. He was presented as the honest terrorist who executed people, no problem, but never buried them. He said the IRA in Belfast was stronger under his command in 1970 than it had been at any time since 1920. That was certainly true. It was much stronger in 1970 than in 1920. It was stronger even than it had been in 1922 at the time of the Treatyite invasion of Northern Ireland, when Whitehall allowed its Treatyite Provisional Government of the 26 Counties to invade the

recently-constituted Northern Ireland region of the United Kingdom in May 1922, with the object of disconcerting the Anti-Treaty forces, before instructing it to make war on the Anti-Treatyites in June.

The new IRA of 1970 was not only stronger numerically than that of 1920, but was a body of a different kind. In 1920 the Northern IRA was the tail of the all-Ireland IRA which was at war with Britain—which refused to recognise the elected Government in Ireland. In 1922, with the Border drawn, the IRA in the North was used as a pawn by the Treatyite Provisional Government in its efforts to consolidate the position in which Whitehall had placed it in the 26 Counties. The Anti-Treatyites were appealed to for support in the invasion to knock down the new Northern Ireland Government. Many of them from around the country responded to the call and so the volunteers were at hand to be rounded up when Collins received orders from Whitehall to make war on the Anti-Treatyites.

The campaign of 1922 had a delusory object—to destroy the Northern Ireland Government, which, however, had no independent existence, and was merely a device of the British State. The Six County IRA went into action in alliance with the Free State invasion force in May 1922, and was then abandoned to its fate in June. Material and moral collapse followed the Free State betrayal.

A small core group kept itself in being during the following decades. It engaged in escapades which had an enlivening influence on the spirit of the nationalist community, but major actions were out of the question.

Darragh McIntyre told us that:

"Gerry Adams joined the IRA around 1966. He rose up the ranks quickly... Interned... in June 1972, the 23 year old Volunteer was released to represent the IRA at talks with the British Government. Later the same year... he was promoted to the post of Officer Commanding... the Belfast Brigade."

But, supposing it to be the case that Adams joined an Army in 1966 and was commander of a Belfast Brigade of an Army in 1972, the Army in which he commanded the Belfast Brigade in 1972 was not the Army he joined in 1966. And it is inconceivable that the British/Irish programme makers did not know that.

The 1966 Army, following the fiasco of its action in the Summer of 1969, became the Official IRA when a new Army was formed during the Winter of 1969-70 under

the impact of the Unionist madness of August 1969. The organisers of the new IRA, the Provisionals, were people who had been expelled from the IRA, or marginalised within it, during the 'modernisation' of the late 1960s. But the bulk membership of the new IRA was composed of people who for the most part had taken no part in Republican affairs before the wild Unionist assault on nationalist West Belfast in August 1969.

One of the slogans of the reform agitation of 1968-9 was "*British rights for British citizens*". The Unionist regime was seen as the body that withheld British rights from the nationalist community in Northern Ireland. The Unionists declared that Ulster was British, so the nationalists campaigned for British rights, only to find the Unionists refusing them. But Britain had no ideology of 'rights', apart from the politics of government. And Northern Ireland was excluded from the politics of British government. It was because of that exclusion that the Unionist regime existed as the form of the British State in the Six counties. And the Unionists were no less excluded from the political life of British democracy than were the Nationalists.

The prevailing view amongst those who were being radicalised by the agitation of 1968-9 was that, because of certain post-1945 developments in Europe, Partition had become irrelevant. And many of them had, furthermore, a healthy scepticism about life South of the Border—which was invariably referred to as the Free State, with all the pejorative overtones of that term.

And yet a war came to be fought with the nominal object of abolishing Partition. This happened because British politics was closed to the Northern Ireland populace, and because there were old IRA men—rejected by the modernisers—to hand when the event happened that ensured that life in Northern Ireland would never again be what it had been since 1923.

It was not the effects of Partition as such that ensured the rapid growth of the new Army. It was the effects of the devolved regime of communal Unionism, which the Westminster Government interposed between itself and the populace of the Six Counties, cutting the region off from the representative government of the state and the democratic politics by which it operated.

The fact that the formal aim of the new Republican movement was not directed at the actual source of the discontent of the

Catholic community was virtually certain to lead to tensions between the post-August membership and the pre-August leadership.

According to Brendan Hughes' account, the move which led to the ousting of the old leadership began in the mid-1970s in a prison collaboration between himself, Ivor Bell and Adams. They decided that the leadership of Billy McKee (who was a long-standing friend of the Hughes family) had to be ended. The issue which brought on this decision was the response of the leadership to the British Government's efforts to bring about civil war, during its 1974-5 Ceasefire with the IRA, with which it had a 'hot-line' communication.

Here is Hughes' account:

"There were communications from the outside leadership to the prisoners... telling us that 'We have fought the British to a standstill, the British want out...' At the same time... Protestants were getting shot, Catholics were getting shot. But there were no British getting shot. I was... getting more and more frustrated... I was sharing a cubicle with Gerry Adams at the time and I packed my gear. By this time the INLA had been formed and had prisoners in Cage 13, and I was heading there. I was going to leave the Republican movement and join the INLA. They had just been formed from a split within the Workers' Party. I was talked out of it by Gerry and remained. He convinced me that the only way to defeat these people was to oppose them from within... they'd be quite happy for me to walk away. But here we were in this situation; it was very demoralising. We then got the word that we must prepare for civil war and, Jesus Christ... we had to start training for that possibility... The British were pulling out and the Loyalists were going to rebel...

"At one time, I actually advocated shooting the Belfast leadership, which Gerry and Ivor were opposed to...

"This sectarian war that the British were able to manipulate the IRA into was part of the Ulsterisation of security... We started to hear words like 'God-fathers', 'Chicago-type killings'. The British sent a guy, Peter Jay, as Ambassador to America, and he went there to convince the Americans that this was a sectarian war here and the British were caught in the middle. The IRA had facilitated this image..." (p193-4).

It is no misrepresentation or exaggeration of Government policy to say that it tried to bring about civil war. When the Labour Secretary of State, Merlyn Rees, failed to crush the Unionist Strike against the establishment of a Council Of Ireland (under the Sunningdale arrangements) while Dublin continued to assert sovereignty over the North, he suggested that the Strike meant the end of Ulster

Unionism. *Times* correspondent, Robert Fisk, was inspired to write a book about *The Strike That Broke The British In Ulster*, or words to that effect. Rees declared that Protestant Ulster had renounced the Union and become Ulster Nationalist. In the face of this development, Rees told Loyalists, the Government had decided to end the Union. He arranged Conferences abroad, at which Loyalist paramilitaries were indoctrinated with Ulster nationalism, and urged to get ready for war with the Provos as the British Army withdrew. (See *Against Ulster Nationalism*, a BICO pamphlet of the mid-1970s, which was published as a book in 1992 about this.)

That was "*Ulsterization*". If the Provos had accepted it as setting a new framework for the War, something like the 1922 situation brought about by the Treatyite pseudo-invasion would have happened.

With the rise of a new leadership from the 1969 generation, a political adaptation to Northern realities was brought about. Spectacular retaliations in kind to Loyalist atrocities were phased out. It was tacitly admitted that the unification of Ireland by force was an unachievable object. The leadership felt its way towards an achievable object—a drastic alteration of the internal mode of Six County sub-government which would enhance the power of the nationalist community and then bring about an alteration of relations between the Catholic and Protestant communities.

That this was happening became evident about ten years after Adams dissuaded Hughes from shooting Billy McKee.

McKee has reason to be resentful. The movement of which he was the initial leader was taken from him. And because it was taken from him, it did not merely fail to bring about a United Ireland, but achieved something else.

McKee's contribution to the BBC/RTE propaganda operation against Adams is remarkably short of relevant factual detail.

A serious effort is being made to undo the interim settlement that has been made under Adams' leadership. The Jean Mc Conville incident is being given worldwide publicity by the two States only because it is thought that would help to drive Adams out of politics.

If the Fianna Fail leader could get rid of Adams at the cost of undermining the Northern settlement, who can doubt that he would do it? So apparently would the SDLP. And the Official Unionists (politically advised by Lord Bew and other mem-

bers of the IRA in the critical years following the signing of the Good Friday Agreement), are acting as a fundamentalist pressure on the DUP. So it is conceivable that the Adams variant on Republicanism might be destroyed. And we gather that arrangements for reconstituting the IRA as an effective force in case of that eventuality are quietly being made by mainstream Republicans who have little in common with the mentality of the super-revolutionaries who have joined with Fianna Fail *et al* in the propaganda against Adams that is facilitated by the two States.

Eamon McCann, in a comment on the programme in his *Irish Times* column (Nov. 13), joined the prosecution. In a rare media comment on Adams' remark that his warmongering super-revolutionary Republican opponents looked on him as a traitor because he made peace, and that their allegations should be seen in that perspective, McCann said that Adams' treason had caused his opponents to tell the truth about him, not to tell lies. He did not reveal how he knows this.

McCann is an adherent of revolutionary socialism of the kind that facilitates a journalistic career in the capitalist press. His party, the Trotskyist Socialist Workers' Party, declared unconditional support for the Provisionals' war effort. "*Unconditional but not uncritical*" support is how we remember it being put.

This journal opposed the War. Its founders took no part in the 'civil rights' agitation of 1968-9. They played a part in defending the Falls against the Unionist pogrom in August 1969 but then urged a different course than warfare to establish ground for socialist unity. However, when an actual war situation was brought about, they recognised it as a fact that had gone beyond the remit of the criminal law and become a Constitutional issue beyond the capacity of the legal system of the state. We looked on Internment in 1971 as a kind of prisoner-of-war status appropriate to a war situation. We did not support the anti-Internment campaign for criminalisation. (And, when this succeeded, it was followed by a campaign for political status for convicted prisoners, i.e. for internment conditions.)

The mere advocacy of peace in a war situation is futile unless it is connected with a policy directed at the causes of the war. Therefore we never supported the spectacular Peace Movements that were given worldwide publicity by the propaganda apparatuses of the two States. We treated them as mere expressions of groundless pacifist idealism, and, in a

world whose practices are largely the creation of British Imperialism, pacifist idealism has little grasp on reality. Those great Peace Movements withered as easily as they had sprouted.

Our first alternative to war was that Dublin should recognise the communal/religious division in the North as a national division, and should repeal the sovereignty claim as a precondition of engaging in discussion with Ulster Unionists. That proposal was instantly shot down by Taoiseach Lynch, who asserted that Partition was the cause of the trouble in the North and so the ending of Partition was necessary to peace.

Treating that view as nationalist Utopianism, we looked for a settlement within the UK on the basis of ending the exclusion of the North from the democratic political life of the state, and we campaigned for that for twenty years before concluding that the united opposition of London, Dublin and Ulster Unionism rendered it hopeless.

We addressed the question of how it was possible for a war situation to come about, and be sustained for a quarter of a century, in the most experienced democratic State in Europe. We concluded that it was because this region of the State was excluded from the democracy of the State—a thing which is found nowhere else in the world. And exclusion from the democracy of the State hinges on exclusion from the party system of the state.

In last month's *Irish Political Review* Michael Stack gave a vivid account of how, in what we call democracy, people are disempowered by the party system which is central to it. But, such as it is, it is effective. It is the means by which the oligarchic mode of representative government had a general franchise attached to it so that it could be called democratic, and the old system be largely preserved at the same time. It is the means—perhaps because it is disempowering—by which internal peace was maintained in the British State during a period of great change. When the Six Counties were detached from the Irish state to remain part of the British, they were excluded from this feature of the British State.

Northern Ireland is a kind of false front on the British State, established at the moment when Britain found it necessary to allow most of Ireland to have something like independent government. And it can hardly be doubted that its purpose was to facilitate continuing Whitehall influence over Irish affairs as a whole. If, when the country was Partitioned by Britain—the

Six Counties had simply been included in the democracy of the British State, it seems highly probable that the nationalist community would quickly have found a place in British politics. In that event Partition would not have been a central issue in Irish politics, and a distraction from the independent development of the 26 County state/.

We concluded that it was the exclusion of the Six Counties from the democracy of the state that preserved and aggravated the antagonism of Protestant and Catholic on which the devolved system was imposed in 1921. And, in the era of democracy, which Britain was loudest in proclaiming, democracy cannot, with impunity, be flouted as brazenly as Britain has flouted it in its Northern Ireland region.

Brendan Hughes was a revolutionary socialist. Within British democracy it is usual for revolutionary socialists to evolve into pillars of the state.

Hughes said:

"My father was a Republican, but I think, foremost, he was a socialist. At that period in the 1960s, up to 1969, Republican socialists did not have a great deal going for them, and so my father was a constant British Labour voter. He was always voting for the Labour Party because there wasn't an alternative, but, when we talk about socialism and socialists and the ideology of socialism, I think Catholic Nationalist people at that time were largely socialists at heart. They... could not quote Marx or Engels or anyone else, but by and large they were working-class socialists... During that time in Belfast you were either Protestant or Catholic and the alternatives weren't great. That's how my father finished up voting for the Labour Party" (*Voices*, p29-30).

Ed Moloney, when editing the extracts from the Boston Tapes, must have known that it couldn't have been the case that Hughes' father voted British Labour for lack of an alternative. British Labour would have been the alternative to voting Catholic or Protestant. Moloney, an Englishman and a journalist, could not have failed to notice that, when he moved from England to Belfast, he moved out of the sphere of operation of British politics. (Hughes' father could only have voted for a 6 County party that called itself Labour, but was excluded from the Labour Party of the state.)

It is a remarkable fact that people bred to familiarity with a particular political system tend not to see it as a whole, but to have their vision confined within it. But an English political journalist moving to Northern Ireland could not fail to notice

that he moved out of British politics. Moloney preferred not to comment on this fact. Presumably he understood that his career prospects would diminish greatly if he did comment on it. The British ruling circles which arranged that his should be the case also arranged that it should not be noticed, or at least not commented on, by 'investigative journalists', who depend very largely on Government goodwill, or by 'political scientists' paid for by the State.

But the fact of exclusion from the British democratic set-up remained a fact, though not commented on by journalists or political scientists, and the lines of opportunist progress to the corridors of power for revolutionary socialists, carefully kept open in Britain, were kept tightly shut in Northern Ireland. (Lord Bew's transition to the Lords as a member of the Official IRA occurred outside the political system and is of no political significance. What is significant is that this rather startling event has scarcely been noticed, except by the *London Review Of Books*. Carroll Professor Roy Foster, for example, makes no mention of it in a CV with which he prefaces a review of Bew's book on Parnell in the *London Review Of Books*, 13 December 2007. He merely describes him as "a graduate of the Peoples Democracy marches as well as of the Cambridge history faculty". (But a later reviewer in the magazine made good the omission.)

The revolutionary socialist in Northern Ireland was subject to none of the opportunist temptation which lured him into the Establishment in Britain. So Brendan Hughes just kept on being a revolutionary socialist while exercising his tactical military talent in the Provos. And, when the War ended in a settlement that was not a socialist revolution, he was a lost soul, repeating the age-old cry that the revolution had not failed but was betrayed. And who betrayed it? The Catholics, it seems:

"People like Billy were about protecting the Catholic people whereas we were developing into... a revolutionary organisation that wanted much more than that. I mean, who gave a fuck if Loyalists blew up the Catholic church... we weren't there to protect the Catholic church... we were there to bring about a united Ireland. The old Brigade attitude was: 'We must protect the Catholic religion; we must protect our faith'. We were developing into an organisation that really didn't care about such things. Certainly I was, and so was Ivor. Ivor was anti-religion. Gerry was still very much in the religious mould but a modernised religious mould. And to this day I'm not sure exactly where his thoughts were. I mean, I shared a cubicle with him, and when I was reading Che Guevara and

Fidel Castro speeches he was saying his rosary. There was always that sort of contradiction: here he was, a revolutionary socialist, yet he was very much involved in his religion and his Catholicism which conflicted [with] what we were trying to achieve. But I think because of the friendship and the comradeship that had built up during the early 1970s most of those apparent contradictions were put aside because we were fighting a war. And the main thing was to fight the war" (*Voices* p196). Omissions are Moloney's).

The war was the thing. But for Hughes it had become a war without a purpose. A war for Utopia. A visionary war in the proper sense of the term. Carroll Professor Foster has disparaged the War of Independence as visionary, but the policies which the elected Government of 1919 sought to implement were entirely practical. All that stood in the way of them was the Imperialist militarism of Westminster. But what realisable object did Hughes, Price etc—who are now championed by Fianna Fail against Adams—want to keep on fighting for?

They were desperadoes in the upheaval precipitated by the 1969 pogrom. Wars need desperadoes. But wars also need realisable purposes. That war was given a false purpose by the circumstances of 1969, a purpose which did not relate to its effective cause. Adams' offence was to give it a realisable purpose, related to its cause.

*

The programme was interlarded with readings by Seamus Heaney from his poems, which seemed to be about undead corpses being conscious of their decomposition in bog-holes.

Against Ulster Nationalism,

A Review of Northern Ireland Politics in the Aftermath of the 1974 UWC General Strike, with Insights into the Development of the Catholic and Protestant Communities, their interaction, and their relation to Britain, in Reply to Tom Nairn and Others by Brendan Clifford.

88pp. £10, £8

Northern Ireland What Is It?

Professor Mansergh Changes His Mind by Brendan Clifford.

278pp. £24, £20

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

Ann Cadwallader: Lethal Allies (Mercier Press, £15)

reviewed by John Morgan, Lt.Col. (retd.), author of

The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings, 1974, a military analysis

With Friends Like That!

Lethal Allies is by Anne Cadwallader. The sub-title is *British Collusion In Ireland*. Maybe this should be "Unofficial". Or, better still, "Official". That's it: "*Official British Collusion In Ireland*". That's more like it. To paraphrase a famous jurist: *Keep your friends fanciful and stay absurd*.

The author gives the British an easy ride (the Officials). Amid all the fanfare, as the trumpets blare, the Officials ride into the sunset. The famous 'Vampire' gets no mention. (He is shunned in the *Barron Report* too, except for a foray South of the Border.) Not a word about his arming of the Monaghan Bomb in 1974. The extraordinary vulnerability of the Republic is barely alluded to. Nothing of the *carte blanche* for the Officials in the North. Nor the Siesta Time in the South.

This book is a chronology of events. The manipulators show a clean pair of heels. Not laughing. Just smiling to themselves. In the book *The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings, 1974, a military view*, published by Belfast Historical and Educational Society, with Foreword and Afterword by Angela Clifford, I tried to wipe the smile off their faces. Fat chance. It's not easy. They hide behind the truth. They have a huge apparatus. They have strange friends in surprising places. Their tentacles are everywhere. Eventually, they isolate you. You're left talking to yourself.

Please see *The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings, 1974* by Self:

"Professor Peter Branyaz, Emeritus Professor of Desmodintology at the University of Sputenberg, stated: "Bats have been given a bad press. They are quite docile and can be easily pacified by being maintained, permanently, on a blood drip."

"Our own 'Vampire' was back in England. A happy man. Then he hears stirrings. There are some moves afoot. He begins to watch. Anxiously. He'd got away with it: Or had he? Is it ever over? Now he's impotent. Hoping the line will hold.

"The case against him was as follows. He was stationed in Portadown. This was the cock-pit. He was a bomb-expert. He had a history of atrocious deeds. He was *sans merci*. He worked also for MI5. It was in control. His Brigade Area of Influence was the Republic, particularly the Monaghan/Louth area. He operated there too with Irish Special Branch links.

He would visit Dublin to meet contacts. He had nerve. He was restless in the cause. He had UDR, RUC, UVF contacts in Portadown. He was identified as arming the Monaghan Bomb" (p149).

One day, at a loose end, I was walking for town. On foot. (Stuff the Bus-Pass.) Moving freely. Not a care in the world. Oh, foolish me. Little did I know. I headed off, leaving Bancroft in Tallaforma. This is the false-alarm-ringing Capital of 'the ciddy'. Into Templeogue. Sharp left at the Bridge. Down Wainsfort, to the K.C.R., Mount Argus. I passed a Sculptor's Yard at Harold's Cross, oppose the Bow-Wows. (All those torn docketts.) And there it was. Staring at me. My headstone. Bearing my own name. Plain and unadorned. It was not even a Celtic Cross.

After the initial shock, I liked it. It said it all. Yes, I was looking at my headstone, alright. I shook myself and moved on. Gong on into the bowels of 'the ciddy'. Staggering a bit. Slightly dazed. Feeling my way. Gingerly. Getting there. It had begun to rain. I was busy dodging umbrellas. Duck - - - duck - - - ducking. I got a poke in the eye. The right one.

I made it to Grogan's. All roads lead to Grogan's. You could meet anyone in Grogan's. Especially if you're not careful. I sat down. Doyle's Corner. Tommy Smith gave me the usual. Barry's. Teabags. He knows where my heart lies. My stomach, I mean. No sugar. A drop of *bainne*. Barely stirred. He knows I'm a bit fussy. I never blow on it. Anyway, the Feeney Fallers have had it. So have the others. No. Not the tea, dope. Their come-uppance.

Tommy is looking at my funny. "*Are you alright? You are looking all shook up!*"

"*I think I've seen a ghost.*" I've gone pale.

"*Well, there's ghosts and ghosts*", says Tommy.

"*But, I recognised this one.*" I was rubbing my eye and thinking of the sirloin in the butcher's window.

"*This place is full of ghosts.*" Tommy shifts on his seat. "*The way things are going, they'll soon have the place to themselves.*" He looks about. "*No one's buying. 'Tis the same in Kilnaleck.*"

The moment is loaded. The universe

begins and ends in Kilnaleck. Stories begin there, but always return. To Kilnaleck. Maybe they start in Manhattan. The Bronx. Anywhere. But back they come. To Kilnaleck.

Tommy muses. "*Ca-a-van. Aye. Aye.*" He's thinking of the Polo Grounds. In '47. And all those cousins. There's a faraway look in his eyes. Suddenly he stands. He picks up a towel and polishes the counter, before flicking at an imaginary fly. "*Crack!*"

"*More tay?*" he enquires. "*Another pot. Right yous are. Aye. Another pot.*"

A few days later, I passed the Sculptor's Yard again. The monument was still there. Looking back. A chill ran down my spine. Then, one day, I summoned up some courage. I'd have to confront my demons. I went and spoke to the sculptor. I asked if anyone had intentions about me. Like, future plans. Was I getting a one-way ticket? He laughed. He was a jolly sort. He explained things. It was meant for another. Payment awaited. Relieved, I departed. If ever I got lucky, I'd cough up for that headstone. Spit into the palm. Shake on it. But, no shekels, no jingles.

One day it was gone. Resting in peace. Anyway, I'd decided on a 'smoke and scatter' for myself. Headstones. Forget it. About this time, I'd become involved with a different headstone. What is it about headstones? Now, with a woman named 'Mary', I'd negotiated with Dublin Corporation regarded erecting a memorial to the victims of Dublin/Monaghan Bombings, 1974. Nothing had been done up to then. After an exchange of letters, the Corpo agreed to placing a headstone near The Garden Of Remembrance.

The inscription I'd penned was accepted by the Corpo. Mary retained a copy of this letter, to which she'd given her approval. Subsequently this headstone was unveiled by Alderman Donnelly, FF, the then Lord Mayor of Dublin. It was replaced later by a larger monument in Talbot Street. The original headstone lies in Glasnevin Cemetery. My connection with headstones persists. There it now lies. Bearing my words. Not my name. My words. I know this. Mary knows this. The Corpo knows this. My inscription is chiselled in stone. But some others have their own agenda. They'd pen a different book. The case has been altered. I'm not to be mentioned. Best referred to as "*Another*".

Lethal Allies deals with the Troubles. It relies heavily on HET, it appears. This is the Historical Enquiries Team, described as a police unit established to review all conflict-related deaths, answerable to the

Chief Constable of the Police Service, Northern Ireland. The book goes into detail, though some doubts were cast upon HET, where members of the British armed forces (on official duty) were held responsible for deaths in certain situations. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary has found it to be so. But does this include those on "*unofficial duty*"? What about those "*not on official duty*"? Is this just obfuscation? I can't be sure. Wouldn't you think some of them might have gone to the Brothers! No wonder I speak such proper English!

By the way, MI5 and MI6 are listed as responsible for "*Counter intelligence*", domestic and foreign, respectively. This leaves a big gap. No one appears to be held responsible for Intelligence. Or is this the famous declining order: Human, animal, military! (Goes to show I know my place, anyway.)

The 'Biggie' occurred on Friday, 17th May 1974. Dublin and Monaghan were devastated. 34 were killed. Hundreds were wounded. As I explained in my book, the Bombings consisted of a professional operation, including a Main Attack (Dublin) and a Supporting Attack (Monaghan). It had the attributes of the Military. Sought maximum casualties (a coincidental Bus Strike in Dublin that day spared many). The participants were mainly UVF, with some UDA. Most were from the Portadown area. Most have been identified. It was an official Brit Military operation.

Three streets in Dublin centre were chosen with tactical nous. The bombers avoided pit-falls. Three bomb-cars were used in Dublin. There were two scout-cum-getaway cars employed. The three bombs were brought in a poultry-truck by Robin Jackson (The Jackal). They had been collected that same day in James Mitchell's farmstead in Glennane, in South Armagh. The bomb-truck, the three bomb-cars and two scout-cars came down through the heart of the Republic, free from intervention. They all crossed The Boyne at Oldbridge (the Obelisk Bridge). They crossed at intervals. They assembled in the car-park of the Coachman's Inn, close to Dublin Airport. The bombs were allotted. British Army personnel did the preparations and they departed.

So did the three laden bomb-cars for the targetted streets: Parnell St., Talbot St. and South Leinster St. They were

The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings, 1974,
a military analysis, by *John Morgan, Lt. Col (Retd.).* 248pp. **£20, £17.50**

detonated simultaneously, in military manner, at 17.30 hours. The bombers withdrew in the getaway cars. They crossed back. Their withdrawal was at 19.00 hours as the Supporting Attack (Monaghan) completed its diversionary task.

The town of Monaghan had remained open all the while—despite what had happened in Dublin.

All bombers (Dublin and Monaghan) had crossed back into the North by now.

There was no Security in the Republic, even though the Ulster Workers' Council Strike had erupted in the North on 15th May and continued. Some Security heads in the Republic had shown the Blind Eye. They were pursuing their own agenda. They were playing at being God. They knew of the planned British vengeance. They'd let it occur. Their Government would have to come down then on the subversives. They'd have to seal the Border. Too late, maybe. But, never too late!

The three bomb cars had been taken in East Belfast and driven to Portadown. There, in an identified garage-yard, they were made ready for the Dublin trip.

The Vampire (a known British Explosive Ordnance Disposal officer) armed the Monaghan Bomb, near Ward's Cross (a Border crossing). He was assisted by a known Ulster Defence Regiment officer. The Vampire came to Dublin, some months afterwards. He continued to stick in his snout. He was rewarded by medals, too, in Bucks Palace.

Two Assembly Areas had been employed. One in Mitchell's Farm (the three Dublin bombs). The other, in the afore-mentioned garage yard near Portadown (for three three bomb-cars for Dublin). A secluded route was used. They crossed at Oldbridge. The Forming Up Point was in the car-park of the Coachman's Inn. Onwards towards the city.

The bomb-streets in Dublin were well chosen. They ran parallel. They led to rail and bus-stations. Sufficiently apart in the event of interception or discovery. Allowing for withdrawal by isolating the "*freed zone*", west of O'Connell Street. The streets were crowded, filled with potential victims.

After the Monaghan attack, the Dublin and Monaghan bombers crossed back into the North safely. The whole operation was well thought out. It had been long planned. It took some months to organise, as I explain in my book.

Nothing like this was conducted before or since. The risks were great. It had possible international repercussions. It had the highest sanction, Intelligence and Military.

The collaborators in the Republic went to ground. The fuss blew over. The politicians let it pass. The fall-out from a proper investigation could not be contemplated. The vista was appalling.

But the British must have laughed. Afterwards.

I learnt little about Dublin/Monaghan from *Lethal Allies*. But, with Friends Like That! Who needs them? *Lethal Allies* states:

"The 2003 Barron Report reached a series of disturbing conclusions... It was "neither fanciful nor absurd" to believe that members of the Northern Ireland security forces could have been involved. It was likely that individual members of the UDR and RUC had participated, or were at least aware at the planning stage ..."

Unfortunately this overstates the findings of the report. For Barron goes on to say that Loyalists were capable of carrying out the bombings on their own, without assistance from the security forces.

Barron, having outlined possible scenarios, refused to draw definite conclusions about Official involvement in the absence of conclusive evidence. But, by the way he is quoted in *Lethal Allies*, he is given an undeserved credibility.

Barron's Report was error-ridden, requiring Errata when he was cornered.

One error was: "*The bombings had been carried out by two UVF gangs, one based in Belfast and the other around Portadown/Lurgan*". This is not quite true. One gang had taken the bomb-cars in East Belfast. Perhaps with owners' agreement. The other gang was from Portadown area. Both gangs were under UVF aegis. But some were UDA. They'd come together for big hits.

He understated the role played by RUC Reservist, James Mitchell, when he says his farm at Glennane "*was likely to have played a significant part in the preparation for the attacks*".

Barron admits that some of those involved had good relationships with the RUC and British Intelligence, adding that the RUC had good intelligence within a short time to suggest who was responsible: he should have said it was known 'before the event'.

Moreover, he categorically refused to accept that there was collusion on the Irish side, denying that such accusations had

been made against the Government, the Army or Garda Síochána. But I did make such a case, suggesting collusion at senior level in the Garda Síochána (The Submission I made to Barron is reproduced in the Dublin/Monaghan book.)

However, Barron finds that the Garda investigation ended prematurely and suggests that loyalist relationships with the RUC could have been a contributing factor, preventing information being passed on. In fact, it was Irish gardai 'relationships' with British Intelligence and/or RUC Special Branch officers at senior level that ran the investigation into the ground.

He refused to accept my presentation that Irish security at a senior level had deliberately left the South undefended, putting no precautionary security measures into place at a time of turmoil in the North.

Barron admits that the Irish Government showed little interest in the bombings. When information was given to it suggesting that the British authorities had intelligence naming the bombers, it was not followed up. (The Irish Government needs to explain why.)

Ann Cadwallader quotes Sir Arthur Galsworthy, as follows:

"In the wake of the bombings, the British Ambassador reported back to the Foreign Office on the mood in Dublin... 'there is now a much keener realisation of the Republic's vulnerability to acts of terrorism spilling over from the North and recognition of the direction connection between this and continued violence by PIRA.'

"At a British cabinet meeting between both Governments on 11 September 1974, Merlyn Rees said he believed people interned during the UWC Strike were responsible for the 'Dublin bombings'. He also provided names, but no action was taken.

"On 18 September, at Baldonnel military aerodrome {sic}... attendees included N.I. Secretary of State Merlyn Rees, Irish Minister for Justice Paddy Cooney, RUC Chief Constable Sir James Flanagan, Garda Commissioner Patrick Malone and senior civil servants from both sides. The minutes are remarkable for the unwitting testimony they provide of Irish ministers and senior gardai failing to raise the Dublin and Monaghan bombings... or to express any concerns about loyalists crossing the border into the Republic. Instead Minister Paddy Cooney invited suggestions from the British, on measures that the Irish Government might take against IRA bombers."

In 2011, on the anniversary of the Bombings, the British Monarch made a visit to the Garden of Remembrance. Nearby, in Talbot Street the relatives and

survivors stood at the commemoration monument; Ignored by the Great and the Good in an act of great insensitivity. Despite the status of the Irish as citizens (unlike the mere *subject* status of the British), they were still consigned to inferiority.

In an act of effrontery, recently, the incumbent British Ambassador advised on the parity of esteem now between the one-time Dublin rebels of 1916 and Her Majesty's military; one of whom, Major Harold Heathcote, 6 and 7 Sherwood Foresters, was the officer in charge of the firing-squads for the fourteen executions in Kilmainham Goal, consequent to the Rebellion. *O tempora, O mores!* Fourteen times his revolver administered the *coup de grace*.

Writing of a sparrow he found dead on his doorstep on a day of Winter, and the pathos involved, P.H. Pearse expressed things:

O little Bird

O little bird!
Cold to me thy lying on the flag;
Bird, that never had an evil thought,
Pitiful the coming of death to thee!

DIGGING

I went to a garden-centre the other day
looking for compost
and was offered
sacks of sacred soil
full of ghosts,
bone-chippings as if someone
had been flayed,
dried blood now alive
from fields rain-soaked,
milked from those who had croaked,
(imported from poor little Belgium)
traces of Wild-Geese Irish as grunge,
a brass button here, a corroded I.D.
disk there,
traces of khaki in shredded tears,
a fossilised voice-box that droned,
(I swear I heard a moan)
a point 303 bullet
stuck in a gullet.
Says I: 'What does it grow—just
spread it and use the hoe,
to grow cabbages, potatoes and sprouts?'
He laughed: 'Maybe, but don't go growing
Krauts.
No, feed the nation,
help its incarnation,
grow war,
it needs human flesh
this Minotaur.

Wilson John Haire
2 November 2013

Shorts

from
the Long Fellow

ACC BANK

It is sad to record that ACC Bank will be winding down its operations. There are about 470 people currently employed. 180 will be made redundant immediately and the remainder will be employed in its debt collection service. Presumably, even those remaining will be let go as the outstanding debts are collected or written off.

The parent company Rabobank has provided 1.3 billion in capital to the bank since 2008. Over 2.1 billion of the loan book has been written off since 2008 (RTE News, 25.10.13). It posted losses of 219 million last year (*Ir. Times*, 25.10.13).

The original *Agricultural Credit Corporation* bank was set up by the State in 1927 to provide credit for the Agricultural sector. It was so successful that in 1933 Sean Lemass set up the *Industrial Credit Corporation* to provide credit for industry.

Both State banks were sold off and became victims of foreign acquisitions and the property bubble. The *Industrial Credit Corporation* was bought by Bank of Scotland in 2001. Rabobank bought the Agricultural Credit Corporation the following year. Privatisation resulted in the banks moving away from lending for productive purposes to property development. The only consolation in the sorry mess is that at least the catastrophic losses of Bank of Scotland and ACC were not borne by the Irish State.

FOREIGN BANKS IN IRELAND

A strong case could be made that the arrival of foreign banks in Ireland after the Euro was a major factor in our banking crisis. At the time of their arrival the Irish media heralded it as "*shaking up*" the banking sector in this country. Well, foreign competition certainly did that and we are living with the disastrous consequences.

On RTE's *Drivetime* (25.10.13) there was a discussion of the possibility that ACC's parent company Rabobank will pull out of Ireland. The *Cantillon* column in *The Irish Times* (26.10.13) also expressed concern that *Royal Bank of Scotland* would wind down its Irish operation *Ulster Bank*.

The foreign banks in this country are not under any pressure from the Irish State to lend to Irish business. Their main

strategy is to Hoover up Irish deposits. The problem with this is that deposits enable banks to provide credit. Credit is not created out of thin air. So, the foreign banks are undermining the ability of Irish banks to provide badly needed credit.

One of the very good measures in the recent Budget was the bank levy which will apply to Irish and Foreign banks operating in the State. The levy will be proportional to the value of deposits. If as a consequence of this the foreign banks exit the Irish market, it would be a tragedy for the diminishing number of their Irish employees, but otherwise it might be a good thing.

THE DEATH OF YUGOSLAVIA

The recent death of Marshall Tito's widow, Jovanka Broz, evokes memories of Yugoslavia's demise. Tito rose to power during the struggle against fascism in the Second World War. He was born in Croatia; had his political base in Montenegro; and became leader of Yugoslavia whose capital was the Serbian city of Belgrade.

Churchill supported Tito, because unlike the Serbian Chetniks his actions were not constrained by NAZI reprisals against the local population. Stalin, on the other hand, urged an alliance with bourgeois patriotic elements.

Tito was the most orthodox of Communists in the aftermath of the War. He thought that Socialist development would dissolve nationalist divisions and that he could succeed Stalin as the leader of a Socialist United States. His Bulgarian rival Georgi Dimitrov, who had been the leader of the Communist International, held similar views. Tito and Dimitrov initiated a Balkan union between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia which it was envisaged would include other Socialist states. Moscow's initial support waned when it saw the new political organisation take independent foreign policy initiatives. Stalin was particularly concerned at provocative actions in relation to Greece. The Soviet leader, unlike Tito, was prepared to accept that this country was part of the Western sphere of influence. The Bulgarian leadership began to fear Yugoslav encroachments of its country's sovereignty and concluded that it was not in its interests to abandon its alliance with the Soviet Union. The ailing health of Dimitrov was another factor in the dissolution of the Balkan union.

The Soviet/Yugoslav split of 1948 was over foreign policy rather than any disagreement over economics or Communist doctrine.

Subsequently, Yugoslavia developed along "market socialist" lines. Self

governing enterprises were allowed operate in a free market environment and the State was opened up to foreign capital. This resulted in unemployment and inflation. While there might have been greater freedom for ordinary citizens in Yugoslavia, Tito was ruthless in dealing with political opponents. But his centralised political control was not enough to prevent the emergence of national bourgeois interests.

Tito died in 1980 and therefore did not witness the breaking up of both the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia into constituent nation states: the very opposite to what he had envisaged.

AUSTERITY WORKS

There is no doubt that austerity works for the Irish economy. That was the lesson of the late 1980s Haughey Government as it has been the recent experience. The policies pursued by the previous Government from 2008 onwards and continued by the current one have pulled the economy back from the precipice.

Unemployment is still high, but has been declining. The number on the live register has dropped below 400,000 for the first time since 2009. Employment is increasing. The National Debt as a percent of GDP will reach a peak at the end of this year (about 129%) and will then begin to decline. This means a smaller percentage of GDP will be absorbed by interest costs. At present it looks like the volume of mortgage arrears has stabilised. AIB is hoping to return to profitability in 2014. The banks may need to be re-capitalised, but it is possible that this will be underwritten by private investors.

The idea that the economy could have recovered with a "*stimulus package*" is misconceived. Keynes' prescriptions for the 1930s do not apply. Then, there was a problem of hoarding within the corporate sector and private individuals; now, the problem is not excessive savings, but an overhang of debt.

POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS

It will be interesting to see if an improvement in the economy benefits the Government parties. The electorate has largely accepted the policies of austerity. It has also complied with the Property Tax. This presents a problem for the Opposition parties, in particular Sinn Féin. Is the latter party going to continue fighting old battles (burning bondholders and opposition to the Property Tax) or has it the ability to adapt and develop new policies?

THE ASSASSINATION OF JFK

The fiftieth anniversary commemora-

tion of President Kennedy's assassination was quite a subdued affair. There were some interesting documentaries in the past month about his life, but nothing of substance about the assassination itself. The pendulum has been swinging back to the view that Lee Harvey Oswald did the deed and he acted alone. Unfortunately, that does not make for very good television.

After the assassination Lyndon Johnson set up a commission to investigate the assassination. He appointed the liberal Republican Judge Earl Warren to chair it. The impressive report of 26 volumes, produced in less than 10 months, concluded that Oswald had acted alone and there was no evidence of a conspiracy.

The report was welcomed by liberal America who feared that any hint of Cuban or Soviet involvement would generate a right-wing backlash. In subsequent years, however, the report was attacked. But, while conspiracy theories have come and gone, the report's findings have stood the test of time. Advances in science have vindicated some of its most controversial findings such as the single bullet theory (a single bullet hit Kennedy from the back, exited through his throat and then hit Governor John Connally).

The Long Fellow is of the opinion that the conspiracy theories, mostly emanating from the left, are a political dead end, leading to a false sense of political impotence in the face of dark and assumed to be omnipotent forces.

DALLAS 1963

The visit of Kennedy to Dallas had political significance. The Kennedy/Johnson ticket had only barely carried Texas in 1960, despite Johnson's Texan political base. In 1963 the Democratic Party in Texas was split down the middle, which would have undermined Kennedy's chances of re-election. In the 1960 election Kennedy had managed to detach many Southern Blacks from their traditional allegiance. Martin Luther King Senior, who was a "Lincoln Republican", initially advocated a vote for Nixon. However, when Kennedy made some discreet overtures to the wife of Martin Luther King Junior following the latter's arrest, the black vote switched to Kennedy.

This was a successful piece of political opportunism, which had more profound consequences than was intended. The Democratic Party in the South began tentatively to move away from its white racist political base. In Texas Governor Connally, the single bullet survivor, represented the Conservative wing of the Democratic Party, while Senator Ralph

Yarborough was on the liberal side. The wily Lyndon Johnson kept his cards close to his chest.

We don't know how Kennedy would have resolved this conflict, but Johnson, despite his friendship with Connally, moved the party decisively away from racial segregation with his Civil Rights bills of the 1960s. Connally became a "Nixon Democrat" and Nixon appointed him Treasury Secretary in 1971. Connally's solution to America's budgetary problems, emanating from the Vietnam War, was to print money, much to the chagrin of foreign creditors. He famously told a meeting of European Finance Ministers that the dollar was "our currency, your problem".

25 YEARS OF FINTAN O'TOOLE The 25th anniversary of Fintan O'

Toole's *Irish Times* column was hardly a significant event. Nevertheless, the newspaper brought out a supplement to commemorate it. There are not many people who have ploughed the same furrow for so long. Indeed his range of professional experience has consisted of not much else (he has been a theatre critic as well). He admits that on his appointment as *Irish Times* columnist, *Magill* owner Vincent Browne thought it was an "early retirement from real journalism".

The supplement accurately describes itself as "25 years of Irish life through the columns of Fintan O'Toole". If Fintan's jaundiced gaze occasionally turned to the outside world, his thoughts were not considered worth commemorating. The supplement is a reflection of parochial Dublin concerns.

Anti-Semitism On The Rise?

"Europe Anti-Semitism on the Rise" warned the headline in the *Irish Independent* (8th November 2013). The basis for this claim was a survey conducted by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, where three quarters of European Jews interviewed claimed they "believe anti-Semitism is on the rise" and one third "have considered emigrating because they don't feel safe". It is one of three such reports, along with an equal number of videos, the FRA (as it is also known) produced this month alone.

Meanwhile in the *Irish Times*, unnamed "Jewish groups warn against complacency among the general population, citing resurgent anti-semitism in Europe and newer concerns about Islamophobia" (Nov 10). The article went on to quote the same European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, reporting that over half of 5,874 Jews surveyed in eight EU countries said they "had heard or seen someone claim that the holocaust was a myth or exaggerated".

The results of the survey were timed to be released on the 75th anniversary of *Kristallnacht*.

The FRA tasks itself with cataloguing experiences and perceptions of discrimination in particular, as part of its 'rights advocacy program'. It has given considerable space to the question of anti-Semitism over the years, and in 2005 (under an older name, the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xeno-

phobia) produced a report which listed as examples of what the FRA means by the term 'anti-Semitism' –

- * Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavour.
- * Applying double standards by requiring of it a behaviour not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.
- * Using the symbols and images associated with classic anti-Semitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterize Israel or Israelis.
- * Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.
- * Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel. (Sources: Wikipedia and website of FRA)

On the surface of it, the reports in the Irish national dailies seem to paint a fairly alarming picture. I think it can safely be assumed no one wants a return to the racism and sectarianism that marred 1920s and 30s Europe, and continues to mar many troubled spots around the world. How significant is this threat in fact? From the information given in both newspapers (and echoed by the *Irish Examiner*) this is hard to gauge.

The FRA's reports were based first and foremost, it seems, on people's perceptions, rather than concrete recorded cases of anti-Semitism. In the *Irish Independent* all we learn is that many European Jews

'believe' that anti-Semitism is on the rise, but doesn't catalogue examples of how or why they believe this. In the *Irish Times* at least, some attempt is made to clarify, for instance citing cases where Jewish people have heard someone claim the Holocaust was exaggerated or a myth. It is easy to understand how this may be alarming, especially given the emotional resonance the World War Two Holocaust has for many Jews, but among that number there are also Jews such as Norman Finkelstein who have raised concerns about how debate being is being stifled on this topic and has thus earned himself the position of *personanongrata* among many Zionists in particular. And notwithstanding the deep emotional resonance, it is difficult to see how simply *hearing* someone claim that the Holocaust was a myth, ought to be sufficiently alarming in itself to cause one to uproot one's whole life and emigrate for 'safety'.

Moreover, this anecdotal evidence is hard to qualify, unlike deliberate and direct acts of vandalism (such as the targeting of Jewish graves some time back), and we may be very thankful that there are not more concrete examples such as the latter to support the report of the FRA.

Other possible ways in which we might try and assess the level of risk is through other quoted results of the survey, where 34% of Jews in Sweden and 29% in France "*said they would never wear a Star of David or anything else that might signify their religion*". This is especially understandable in the aggressively-secular French culture, where most religious symbolism is either already banned, or in the process of being banned, in the public sphere. It's not that long ago that Islamic headscarves were banned from French schools, which must have caused considerable anguish for the country's many female Islamic students, but also ripples of fear among their Jewish neighbours, with its reminder of how symbols of Jewish religious life were banned from 1930s Germany except to identify Jewish people as *personas non grata*. Is the sense of fear a consequence not of anti-Semitism in particular, but an aggressive project of secularization at European level? The two countries quoted in the *Independent*—Sweden and France—are well known for their particular attachment to secularism and the pushing of all religion from public life.

On the whole, the FRA's survey gives us a clear picture at the level of fear among the general Jewish population, but is thinner on the ground (at least, as reported in the national newspapers) on concrete

reasons to explain the source of this fear. In short, it claims—or the national newspapers of this country claim—that anti-Semitism is on the Rise because of people's perceptions. The headline in the *Independent* should more correctly read "*European Jews believe anti-Semitism is on the Rise*".

The question remains as to the origin of these fears—it is a well-known sociological phenomenon for example, that fear of crime in public perception can often heavily outweigh actual levels of crime. In some studies levels of crime had been steadily dropping whilst public fear of crime had been increasing. Even in this country many serious crimes, such as murder, use of firearms in violent crimes etc., have been dropping for the last few years, whereas public perception—if you were to listen to Joe Duffy or ask 'the man in the street'—has gone the opposite way. But cold statistics can rarely compete with

prurient media coverage of criminality.

What we are left with is a survey in which a lot of people said they were 'scared' or 'worried', but almost no concrete facts on the ground, beyond these feelings, to establish why this should be so. But as mentioned previously, perhaps in this instance we should be grateful such concrete evidence does not seem to exist, as if it did, it would point to a sorry state of affairs indeed.

Yet the FRA wants the results of its survey to be taken into account "*to provide guidance on measures to take against anti-Semitism*". While it would be easy to find general agreement on the need to ensure people of whatever religion can live their lives free of fear of persecution—and what better time to recall that than *Kristallnacht*?—subjective personal perception surely is not the best basis on which to build policy.

Nick Folley (2013)

the last word on the last survivor....?

The following letter from John Young, son of the last surviving Kilmichael Ambush veteran, Ned Young, has appeared on the *Letters Extra* page of the *History Ireland* website (it was delayed due to confusion about whether it was for publication). Earlier letters in the sequence by Niall Meehan, Eve Morrison, Sean Kelleher, Maureen Deasy, etc. are at:

<http://www.historyireland.com/letters-extra/peter-hart-etc/>.

To:
The Editor, History Ireland,
May 17th, 2013
Dear Editor,

It was wrong of Dr Morrison to imply (*History Ireland* letter, April 9th, 2013) that the late Jim O'Driscoll did not read my Affidavit before witnessing my signature. He did just that when we met in Ballydehob in August 2007, as any sensible person would. At the time, as I pointed out earlier to Dr Morrison, Jim told me he had dropped Peter Hart near my parent's home in 1988, but was too busy to go with him.

Before his untimely death, Jim O' Driscoll's name appeared twice publicly in relation to Peter Hart. First, in Hart's 1998 book that acknowledged Jim's kind assistance. Second, in *Troubled History* (2008) as a witness to my signature on my Affidavit, that refuted Peter Hart's claim: (a) to have interviewed my

father; (b) to have interviewed a Kilmichael Ambush participant six days after my father, the last survivor, died. If Jim had felt so strongly about Hart's "scholarship", why did he associate himself, in any way, with a document critical of it? Why did he go out of his way freely to do so, having personally researched the issue? Readers may draw their own conclusions.

Dr Morrison also states in her letter:

'Ned Young, in his Chisholm [tapes] interview, does NOT say he was told about a false surrender 'immediately' after the ambush.'

Dr Morrison repudiates herself. She contributed the following to her *Terror in Ireland* 'Kilmichael Re-visited' essay (p168):

'Young told Chisholm he had seen [John] Lordan bayonet an Auxiliary, and that after the ambush members of the column had informed him that this auxiliary had surrendered falsely'.

A transcript would authenticate the point. However, aside from Dr Morrison and a chosen few, no one else has been given the opportunity to listen in full to the 'Chisholm tapes'. Again, I would ask that, whatever convoluted way the tapes are being held, that they be released into the public domain. This is also

the last published wish (in *History Ireland*, <http://www.historyireland.com/letters-extra/kilmichael-2/>) of the late Maureen Deasy, eldest daughter of Liam on whose behalf the tapes were made.

I do not remember my father speaking at the 1987 Kilmichael commemoration. The guest speaker that year was Fr Des Wilson from Belfast. The sole sentence "emotionally recalled" for the *Cork Examiner* reporter, attributed to my father, could have been given later (November 30th, 1987, p4). Dominating page one of that *Examiner* edition is a large photograph of my father sitting by the Kilmichael Ambush monument. Above that is a caption, "The Last Boy of Kilmichael". If my father was openly recognised as the last surviving participant of the Kilmichael Ambush, how did Hart manage to 'interview' an "unarmed scout" six days after my father's death? Significant silence so far on this point from Dr Morrison.

In her earlier essay Dr Morrison admitted (p161) that Hart "wrongly attributed" to the "unidentified scout" words on the Chisholm tapes said by Jack O'Sullivan (acknowledged as the second last Kilmichael veteran to die in 1986). Dr Morrison suggests (p173) that Hart's "muddled... citations... do not undermine the authenticity of" his research. I beg to differ.

Based on newspaper articles, Dr Morrison assumes that my father was hale, hearty and quiet happy to talk openly in 1988 to a Canadian student, a complete stranger, about the Kilmichael ambush. Even in good health, my father was wary of who he spoke to on the ambush. He only agreed to be recorded by Fr. Chisholm in 1970 because of the Liam Deasy connection and, possibly, because, as Chisholm put it, he "trusted me as a priest". I again give Eve Morrison my word that after his stroke late in 1986 my father was not well enough, "having virtually lost the faculty of speech" (my Affidavit), to be interviewed in 1988 by Peter Hart.

In an earlier letter to Maureen Deasy, Fr. Chisholm protested that Hart referred to the Chisholm tapes "without my permission". He obviously did not protest enough—for he allowed Hart just to do that. Hart had to refer to the tapes, as he had nothing of his own to fall back on as evidence for his "interviews".

Ultimately, the reason Dr. Morrison attempts to discredit my Affidavit is that she has no actual evidence that Hart interviewed my father, other than hearsay. Why else did she contact me in the first place? Hart should have been able to produce authenticated notes, or even tapes, of these claimed interviews with my father and others. The excuses Hart used for not doing so, such as confidentiality or concerns for the families, were just a means of avoiding the issue. Hart never, at any stage, had contact with myself or my family, so how could he decide what our reaction would be?

Tom Barry, Ned Young and the Boys of Kilmichael have all gone to their rest. So too, unfortunately, have Peter Hart, Jim O'Driscoll and Maureen Deasy. I intend now to give the Kilmichael Ambush a rest. Perhaps Dr Morrison should do the same.

John Young

And speaking of last words....

David Fitzpatrick, Professor of Modern History at TCD in his supervising and promotion of his star pupil, Dr. Peter Hart, is the person most responsible for promoting the thesis that the War of Independence was essentially a sectarian squabble against Protestants. This was done by, *inter alia*, distorting and abusing sources, anonymous interviewing of the living and the dead and other such techniques. Countless commentators and historians have regurgitated this rubbish on the strength of the credentials of these authoritative figures in academia. The Professor surpassed himself by composing a sectarian song to add to the mix in case there were some who did not get the message by the other methods that were used. Because of his espousing of the sectarian thesis Peter Hart has died a second death with the gradual discrediting of this thesis and the latest to add a metaphorical nail to his coffin is none other than his supervising Professor!

In an article entitled "Protestant depopulation and the Irish Revolution" (Irish Historical Studies, XXXVIII November 2013) Professor Fitzpatrick's final and concluding words are that: *The spectre of Protestant extermination has distracted debate about revolutionary Ireland for too long, and should be laid to rest. The inexorable decline of Southern Protestantism was mainly self inflicted.* (p. 659).

Could Eoghan Harris and others please note that the Professor has shot their fox.

But for the record we republish below the sectarian ballad composed by him just a few months ago called *A New Revenge for Skibbereen* to the tune of *The Galtee Mountain Boy*, which he sang to introduce his lecture, *'The Spectre of Ethnic Cleansing in Revolutionary Ireland'*, at the 2013 Magdalene College Cambridge Parnell Lecture, on 11th February 2013. It depicts the killing of Protestants as Protestants in a celebratory tone as an Orange song would do regarding the killings of Catholics. Readers can judge for themselves how seriously we should take this Professor of history.

Jack Lane

'A New Revenge for Skibbereen'

*'Twas in the month of April in the year of '22
We took it out on the Protestants, we could only catch a few
In Bandon and Dunmanway, Kinsale and Skibbereen
Their colour it was Orange and they trampled on the Green
Old Buttimer came down quaking
'What do you want', says he
'Come out or we'll make ye, we want your drapery"
The missus tried to argue
'Go to bed old women', says he
We sprayed his brains with bullets that Ireland might be free
We visited Tom Bradfield, we dressed up in Khaki
Says he, 'You're welcome officers'
A fine snug farm had he
We gave him a grand court martial
And sentenced Tom for to die
We tied a note around his neck
It read 'convicted spy'
Farewell to all ye Protestants, so prim and dry and tight
Ye thought ye owned old Ireland
Yet ye fled without a fight
From Bandon and Dunmanway, Kinsale and Skibbereen
Ye scuttled out of the County Cork and never since was seen
'Twas revenge for Skibbereen.*

Troubled History: A 10th Anniversary Critique Of *The IRA & Its Enemies* by Brian Murphy and Niall Meehan. Introduction Ruan O'Donnell.

48pp (A3). £10, £8

Kilmichael: The False Surrender: a discussion by *Peter Hart, Padraig O'Cuanachain, D.R. O'Connor Lysaght, Dr. Brian Murphy, & Meda Ryan*, with: **Why The Ballot Was Followed By The Bullet** by *J. Lane & B. Clifford.*

48pp. £6, £5

es ahora *

"Ascendancy women, lively, with high-boned thin faces, wondering if enough can be salvaged for another meal tomorrow. With their pale intensity, some lack softness: survival is demanding; their men are not famous for knuckling down to tackle either the dry rot or the bank balance, equally mouldering. They are looked after by servants bought out of old people's homes; they write to friends on sawn-off greeting cards. Even if the house is being sold over their head, still the old courtesy: 'Sherry, Daff?'... The Irish say they would hate it if the Anglo-Irish died out, bearing out Harold Macmillan's experience as Prime Minister, when he found: 'It is the second-rate people who despise each other.... There are no RMs anymore. 'It is rare to meet a rural Protestant who matters'. Nuala O'Faolain, one of Ireland's brightest young commentators whose words tumble out in bright Joycean phrases, works for the old Ascendancy newspaper 'The Irish Times', where Catholics these days 'dress like Protestants in tweeds; normally Catholics are in nylon shirts.'" (Picnic In A Foreign Land, Ann Morrow. Grafton Books. London. 1989.)

While Sir Josslyn Gore-Booth was stuffing his turkeys with a certain viciousness and giving tourists their mediaeval banquets *a la* Bunratty Castle but in a very pared down dining room, one could see that his heart was not in it. As Patrick Cooney's film ran on taking it all in, a frustrated Josslyn vented about those who would want to come and see tumble-down houses. And as he furiously puffed on another large cigar, tumbler again in hand, he expounded *"on the energy needed to be nice to people who are invading your home"*—and the local tourism people wanted him *to do this every night!* *"I take my hat off to anyone who is prepared to turn themselves into an Irish version of Basil Fawlty."* Finally one morning he got up and realised he just couldn't do it anymore. *"The decision is made, I didn't talk to anybody about it"* (shades of Elizabeth Bowen!), and so the selling of Lissadell became a reality. It became a national talking point with various people like Roy Foster, Desmond Fitzgerald and of course *The Irish Times* itself suggesting that the State should buy Lissadell House. (See the *Irish Political Review*, July 2003 for my article on the whole controversy.)

What the film showed was the actual auction of the contents that were left—

It Is Time

after a previous auction netted Josslyn over 300,000 euros. What I was unprepared for was the excess of the Celtic Tiger being caught on camera. There were at least 3-4 private helicopters on the grounds and hordes of people filling the big hall, trying to buy whatever they could lay their hands on. Wads of cash were flying out of pockets and there was a memorable shot of Josslyn leaning down over the banister of the Gallery looking on with a slight mortifying air and saying *"it's all trash"*—but *'buying class'* had become the pursuit of the new Celtic Tigers and they just couldn't get enough of the stuff!

It was only on reading Ann Morrow's book that I found that Josslyn was actually English-born, was bred and worked in the banking sector of the City of London, and also owns a large house and land in the north of England. *"Call me a Yorkshire squire"*, he told her. The Irish State had to take over the administration of Lissadell estate, because the aunts mismanaged it so badly that the cattle had to be taken off them as they were so malnourished; and the woods had to be cut down to settle some of the debts they had run up. It was this High Court order that led to Sir Josslyn taking over the estate, but he still continued with his life in London and Yorkshire.

Cooney asserted in his *Guardian* article (10 November 2001) that Josslyn at the age of 48 finally came over and tried to make a go of Lissadell. The latter certainly, as he acknowledged himself, got the Heritage Council to completely re-roof the House and had other work like re-wiring done by the State. My reading now is of a very shrewd man who perhaps always intended to go back to his Yorkshire estate but was now considerably enriched by selling off first the contents, and then the house itself for 3.5 million euros to two Dublin barristers Edward Walsh SC and his wife Constance Cassidy SC. The couple found themselves almost immediately embroiled in a right-of-way controversy with the local Sligo County Council. It was only on the 12th November 2013 that *The Irish Times* reported that, after a five year court battle, the Supreme Court ruled in the family's favour, leaving a legal bill of between 6 and 7 million Euros to be picked up by Sligo County Council or the tax-payers more likely.

A further bitter pill for the ever-suffering tax-payer was served up by the *Irish Examiner*, where it was reported that the Environment Minister Phil Hogan, Fine Gael

"has approved that the local Government official who presided over Sligo County Council's Lissadell court saga,

Hubert Kearns, the County Manager who retired this month at the age of 57 with a pension lump sum of over €250,000... is to receive an annual pension of €62,827" (21 November 2013)

By a strange coincidence the obituary for Olivia Dundin-Robertson, of Huntington Castle in Co. Carlow appeared in the *Sunday Independent* (24th November 2013), though she died on the 14th November 2013—with her brother Lord Strathlock having passed away in 1994. Both were founders of the *Fellowship of Isis*, which announcing her death *"enjoined the Goddess Isis of 10,000 Names to 'bless and keep her as she makes her journey into the next spiral of the cosmic web'..."* The late Olivia featured extensively in Patrick Cooney's *'The Director's Cut'* of the *'The Raj in the Rain'*.

My impression of Sir Josslyn as an acute financial brain has been further strengthened by an article in *Ireland on Sunday* (27th July 2003) by Paddy Clancy titled *'Lissa-sell House'*, where the author charges Josslyn with trading off his great aunt Constance Markievicz as a marketing ploy to get the Irish State interested in buying the House. In the article, Josslyn is referred to as a *"former London investment banker"* who *"held the stewardship of Lissadell for twenty five years but only moved into it with his wife Mary and daughters Mary, 17 and Caroline 15 in 2002"*. He also placed an archive of important papers on indefinite loan with the Public Office of Northern Ireland in Belfast because *"storage facilities at Lissadell were inadequate and scholars would have not had access to them"*. This surprised me until I read in another interview he gave that he saw himself as a Unionist! And certainly in the film when Josslyn is recounting the achievements of his great aunt Constance, he holds up his hand and dismissively counts off on his fingers:

"She tried the acting thing and she really wasn't very good. She tried the painting thing and it hadn't really led anywhere. She tried being a mother and didn't find it to her taste. She tried being a wife and only found it satisfying up to a point. So she was essentially looking for some role which would give her a focus for her existence and she chose nationalist politics, I suppose you could say".

That's his description of a lady of the Ascendancy who joined the Citizen Army, served several jail sentences in Holloway, in Ireland and in Aylesbury, was sentenced to death though later reprieved, became

the first woman elected to Westminster, and the first woman Minister of Labour in Ireland. By any standards that was a well-lived life. Paddy Clancy hasn't his facts straight when he stated that she died alone and was buried without ceremony and fanfare. Though she did die in a public ward in Sir Patrick Dun's Hospital, she had Casimir and his son Stasko by her side *"laden with flowers and several of her women friends including Esther Roper and she had been received into the Catholic Church some time before"*. She died of peritonitis on 15th July 1927, aged fifty-nine. Over three thousand people went to her funeral in Dublin and eight lorries were needed to carry her flowers.

All the official organisations marched: Sinn Fein, Fianna Eireann, Inghinidhe na hEireann, Cumann na mBan, Fianna Fail, ITGWU, Irish Citizen Army. At Glasnevin her Irish Citizen Army uniform was lowered into her grave, the Free State soldiers were armed and ready to prevent a volley being fired over her grave. (Five days before her death, Kevin O'Higgins had been shot on his way from Mass though she hadn't been told.)

Her old friend from Mountjoy, Father Ryan, was there faithful to the end, as were Casimir and Stasko. Mr Eamon de Valera gave the funeral oration. And strangely enough Sir Josslyn, her estranged brother, represented the Gore-Booths. Most of the *Ireland on Sunday* article has its source, according to Paddy Clancy, in Joe McGowan,

"a local historian and expert on Constance who called on Sir Josslyn to give Lissadell House to the nation. Mr. McGowan is chairman of the Markievicz Millennium Committee which last Easter unveiled a memorial to Constance at Rathcormack in Co. Sligo."

Apparently Sir Josslyn was invited but he didn't even bother to reply according to Joe. The former said he didn't get the invitation in time to cancel other commitments. He also indicated that he felt snubbed by the committee stating:

"I didn't feel they really wanted my involvement... I had thought it would have been nice if they had contacted me when they were starting. Maybe I'm being too sensitive."

I can't leave the story of Lissadell there, on the rather true-to-form sniffy retort from Sir Josslyn on the necessity of the locals having to contact him—Big House echoes—at the outstart of *their* tribute to his great-aunt. The *Irish Times* (26th March 2007) reported that Taoiseach Bertie Ahern was to open 'Lissadell Markievicz exhibition':

"The Taoiseach is to officially open an exhibition honouring Countess Constance Markievicz this week at her ancestral home more than three years after the Government refused to buy it for the nation. Bertie Ahern has slotted the engagement into a whirlwind tour of Co. Sligo on Friday. He will open the Countess Markievicz exhibition housed in a restored coach house at Lissadell House. Owners Eddie Walsh and his wife Constance Cassidy said yesterday they were delighted Mr. Ahern has agreed to do the honours. "It's an exhibition that is of importance to Sligo because it honours Countess Markievicz in all her different guises", Mr. Walsh said.

"It marks her life both as a young girl growing up here in Lissadell, as a young horsewoman riding across the countryside of Sligo immortalised by Yeats, and then as she moved on to London and Dublin society.

"It also commemorates her life from 1908 when she became one of the major players in the Irish nationalist movement, leading to the foundation of the State."

The couple bought Lissadell House and much of its furnishings for €4.55 million in 2003 after experts advised the Government to resist pressure to buy it for the people of Ireland. Ministers were told it would take another €30 million to restore and maintain the dilapidated property. However Mr. Walsh and Ms. Cassidy reckoned when they bought it that €5 million would restore the house and surrounding gardens to their former glory over five years. Mr. Walsh said yesterday:

"What we're simply trying to do is get Lissadell up to the way it was 100 years ago when it was a centrepiece for horticulture in Ireland. At the time it employed 200 people. With modern machinery we'll never get back to those numbers, but we are trying to do our bit. We have up to 20 people employed. It is shaping up".

Julianne Herlihy ©

To be continued in the next
Irish Political Review

Some Collinsees And Somervilles, Part Four

Did Borgonovo Miss The Point About The AFIL?

Did I praise John Borgonovo too much in the August issue of *Irish Political Review* as the only academic who had not missed the point in his book, *The Battle for Cork* (Cork: Mercier Press, 2011), regarding the critical role played by Captain Hugh Somerville? After all, Paul McMahon's PhD dissertation for Cambridge University, *British Spies & Irish Rebels: British Intelligence and Ireland 1916-1915* (The Boydell Press, 2008), had already appeared, in the publishers' words, as the *"first volume in an exciting new series, the history of British Intelligence"*. They further announced:

"With the recent opening of government archives to public scrutiny, it is at last possible to study the vital role that intelligence has played in forming and executing policy in modern history. This new series aims to be the leading forum for work in this area."

In the *Dublin Review of Books*, Trinity College Professor Eunan O'Halpin enthused:

"Paul McMahon's book is an exemplary study of the strengths and limitations of British intelligence on Ireland from the 1916 Rising to the end of the Second World War. McMahon's research demonstrates the immense value of security and intelligence material now available in British records. In the post-Cold War

climate of the 1990s all the British police and secret agencies with the exception of the foreign intelligence service, MI6—and even they have commissioned an official history by Prof Keith Jeffery of Queen's University Belfast, to be published in 2009—began to release significant portions of their records. That this was done mainly to justify their continued existence by demonstrating their historical achievements, rather than in a spirit of disinterested openness, does not detract from the value of their actions."

And, indeed, McMahon had written:

"The Royal Navy was a constant presence around the coasts and ports of the south and west of Ireland in 1922. The spin-off of naval involvement was some good intelligence. Naval officers were the best source of information on the civil war outside Dublin: they were practically the only remaining British officials outside the capital: they were concentrated in the counties where the Civil War was fought and won (Cork and Kerry); and they had access to other remote coastal areas that saw much republican activity—west Galway, Mayo, Sligo and Donegal. **This intelligence gathering was channelled through one man: the Senior Naval Officer at Queenstown, Captain Hugh C. Somerville.** The brother of the writer Edith Somerville {co-author of *The Irish R.M.* }, he was a member of a well-known loyalist family

from Co. Cork. {My emphases—MO'R.} He provided invaluable, regular intelligence reports on the progress of the Civil War in the south and west of the country in 1922. He drew on the reports of naval commanders on their tours up and down the Irish coast. He was well positioned to observe the landing of Free State troops at Queenstown during the capture of Cork city. (On one occasion he played an active role, boarding a ship that had been left by the Irregulars to block the river channel and disconnect an explosive device.) (Intelligence report by Somerville, 9 Aug 1922). Somerville and other naval officers also used their local contacts to build up a network of pro-Free State informants around the coast. For example, the Harbour Master at Fenit provided details of individuals involved in republican gunrunning. (Intelligence report by Somerville, 2 Oct 1922). This was not the only surreptitious activity carried out by the Royal Navy in this period. Together with the British military, it actively intercepted, decrypted and read the signals communications of the Free State army. (Intelligence report by Somerville, 8 Aug 1922)... Captain Hugh Somerville in Cork enjoyed good relations with local Free State army commanders, who kept him fully briefed on the course of the war. Naval ships helped to prevent republicans moving by sea, and gave direct assistance to the Irish {Free State—MO'R} army on land; for example, when the Free State garrison was attacked at Cahirciveen, HMS *Waterhen* used searchlights and fired a star shell, which 'effectively stopped the battle'. (Intelligence reports by Somerville, 19 Sept and 13 Oct 1922)." (pp 85-86 and 93.)

Given that so many Free Staters did in fact share the same ultimate objectives as their Republican opponents, I sometimes opt for those Irish language terms that have been used to describe the Irish Civil War—*Cogadh na gCarad*, meaning the War of Friends, or *Cogadh na mBráithre*, meaning the War of Brothers. No such euphemistic terms could, however, be applied to the Russian Civil War. Yet the Soviet Bolsheviks also had good reason to designate it as the War of Foreign Intervention. But in view of the fact that Collins had launched the Irish Civil War on British Government instructions, and was to wage it with such British military assistance, could we not, with justification, also describe it as the *War of British Intervention*?

What, however, had O'Halpin to say of McMahon's revelations in that regard? He wrote:

"McMahon's treatment of intelligence issues during the civil war makes particularly good use of Admiralty and military sources. Naval intelligence had never been at its best in producing sophisticated political analysis, but it knew a lot

about coastal movements and security, and it could intercept and decode radio traffic. He also describes the considerable efforts of southern unionists to report on civil war conditions. Much of what they said was alarmist, but as a community they had good reason to be fearful until the flames died down in 1923."

But O'Halpin could not bring himself to name Hugh Somerville as the central Intelligence figure in that War of British Intervention. Was he concerned that readers might be tempted to explore the possibility that the wider Somerville family of Castletownshend nurtured and harboured a nest of British spymasters *par excellence*?

O'Halpin's claim that "*naval intelligence had never been at its best in producing sophisticated political analysis*" is certainly wide of the mark as far as the Somerville family spies were concerned. But the most powerful refutation of O'Halpin's reticence concerning Hugh Somerville was strangely omitted from McMahon's own narrative: the fact that his most substantial Intelligence source in Cork city had been Michael Collins's own sister, Mary Collins-Powell. It is therefore thanks to John Borgonovo alone that the role of "*this one woman fifth column*", as he describes her (p 77), was first brought to light for readers of Irish history. And, in that regard, Borgonovo was also generous in expressing his own thanks: "*Historian Tom Mahon of Hawaii earns special kudos for graciously copying Captain Somerville's reports to the British Admiralty, which can be found in Kew National Archives. I am looking forward to Tom's upcoming book on the Upnor raid*" (p 8).

But, in giving credit where credit was due, had I not simultaneously damned him with faint praise, since I had also referred to Jack Lane's trenchant review, in the July issue, of his latest book? At the very least, it was now morally incumbent upon me to read in full *The Dynamics of War and Revolution: Cork City, 1916-1918* (Cork University Press, 2013), Borgonovo's PhD dissertation for University College Cork. One could, of course, nit-pick about some typos, as when a footnote refers to the number of Cork Republicans who had been educated by the Christian Brothers at the "South Mon" (sic). But that would be a cheap shot, since the basic text itself correctly refers to the North Mon. Moreover, a critic in a glass house shouldn't throw stones! A typo in the text of my August article has my father being walloped by my grandmother for "*fraternising*" with a notorious Black-and-Tan at the age of—what?—thirty! The

context, however, should make clear that he was only a three-year old at the time.

So, then, let's get back to the substance of the matter. Is it true, as Jack Lane charges, that Borgonovo misses the point about the significance of both the All-For-Ireland League election defeats of the Redmondites in Cork in 1910 and the British response to the Sinn Féin victory in the 1918 General Election? I initially found abundant evidence for the former, but little for the latter charge. And what hit me most regarding the former was a glaring omission. Why should I complain? After all, Borgonovo writes:

"In July 1918, the police moved against so-called British 'skulkers' in Cork and elsewhere... (and) the Cork RIC arrested four young men from England, who were all Jewish. Hostility towards Jewish conscription refugees deserves mention. An Englishman in Cork complained to the chief secretary about Jewish 'flyaway boys'. '*Most of these young English Jews believe they will be ruthlessly taken*', wrote Joseph Hurry. '*Why disappoint them?*' ... Stepping carefully beyond the issue's clear anti-Semitism, of the 129 aliens incarcerated in Ireland during 1918, 75 were Russian citizens, including 30 deserters from the British armed forces. Of these 75, 16 had the first names of Abraham, Israel, Jacob and Solomon, though it is impossible to discern the religion of the remainder. The 1918 alien prisoner lists hint at (but do not prove) the presence of Jewish conscription refugees in Ireland, most likely from Britain. Alternatively, the arrest list may also indicate selective persecution and harassment of Jewish conscription refugees by the Irish police. This would be consistent with labour historian Manus O'Riordan's suggestion that anti-Semitism was embedded within broader pro-war, anti-German sentiment in Ireland during the war. (Manus O'Riordan, *James Connolly, Liberty Hall and the 1916 Rising*, (Dublin: Irish Labour History Society, September 2006, pp 28-9)." (Borgonovo, pp 202-203.)

That was a generous citation. But would a similar citation have been given in respect of the previous publication of that same statement in an earlier version of my essay, *James Connolly Re-Assessed: The Irish and European Context* (Millstreet, Co. Cork: Aubane Historical Society, March 2006, pp 31-32)? I doubt it. In "*An Academic Views the Treaty War in Cork*", his December 2011 review of Borgonovo's *The Battle for Cork for Irish Political Review*, Brendan Clifford was to highlight the noteworthy omission by Borgonovo of the only extant biography of the leader of the Neutral IRA in Cork:

"There is a biography of O'Hegarty which goes into his actions in those crucial six or seven months after the 'Treaty'—

Kevin Girvin's *Sean O'Hegarty, O/C First Cork Brigade, Irish Republican Army*, published by Aubane. Borgonovo does not refer to it, or even list it in his Bibliography, even though it is the only book on O'Hegarty, and O'Hegarty was indisputably the central figure in the Battle for Cork."

For whatever reason, Borgonovo would seem to have embarked on a policy of blacklisting all Aubane publications from even being referenced.

It was not always so. In both *Florence and Josephine O'Donoghue's War of Independence*, (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2006) and *Spies, Informers and the 'Anti-Sinn Féin Society'*, (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2007), his MA thesis for University College Cork, Borgonovo cited the publication by Aubane in 2004 of *Seán Moylan: In His Own Words*. But he did more than that. In his acknowledgements for his 2007 book Borgonovo was positively effusive:

"While editing Florence O'Donoghue's memoir ... I received some research assistance from Jack Lane of the Aubane Historical Society. Much to my surprise, Jack asked me if I had any plans to publish my (MA) thesis. It still seems remarkable to me that someone actually found the work, and read it. That conversation led to the release of this book by Irish Academic Press."

And Borgonovo also owed something additional to Aubane. In March 2007 it was none other than the Aubane Historical Society that had sponsored the simultaneous launch in Cork City Library of Borgonovo's own book, alongside—wait for it—Girvin's biography of O'Hegarty! Dr John Borgonovo lectures in the School of History, University College Cork, thereby sharing the same employer as Kevin Girvin, with UCC itself listing the latter staff member as one of its Library Department Operatives. It is greatly to be regretted that by 2011 Borgonovo should have concluded that, since Girvin's MPhil thesis for UCC had been published on the wrong side of the tracks, Kevin should now be placed on an academic blacklist of Aubane publications and be treated not only as a non-person, but, horror of horrors, a "*non-historian*"!

Before returning to Jack Lane's dual charge against Borgonovo's latest work, I have to say that I regard it as an impressive volume of meticulous research. Some of its many academic references, however, hardly seem to be worth the mention, adding nothing of substance to our understanding of the subject-matter of such a UCC PhD dissertation. Unless, of course,

mutual back-slapping is held to be *de rigueur* in the freemasonry of academia. Take, for example, the following:

"Historian Brian Girvin provides a handy summation of the Irish Party's rationale for participating in the war: '*it would confirm and secure Home Rule, and that it might find the basis for consensus among Irish people once the conflict ended.*' (From *Union to Union*, Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2002)" (p 26).

But Brian (a brother of Kevin, who thanked him for his support and encouragement in writing the O'Hegarty biography), was doing little more than restating his own commonplace neo-Redmondite and Churchillian view as to the role Ireland should have played in both World Wars. On the other hand, Dr Brian Girvin had been published by a "respectable" house, is himself a former lecturer in UCC's own School of History, and is now a Professor of History at Glasgow University. Urbane, rather than Aubane.

With his formidable and detailed marshalling of both primary and secondary sources, what it is that Borgonovo has chosen to omit is, accordingly, particularly noteworthy. On page 251 he gives as his sources for the All-For-Ireland League: Patrick Maume, *The Long Gestation*; Joseph O'Brien, *William O'Brien and the Course of Irish Politics*; Sally Warwick-Haller, *William O'Brien and the Irish Land War*. And? And, you may well ask, until the cows come home. Borgonovo's blacklist, in turn, costs him historical detail. He writes that "the city AFIL boasted ... the daily *Cork Free Press* newspaper financed by O'Brien's millionaire wife, Sophie" (p 8). But why does he not mention the particular issue made of O'Brien's wife by Redmondite political agitation? After all, in his citation of my pages 28-29 regarding anti-Semitism going hand-in-hand with anti-German pro-War hysteria, he has chosen to ignore the fact that, on that very same page 28, I had also written:

"Anti-Semitic outbursts would not have been a novel feature for a Redmondite mob. At the February 1909 Convention of the United Irish League, where John Redmond had denied free speech to Cork MP William O'Brien and had driven him out of the Party, when the Ancient Order of Hibernians toughs acted on instructions to prevent anybody getting near the speaker's podium who had '*a Cork accent*', the great cry of Redmond's AOH bully-boys had been '*Down with the Russian Jewess!*'—a reference to O'Brien's wife, Sophie Raffalovich."

But if Borgonovo had quoted me on that, he would have also had to cite the

source that I had freely acknowledged in my own footnote, namely, page 133 of the 1997 Aubane Historical Society book by Brendan Clifford, *The 'Cork Free Press' in the context of the Parnell Split*. And there was no way Borgonovo was going to suspend his anti-Aubane blacklist and mention the unmentionable Clifford.

More's the pity, for Borgonovo thereby misses the point about the War of Independence in Cork being rooted in the AFIL. While he acknowledges the O'Brienite defeat of the Redmondites in Cork in both the General Elections of 1910, he treats it as, at most, a four-year wonder:

"The Irish Party eclipsed the AFIL in the 1914 local elections... In 1916 the Irish Party was ascendant in Cork city. Triumphant in the 1914 local elections, Redmondites secured a strong Corporation majority of 33 councillors against 12 for the AFIL (and eleven independents) and seized a twenty to twelve majority on Cork County Council. The Redmondites won the Cork lord mayorship and began to purge All-For's from municipal government employment. The 'Mollie Maguires' (as they were popularly known) eagerly awaited the next parliamentary election to drive a stake through the heart of their nemesis William O'Brien" (p 9).

However, national political issues, as expressed through parliamentary elections, and local political issues, as expressed through local elections, do not necessarily run perfectly parallel as regards party political outcomes. And if Borgonovo wishes to treat the national and the local as identical, well then, he should have treated the 1910 AFIL victory in Cork city as not even a four-year wonder, but rather as a one-to two-year wonder at most. For the Redmondites had not just won the Cork city lord mayorship in 1914, as stated by Borgonovo, they had actually held it since 1912. As regards the national question, however, while it could be said of Cork as a whole that the December 1910 parliamentary general election was an O'Brienite v Redmondite contest about the direction of national politics, this was particularly the case in Cork city. The sitting MPs were William O'Brien himself and the Redmondite Augustine Roche. But John Redmond made it a head to head contest, by putting forward his brother Willie Redmond to take on O'Brien. Roche ran again, as did Maurice Healy for the AFIL. But it was the AFIL that took **both** seats. O'Brien's had a 638 majority over Redmond, while Healy had a 526 majority over Roche. That, then, was Cork city's decisive AFIL verdict on the O'Brien v Redmond contest regarding the direction of national politics.

Just one month later, however, when it came to purely local politics, there was, from the start, a more even Party balance in the city. The January 1911 local elections resulted in a Cork city corporation of 23 O'Brienites, 22 Redmondites and 11 independents. James Simcox of the AFIL was elected Lord Mayor by 30 votes as against 23 for the Redmondite Henry O'Shea, and in January 1912 he was re-elected by 27 votes to 23. But then, in April 1912, Simcox threw a wobbly. Carried away by Redmond's Pyrrhic victory in seeing the British Government table a Home Rule Bill in the House of Commons, Simcox announced that he would attend a Home Rule convention called by Redmond. For this he came in for criticism in the *Cork Free Press* of April 13th. Simcox next threw a huffy fit, and resigned as Lord Mayor. O'Shea took his place, and in January 1913 the AFIL did not contest O'Shea's re-election as Lord Mayor. But then Maurice Healy went on to try and unseat O'Shea by different means, during which local struggle no issue of national politics came to the fore. The most belligerent Redmondite politician in Cork city was John J. Horgan. In his 1949 memoirs, *Parnell to Pearse*, Horgan began by relating the traditional Redmondite make-belief narrative, but in the end cynically revealed:

"(Thomas) Kettle, who spoke at the (May 1912 Home Rule) Convention ... said that in the end this Bill would give us an Ireland completely controlling her own political life, taking her place in the humane tradition of Europe, and welcomed among the nations of the earth... The Cork contingent made its own contribution to the occasion, for we had brought with us Henry O'Shea, the newly elected Nationalist Lord Mayor, first fruit of our campaign against O'Brienism, and he was selected to second the principal resolution... O'Brien's vindictive attacks on members of our party reached a climax in a vendetta... directed against Alderman Henry O'Shea whom we had successfully run for the Mayoralty of Cork in 1912. **By trade a successful baker, Alderman O'Shea was one of the quietest and most inoffensive of men, and although steadfast in his political opinions, in no sense a politician...** The Lord Mayor as a young man had spent several years in New York and made no secret of the fact that he had been admitted as an American citizen. The O'Brienite party therefore in 1913 lodged an objection to his vote on the grounds that he was an alien. Maurice Healy MP, who acted as solicitor for the O'Brienite party ... launched proceedings against the Lord Mayor for acting as a member of the Cork Corporation while an alien. In the meantime, acting on Counsel's advice, I had taken the necessary steps to have the Lord Mayor re-

admitted as a British citizen.... When the case was heard at petty sessions I was able to prove by independent testimony that the Lord Mayor had resided in America for nine years, from 1880 to 1889, and I then produced a certificate from the appropriate American official to the effect that no such person as Henry O'Shea had been admitted as a citizen in New York State during that period. On this evidence the magistrates dismissed the case... **The truth was that the Lord Mayor ... had been admitted as an American citizen under the name of Henry Shea...** On the termination of the proceedings I presented the Lord Mayor with the various official certificates concerning his nationality, suitably framed, and this collection of legal contradictions subsequently adorned his study. Two years later, while still Lord Mayor of Cork, he received the well-merited honour of knighthood." (2009 edition, pp 218 and 249-250. My emphases—MOR).

So much for that Redmondite "victory" (AFIL "eclipse"?) in politics at its most parochial. The electorate were led to believe by Horgan trickery (upheld by court ruling) that the AFIL had mounted a vicious, baseless campaign of character assassination against an inoffensive baker, slandering him as a Yank rather than a Brit, whereas, in truth, the former is what O'Shea's legal status had been for over three decades. And the AFIL would indeed pay a price for such 'slander' in the 1914 local elections.

But what of national politics? As Borgonovo puts it, "*the 'Mollie Maguires' eagerly awaited the next parliamentary election to drive a stake through the heart of their nemesis William O'Brien*" (p 9). Well, the only parliamentary election where that could have been put to the test was the November 1916 West Cork by-election, following the death of the AFIL MP, James Gilhooly, when the seat was indeed won by the Redmondite candidate, Daniel O'Leary. But Borgonovo is quite contradictory on this issue and only succeeds in producing confusion. He had already written: "*The Irish Party eclipsed the AFIL in the 1914 local elections*" (p 9). Now, in the non-astronomical usage of the term, "*eclipsed*" is given a dictionary definition of "*a humbling end or downfall*" or "*a fall into obscurity or disuse*". And yet it was not the fluke, Pyrrhic victory of the Redmondite O'Leary that saw off the AFIL. Borgonovo goes on to write:

"Despite growing public support following the Easter Rising, no formal republican party structure existed in Cork until December 1916. The political

vacuum was especially acute in Cork, because William O'Brien's {eclipsed?} AFIL offered disillusioned nationalists an alternative to John Redmond. The All-For threat to republicans became evident during a December (sic) by-election to fill a parliamentary vacancy in west Cork... Frank Healy had been briefly interned ... (and) he stood for the vacant seat on behalf of the AFIL, while claiming to represent Irish political prisoners ... but refused to abstain from the House of Commons. Writing on behalf of fellow republican prisoners in Reading jail, Tomás MacCurtain repudiated Healy's candidacy. Volunteer leaders in Cork also charged Healy with attempting to co-opt their movement... Despite O'Brien's intervention, Healy lost the Bantry by-election to a Redmondite (a second AFIL candidate split the All-For vote). The defeat convinced O'Brien to wind down the AFIL and shut the doors of his money-losing *Cork Free Press*." (p 76).

But it was not so much a wind down as a takeover by what we might call Continuity *Cork Free Press*. There was once a time when—having received my article "*Did Redmond Reconquer West Cork in 1916?*"—Borgonovo would have noted its findings. But nowadays we must deal with the negative consequences—as far as Borgonovo is concerned—of the fact that this article appeared in the July 2009 issue of *Irish Political Review*. (Oh bah! Aubane!). John would otherwise have noted how I had pointed out that in the November 1916 by-election the Redmondite O'Leary's vote was down by 94 votes on his December 1910 total; that the combined, but split, vote of the two AFIL candidates exceeded O'Leary's by 255; that the *Cork Free Press* correspondent Tadhg Barry had first made an unsuccessful approach to get Healy to stand as an abstentionist Sinn Féin candidate; and that there was probably a significant ex-AFIL—now turned Republican—vote that had abstained on this occasion. The AFIL was, indeed, ripe for takeover.

John Borgonovo has played an important role in arguing against the sectarian interpretation of history by Peter Hart, in demolishing the work of Hart's disciple Gerard Murphy, and in directly confronting in debate on such issues, Hart's mentor David Fitzpatrick, Professor of Modern History at Trinity College Dublin. The Professor now gets his revenge on Borgonovo by way of a condescending and patronising review in the September/October issue of *History Ireland*, even to the point of partly rehabilitating Murphy, whose work Fitzpatrick had previously rubbished as follows in the Spring 2011 issue of *Dublin Review of Books*: "At

times the exposition resembles that of a mediocre essay by a bright but untrained undergraduate. As history, the book is almost impenetrable." But now Fitzpatrick writes:

"Cork provided the setting for Peter Hart's controversial yet compelling *The IRA and its enemies...* Less rigorously, Gerard Murphy's *The year of disappearances* provided further evidence of brutal sectarian murders and sinister abductions in the city... Apologists of contemporary republicanism have set out to discredit, sometimes by foul means as well as fair, the integrity of those denigrating the revolutionaries. {Whoever can he mean? —MOR.} John Borgonovo ... does not directly re-enter this minefield in his new political history of the city... Instead, he returns to the slightly less-trodden terrain of political republicanism in its least violent and most populist manifestation, before the toughs took over the show {or perhaps before they had toughened}. The narrative is jaunty and endearingly old-fashioned... {Yet} he cannot match the analytical power and eloquence of Hart, the intellectual range of Townshend or the meticulousness of Laffan."

Fitzpatrick does, however, have one valid objection to Borgonovo's approach that is worth refining and then pursuing:

"Reverting to Brian Farrell's dubious claim that the vote in 1918 reflected a generational gulf between ageing Home Rulers and young, previously disenfranchised Sinn Féiners (p 228), he ignores the more plausible thesis that the new movement drew much of its electoral support from former Home Rulers and their families."

But that is only half the story. Electoral support for the Republic in 1918 would, indeed, have come from across the board. But from which background did Cork's Republican **activists** emerge? Borgonovo fights shy of articulating any such Aubane conclusion, namely, that a decisive blow to Redmondism in Cork had already been inflicted by the AFIL victories of 1910, facilitating an almost seamless movement of the latter's activists towards Sinn Féin. Borgonovo prefers to conclude that, along the way to their 1918 victory, "*republicans buried the AFIL*" and "*smashed Irish Party*". (p 230). Now, "*dead and buried*" was indeed the sort of language about the AFIL that had previously been quoted by Borgonovo from the Cork County Secretary of the Redmondite AOH in order to explain the continuation of AFIL hostility that had seen the shrinking of his own troops from 34 to 11 divisions between 1916 and 1920: "*When it (the AFIL) was dead, they turned and joined the Sinn Féiners*" (p 116). But surely such a coherent and disciplined crossover of

membership should be called a takeover rather than a burial. The details in the body of Borgonovo's own text cry out for such a conclusion.

"The Irish Party's core structures in Cork took a beating during 1917, continuing a downward trajectory from 1914 to the final collapse in 1919. The National Volunteers militia was the first to go, having degraded significantly in 1915... The City Regiment fell to 200 reliable at the end of the year, with J.J. Horgan explaining to John Redmond (4 December 1915) that '*it has almost ceased to exist*', having lost members to the British Army and the despised AFIL." (p113).

"As the Cork Sinn Féin organisation was constructed in 1917, very few Irish Party office-holders crossed over to the republicans... Likewise, Sinn Féin did not absorb any of the AFIL town councillors or party leaders, despite their prior sympathy with separatism and **the migration of the AFIL rank and file to the republican banner**" (pp 79-80; my emphasis—MOR).

That Borgonovo misses the point in his conclusions is also down to the fact that he makes only four references in the body of his narrative to the final editor of O'Brien's *Cork Free Press*, Frank Gallagher. He totally ignores the latter's eyewitness account in respect of a critical turning-point, and even suggests that Gallagher was actually untruthful at another juncture. Now, having his good name taken is not something new, as far as Gallagher is concerned. As I wrote in "*Citizens of the Republic: Jews in Independent Ireland*"—see www.dr.b.ie/essays/citizens-of-the-republic—*Dublin Review of Books*, Summer 2007:

"The reputation of Éamon de Valera's propaganda chief Frank Gallagher—founding editor of the *Irish Press* and editor and director of the Government Information Bureau—has been tarnished by the novelist Roddy Doyle. Author of that powerful 1953 account of the War of Independence, *The Four Glorious Years*, Gallagher had heroically served the underground elected Irish parliament, Dáil Éireann, as editor of the *Irish Bulletin* during that same War. In Doyle's 1999 historical novel, *A Star Called Henry*, he was to be caricatured in the shape of the character Jack Dalton, the rabidly anti-Semitic *Bulletin* editor/gunman behind the racist murder of the Jewish Mr Climanis—an incident that had no foundation in fact. It is to the credit of Dermot Keogh that, in both his 1998 history (*Jews in Twentieth Century Ireland*) and his 2006 essay ("Irish Refugee Policy: Anti-Semitism and Nazism at the Approach of World War Two", in Gisela Holfter, ed, *German-speaking Exiles in Ireland 1933-1945*), he painstakingly related the strenuous—

and ultimately successful—campaign organised by Frank Gallagher to rescue the Jewish Wortsman family from Nazi Germany, an account also echoed by Siobhán O'Connor (See her essay in Holfter, *op. cit.*). In addition, the recollections of the half-Jewish German refugee Monica Schefold (née Hennig) portray with considerable warmth the welcome that she received in Gallagher's home during her earlier years of childhood exile (See her essay in Holfter, *op. cit.*)."

But why do we find Borgonovo taking a particular Cork newspaper account as the preferred option of his basic narrative on page 31, while adding a footnote on page 261 that casts doubt on the veracity of Gallagher's account?

"J.J. Horgan did covertly assist the recruiting council by suggesting a speaking tour by Inchigeela native and Victoria Cross winner Sergeant Michael O'Leary... {But} authorities dispensed with the services of his father after he complained to a Macroom audience, 'The Irish never got their rights from England, but the Irish fought her battles.' (*Cork Constitution*, 13 April 1915. This quotation differs from Frank Gallagher's in *The Four Glorious Years*, p 43)."

And so, Borgonovo opts for the prim and proper language attributed by that Empire Loyalist newspaper to O'Leary's father, ignoring the fact that this language was a British censor's construct, as had been explained by Gallagher on the self-same page 43, and which censored version would have been accepted with alacrity by such an organ of Cork Unionism. And when it comes to his account of O'Brien's anti-partition meeting in Cork City Hall on 23rd June 1916, where Republican demonstrators had indeed denied O'Brien a hearing, Borgonovo's complete wiping of Gallagher's own account from the record is all the more inexplicable.

Borgonovo narrates:

"Republicans Dermot O'Brien and Tadhg Barry (a sports reporter employed by William O'Brien's *Cork Free Press*) stormed the stage and seized control of the meeting... William O'Brien never again mounted a platform in Cork city, and within a year he retired from politics. With characteristic hubris and questionable veracity, O'Brien claimed the republican leaders '*came out on the platform to announce that their refusal of a hearing was not through any personal disrespect or failure of affection for me, but to express their dissent from my attitude in the War, and solely because I was the only man who had the power of winning honest Nationalists back to a Parliamentary movement which was otherwise dead and rotten.*' ..." (p 51).

But why does he characterise O'Brien

as a liar on that score? Much later, Borgonovo makes a passing reference to the Republican Gallagher as O'Brien's "*former protégé*" (p 215), yet he ignores the fact that, from 1914 on, Gallagher had also been O'Brien's main protagonist in such arguments, while never ceasing to love him throughout their quarrel. Borgonovo should have taken account of how Gallagher himself had written of that conflict:

"The great Home Rule debates were on in London and I was chosen by ... the *Cork Free Press* to go there to report them. Old William O'Brien ... was then the nearest of the National leaders to Sinn Féin... One (1914) evening he sent me a note to come to him... We often had such meetings. **A relationship had developed between us almost of father and son...** He was then sixty-one years of age, and I had just turned twenty. That night William O'Brien told me he was going to declare for Britain in the war... There abides with me a recollection of a conversation, entirely placid, which is strange... I turned to the practical effect of what he was going to do. If he made a recruiting speech ... **his All-for-Ireland clubs would swing away and become branches of Sinn Féin...** He made his speech—and his leadership was over... His All-for-Ireland movement melted away and its place was taken by Volunteer companies and Sinn Féin clubs. **Later I was called back to Ireland to run the paper, and I found that the staff was Sinn Féin, too.** Tadhg Barry, our GAA specialist... Seán Ó Tuama, Paddy Reilly, old Ned Lane, and, of course, many of the printers... {After O'Brien had deplored the 1916 Rising as 'heartbreaking folly'} the staff and I talked it over and it was decided I must go to London to see William... It was a stormy meeting... He was an explosive man and he exploded... 'I know the Irish people and believe me there won't be a Sinn Féiner in Ireland in three months.' I answered with a young man's dogmatism, 'there won't be any but Sinn Féiners in Ireland in three months!' ... {The compromise was that} for nearly six months, when the voice of insurgency was throttled, the *Cork Free Press*, though it could not openly support Sinn Féin, spoke out of a background of Ireland's right to be free and to have her own policy even in war... {As regards the June 1916 Cork City Hall meeting} that William O'Brien should have been denied a hearing in the city he had represented for so long meant more than a political change. It was a national turning away from even the kindlier phases of 'Constitutionalism'. After the meeting I went to see him... Looking up quizzically as I came through the door he said: 'So this is what you and your Sinn Féiners have done to me.' 'Not the Sinn Féiners', I answered, 'because you remember, Mr. O'Brien that in three months ...' and as I vanished I heard his burst of laughter." (pp 222-228; my emphases—MOR).

Borgonovo does relate:

"The AFIL's two (Cork city) parliamentary incumbents, William O'Brien and Maurice Healy, stood down prior to the {December 1918} election. At the beginning of 1918, O'Brien graciously, if reluctantly, passed the baton to Sinn Féin. In late October, William O'Brien announced his retirement, endorsed Sinn Féin, and published his new pamphlet, *The Failure of Parliamentarianism*. He told former protégé Frank Gallagher..." (p 214-15).

But that was not the sequence! In his footnotes for the second sentence, he records Tim Healy dating the O'Brien decision as being 17th February 1918. But O'Brien's "*Sinn Féiners have saved the country*" letter to Gallagher was dated 3rd January 1918. In other words, he had told Gallagher first, almost six weeks earlier! How come? One would never guess, from the paucity of references to Gallagher, the intensity of his ongoing political relationship with O'Brien. At one point Borgonovo relates:

"by the end of 1917, the city boasted sixteen (Irish Volunteer) companies covering the breadth of the city, organised into two battalions and numbering about 2,000 men." (p 85).

But when we go to the footnotes on page 276 to ascertain the source, we find that this information was communicated in a letter dated 31st December 1917 from Gallagher to O'Brien, to which the latter's "*Sinn Féiners*" letter, three days later, was a reply! Nothing "*reluctant*" there! For Gallagher had never given up on O'Brien. It could be said that the child had become father to the man. In truth, the Cork city Republican movement could quite accurately be described as Continuity *Cork Free Press*!

But what of West Cork? Michael Collins's eldest brother, Johnny, was eleven years his senior. In *Michael Collins—A Biography* (1990), Tim Pat Coogan recorded:

"A week after Bloody Sunday, on 28 November 1920, there came the news of the Kilmichael ambush by Tom Barry and his flying column. The Auxiliaries had suffered their greatest losses to date, seventeen killed in the attack. **Seán Collins (equally known as Johnny), Collins' brother, had played a part in its planning.** Collins' depression lifted." (p 164; my emphasis—MOR).

But, in writing of the November 1916 West Cork by-election in *Mick—The Real Michael Collins* (2005), Peter Hart had also speculated:

"Two AFIL candidates did try to align themselves as separatist sympathisers

(was Johnny Collins involved?), but their squabbling helped let the Irish Party man back in." (pp 124-125).

Except, of course, whatever about that Pyrrhic victory, the Redmondite candidate had not been "let **back** in", since he had lost the previous two electoral contests, making it an AFIL seat 1910-16.

But what of Johnny Collins's politics? The earlier part of Peter Hart's biography of "*Mick*" provides some background, as well as a healthy antidote for the poisonous, sectarian narrative dominating Hart's own earlier books:

"Before he was anything else, he was a Collins. Or, more properly, he was a product of the Collins and O'Brien families, born on 16 October 1890 to Michael (Mike) Collins and Marianne (or Mary Anne) O'Brien... **Some of the Collinses and many other future republicans were O'Brienites.** Many of the Collinses' neighbours were Church of Ireland... Neighbourliness and friendship often trumped religion or politics within this and other townlands, as evidenced by Mike senior's helping out the local vicar. Some Protestant farmers had joined with their Catholic and nationalist fellows in fighting for lower rents and the right to buy their farms from their landlords. **A few were active nationalists.** The great majority were not 'active' in politics at all, but were mainly interested in getting along and getting ahead. Having neighbours who are ethnically different has never pre-disposed anyone to tolerance, but under his father's influence ... **Collins was absolutely devoid of sectarian prejudice...** Working farmers rarely have much time to spare for politics but **Johnny did have his own political career.** 'He had always been an advanced Irishman', according to Collins... **He was the first president of the Lissavaid branch of William O'Brien's All for Ireland League, was later involved with the Clonakilty Farmers Association, and by 1921 was on the county council (for Sinn Féin).** Woodfield (his home) was used as an IRA safe house during the guerrilla war and, like every other Collins and O'Brien house, was raided by Crown forces. **Once his pony cart was found abandoned near the site of a failed ambush in Rosscarbery (four miles away) in February 1921 reprisal was certain.** The army waited until mid-April. What happened is best told in Collins's own words: '... *The English forces proceeded to throw them (the Collins family) out of the house, and ... proceeded with burning. The dwellinghouse itself, and every out-office (with the exception of one stable) was completely destroyed... Eight young children were left homeless and there was no person and no thing left to carry on the ordinary work of the farm.*' ..." (pp 3, 12; and 20-21; all emphases mine—MOR). Like the Kil-

michael ambush, in whose planning Johnny had been involved, the Ross-carbery ambush had also been mounted by Tom Barry's Flying Column. Participating in the latter ambush was the IRA's Clonakilty Battalion Commander, Jim Hurley. Hurley would later be among the ambush party that shot Michael Collins in August 1922 in the Cogadh na gCarad military engagement at Béalnabláth. Johnny made his peace with Jim Hurley as early as 1923, and they would be buried side-by-side in Clonakilty, upon their respective deaths in 1965).

In this book, Hart did not cite any Aubane publication for providing him with background on the AFIL, but neither did he cite any other publication, 'academic' or otherwise. In fact, one of the book review criticisms made of his Collins biography was the paucity of citations in general. Be that as it may, and for all his faults, Hart did at least list three Aubane publications in the bibliography for his 1998 book *The IRA & Its Enemies*. Indeed, by way of contrast with Borgonovo, when citing sources for AFIL background in his earlier book, Hart had no hesitation in listing the Aubane book by Brendan Clifford, as well as the Berkeley University book by Joseph O'Brien and an Oxford University book by Paul Bew (pp 42-43). Admittedly, when it came to specifics for Hart, it was to start quibbling with Brendan Clifford's analysis:

"Most young men had no 'politics' (in the party sense) at all. William O'Brien's All For Ireland League did have a scattered fringe of youthful radicals (primarily in Bantry, Ballinadee, and the city) but most of those departed after O'Brien declared his support for the war effort in 1914. {Precisely!—MOR}. O'Brienites were seen as natural allies by Sinn Féin in the common fight against the 'Mollies', and as natural supporters during the Tan War by the IRA, but there is no evidence that the Volunteers drew proportionately more members from O'Brienite families or districts... However, to say, as Brendan Clifford does—page 51—that '*the AFIL strongholds were the areas where the war of independence was chiefly fought*' is clearly untrue... The Haleses were an exception in this respect" (pp 205-6).

Yet, in 1972, Liam Deasy of Innishannon, who had served as Adjutant of the IRA's West Cork Brigade from August 1919 and its Commandant from April 1921 (following the capture of Tom Hales in July 1920 and the death in action of Hales's successor, Charlie Hurley, in March 1921), recalled the vigour of the political conflict he had witnessed in his early teens, in sharp contrast to the overwhelming dominance of Redmondism elsewhere in Nationalist Ireland:

"The elections were, in most cases, closely contested. House to house canvassing took place, public meetings were held, and feeling ran high. The keen political rivalry between the O'Brienites and the Redmondites, which I witnessed in my native district during the years between 1909 and the outbreak of the first world war, was peculiar to County Cork for the reason that nowhere else, save perhaps in North Louth, was the sway exercised by O'Brien so strong as in Cork City and County. And it may well be that the interest in political affairs roused throughout Cork by the struggle between the two opposing parties of the O'Brienites and the Redmondites helped to stimulate the extraordinary enthusiasm and drive that Cork City and County showed later in the Volunteer movement during the War of Independence." (*Towards Ireland Free: The West Cork Brigade in the War of Independence*, p 2).

But, back to the Hales saga, and the fact that it only goes to prove Brendan Clifford's point, which argument is further strengthened by Hart's own later researches on the Clonakilty AFIL family background of Michael Collins. In West Cork, AFIL and Republican fervour was one and the same thing. Clonakilty had been the only district in Munster to rise in 1798, when the Battle of the Big Cross was fought by the Croppies and their leader Tadhg an Asna killed in action. He is buried on Ballintemple hill, on land that had been the childhood home of my maternal grandfather Larry Keohane until his family were evicted in the 1880s, and which hill in turn overlooks the Darrara churchyard where my Keohane forebears are themselves buried.

In 1998, Clonakilty's Battle of the Big Cross Commemorative Journal carried an article entitled "*The All For Ireland League Banner*", in which Jerry O'Leary recounted:

"I have in my possession the All For Ireland League Banner which belonged to the Darrara Branch, and which was entrusted to my father for safe keeping. On the front is a hand painted portrait of Tadhg an Asna seated on a white horse on his way to the Battle of the Big Cross, with images of other United Irishmen armed with pikes in the background... On the reverse of the banner is printed the following verse: '*We hate the Saxon and the Dane, We hate the Norman men, We cursed their greed for blood and gain, We curse them now again. Yet start not, born Irishmen, If you're to Ireland true, We heed not blood, nor creed, nor clan, We've hearts and hands for you.*' ... During the War of Independence, the banner was buried wrapped in straw and blankets several feet deep in a field. If it was detected during a house raid by the military at the time it could have had grave consequences for the household... It made its next public appearance at the

150th commemoration of the Battle of the Big Cross in 1948, when it was carried on the march from the Big Cross to Tadhg an Asna's memorial in the square in Clonakilty... Plans are presently underway to preserve the Darrara Branch All For Ireland League Banner in its original state."

The Haleses were **not** an exception, but they were central. And in that centrality they were undoubtedly leaders of exceptional calibre. I have always given credit to Hart where credit was due. As I pointed out in my July 2009 article, in the midst of all the poisonous dishonesty about Kil-michael and Dunmanway in Hart's *The IRA & Its Enemies*, there is one essay that is both an exception in character, as well as being exceptionally well-researched. That is "*The Rise and Fall of a Revolutionary Family*", Hart's portrait of the Hales family. The late Peter Hart was a mass of contradictions, and in the case of his quibbling with Brendan Clifford's assessment of the AFIL's significance, Hart's own Hales essay, followed by his Collins biography, actually confirms Brendan's conclusions! As Hart related (all emphases being mine):

"On 22 August 1922 Michael Collins set out on a tour of his native West Cork, newly occupied by Free State forces. His last stop was Bandon. There he met with Seán Hales, the officer responsible for driving the IRA out of the towns he had just visited. An hour later Collins was dead, killed in an IRA ambush on the road home. The commander of the ambush was Tom Hales. {Surely the most dramatic illustration of the appropriateness of the description, Cogadh na mBráithre! Free State TD Seán Hales would later be assassinated by the IRA's Dublin Brigade, on 7 December 1922—MOR}. The two brothers' involvement in this critical episode was no coincidence. The Hales family had been at the eye of the revolutionary storm in West Cork since the 1916 rising, and their personal histories were closely intertwined with that of the Volunteer movement... All his life (their father) Robert Hales was a pioneer. Born in the shadow of the great famine in 1849, by the turn of the century he stood out as a successful entrepreneur, even among the prosperous farmers of his home district of Ballinadee (several miles south of Bandon)... Robert Hales was also a political entrepreneur. Active in the Land War and the Plan of Campaign (and a reputed Fenian), he was a lifelong radical and supporter of William O'Brien. **When O'Brien formed the All For Ireland League in 1910 to oppose the Irish Party, Hales was among the first to join and was elected as an O'Brienite to Bandon's Rural District Council and Poor Law Board.** (See *Cork Free Press*, 18, 20 June 1910). Hales's children inherited much of his energy as well as

his anti-landlord and anti-British politics. **His eldest sons, Seán, Bob, and Tom were ... staunch O'Brienites ...** and (also) joined Sinn Féin and the clandestine IRB. **Like many other AFIL members, however, they initially held aloof from the Volunteer movement in 1914, considering it a Redmondite front.** In this ... the other young men of Ballinadee followed their lead. After the Volunteers split and the dissident minority reorganised itself in early 1915, however, the Haleses became enthusiastic converts. Robert had already taken a public stand against supporting the British war effort. Seán wrote to Terence MacSwiney in April promising that he could raise a hundred men for a Volunteer company, nearly all over 6 feet tall... The Haleses delivered the young men of Ballinadee *en bloc* by recruiting friends, neighbours, cousins, work- and teammates. At the centre of this network were the four Hales brothers, Seán, Robert, Tom and Bill... The company grew from about thirty men in May 1915 to sixty in June, and sixty-eight in July. By April 1916 they numbered 110... The (RIC) county inspector for West Cork singled out Ballinadee for special attention and reported that **'they are almost entirely composed of farmers' sons of military age, who, before the war, were followers of Mr O'Brien MP, but who are now in opposition to his pro-war policy'**... Although Seán, aged 35, did much of the organising work, it was Tom, 25, who became the Captain. Bill, the youngest, was made secretary. When the Ballinadee Company and its satellites were grouped into a battalion in 1916, Tom was appointed its commander and Seán replaced him as captain." (pp 187-189).

Following the post-1916 reorganisation of both the Volunteers and Sinn Féin:

"Bill became (West Cork party) secretary and Tom was made a member of the party's constituency executive. Both followed their father onto the local district council... Tom was confirmed in early 1918 as the (IRA Bandon) battalion O/C, Seán was once again captain of the Ballinadee Company... *'It was the sixty men that I inaugurated outside Ballinadee'*, Tom declared (in 1941), *'that made the Third Cork Brigade'*... All the brothers were now on the run. **Their position in the vanguard of the struggle was confirmed in January 1919 when Michael Collins placed Tom in command of the newly formed (3rd) West Cork Brigade...** Seán took Tom's place as Bandon battalion commander... **The family was also in the forefront of the burgeoning guerrilla campaign...** The Bandon Volunteers launched a series of raids ... culminating in February 1920 with simultaneous assaults on RIC barracks in Timoleague and Mount Pleasant, led respectively by Seán and Tom. Seán led the brigade flying column in the Brinny and Newcestown ambushes

in the autumn and Bill was also active in several operations that winter. **Seán, Bill, and Bob were all present at the battle of Crossbarry in March 1921,** Bob participated in the subsequent capture of the Rosscarbery barracks and Seán organised kidnappings and reprisals against suspected loyalists in June... The family's reputation as patriots and leaders, already established before the Great War, rose with each exploit... Tom and Seán Hales proved to be successful entrepreneurs like their father. Between them they helped create the republican movement in West Cork and led—or pushed—it down the untried and uncertain path to revolution. By doing so they made history... Radicalism ran in the Hales family... The father {former AFIL local leader Robert Hales—MOR}, sisters, brothers, and cousins were all active in the republican movement. Closely bound up with this kinship network was the Haleses' strong sense of neighbourhood... The Haleses defined themselves politically in terms of this community: *'there would not be a parliament in Dublin but for the Ballinadee crowd'*. (Tom Hales, 10 June 1941). It was their leadership of the 'Ballinadee crowd'—the declared

ability to recruit 100 men over 6 feet tall—that made them regional leaders in West Cork" (pp 192-200).

The West Cork Brigade's victories at Kilmichael and Crossbarry shook British rule in Ireland to its foundations. As the song says, *"The boys who bate the Black-and-Tans were the boys from the County Cork"*. And yet: the IRA's West Cork Brigade had been created and commanded by the former AFIL activist Tom Hales; Michael Collins's brother, the former AFIL local leader Johnny Collins, was to be involved in the planning of the Kilmichael ambush; and the former AFIL activist Seán Hales was to be a Section Commander at the Battle of Crossbarry. In fact, the boys who bate the Black-and-Tans were *Continuity AFIL!* But Peter Hart could not see the wood for the trees of his own research. And, of course, John Borgonovo is another who has completely missed the point about the AFIL. But has he also missed the point about the First Dáil?

(to be continued)

Manus O'Riordan

A Critic Emerges From Academia, *Michael Carragher*

The following item by Michael Carragher was published on the Internet on 21st November 2011. Being computer illiterate, I could not know of it until a printed copy was sent to me. It is two years old, which I suppose is pre-historic in Internet time. On the other hand, it appears to be the studied judgment of an academic insider on the B&ICO etc. etc. and deserves to be put on the printed record in real time. I have no idea who Michael Carragher is, but he writes in mentoring mode, as if on behalf of the profession of academic history. Academics have been brooding resentfully for a generation about the encroachments of BICO etc. on their territory, while maintaining a rigid silence in public. But Carragher has gone public and given us an insight on their musings.

*

"Re: Historical Revisionism and the Irish War of Independence.

by *michaelcarragher...*

Vincent,

This is, as you say, a "very good paper", if a polemical one. That Niall Meehan is not a professional historian hardly takes from the worth of his views, and besides, the whole revisionist issue being a divisive one, polemicism is inevitable, and a review of rival polemicisms necessary for the honest

student of history to form as near to an objective opinion as anyone can ever get.

That honest student, however, would need to bear in mind the source of this paper: the Aubane Historical Society, a front for the British and Irish Communist Organisation and therefore an historical society in the same way that, say, Martin Mansergh is an historian.

This is not to equate Mr Mansergh with Aubane: I don't doubt that Mr Mansergh is an honourable man but for all his impressive knowledge of the past he is not an historian because he is a politician, and no man can serve those two masters. Even more so, no Communist organisation can be an historical society in any meaning of that adjective.

So, while Brian Murphy's piece is honest and sincere, his claim that Aubane's "publication of [original source material], all with important introductions, indicate[s] a willingness to restore original source material into the historical narrative", is quite touching in its naiveté (for I cannot believe Fr Murphy would try to mislead people).

To take one such document he mentions, Percy Crozier's *The Men I Killed*. The choice of that tasteless title for a single-volume distillation of Crozier's four sizeable books is itself significant;

A Brass Hat in No Man's Land, or Impressions and Recollections, would seem to be more suitable, but *The Men I Killed* better suits the message to be sent about a British general and leader of the Black and Tans. The fact that old Percy was a thoroughly nasty bit of work offers plenty of opportunity to hoist him on his own petard.

Percy wasn't the leader of the Black and Tans at all, of course, but of the Auxiliaries {sic}; but not all of the people that Aubane seeks to seduce will know about the Auxies, while all can be depended upon to know about the Black and Tans, and react in Pavlovian fashion. And it will come as news to historians that in the inter-war years "Britain was still 'the' Great Power". She had long ceded this position to Germany and the USA, and if Germany was for the moment ruined by its rash war, Britain had also been ruined in defeating Germany, and the USA, by a very wide margin, was "the" Great Power.

So either this historical society takes a very slanted view of history, or its business isn't history at all, but propaganda.

To take another example, Casement's book, *The Crime Against Europe*, which sets out to prove that the Great War had been engineered by Britain and that Germany was the victim. This is edited by Brendan Clifford and, while I have no intention of buying his book (I have my own copy), I doubt that Mr Clifford presents it as an interesting example of the absurd and malicious ideas held by many "advanced nationalists" of the day, as an historian would have to.

For instance, Casement claims that

"German militarism" ... is no more a threat to civilisation than French or Russian militarism. It was born, not of wars of aggression, but of wars of defence and unification. Since it was welded by blood and iron into the great human organism of the last forty years it has not been employed beyond the frontiers of Germany until last year.... German militarism has kept peace and has not emerged beyond its own frontier until threatened with universal attack.

Now this is complete nonsense. No historian doubts that Bismarck's wars were anything but cleverly engineered wars of aggression, or that the unification of Germany was anything but the imposition of Prussian might over all the other states. But most damningly of Casement, he denies the Herero and Maji-Maji campaigns, each of which claimed probably 60,000-80,000 Afri-

can lives, or the deliberately induced famine in Ostafrika, which may have killed 300,000. And I doubt if Mr Clifford provides any correction to that misinformation.

However, even a stopped clock tells the right time twice a day, and good propagandists know that the most effective lie is the half-truth, so they leaven their lies with truths and "verisimilitudes". My review of *The Coolacrease Controversy*—on p. 4, above—illustrates this trick.

This particular pamphlet is worth reading. Just always remember to bring a very long spoon when you sup with the devil. And watch for poison mushrooms in the baloney sauce.

michaelcarragher

(<http://livinghistory.ie/viewtopic.php?f=18&t=1619&st=0&sk=t&sd=a&start=80>)

*

I don't doubt that academic historians in Ireland who have read BICO attempts at writing European history—as many of them have done, despite being bound to silence—found the treatment of Britain as the World Superpower in the inter-War period absurd. Post-War British historians did not want the position of Britain after the Great War to be understood that way. But in Britain it is usually arranged that somebody will blurt out the truth, so that actual history and official history do not part company altogether. So there is a book called *The British Empire As A Super-Power 1919-1939*, written by Anthony Clayton, Senior Lecturer in Modern History at Sandhurst, who had a PhD from St. Andrews. It was published by Macmillan in 1986 and therefore had a wide circulation. It was not much noticed as far as I recall, but it was there if needed. I must look up reviews of it and see if the idea that Britain was the Super-Power of the period was indignantly rejected by "historians".

"*She had long ceded this position to Germany and to the USA*" ! She had in fact maintained her absolute naval dominance of the world right through the Great War and refused to concede the American principle of "*freedom of the seas*". Germany was nowhere near disputing British naval dominance when Britain made war on it, locked up its Navy in the Baltic for the duration of the War, and destroyed it after the War. Germany did not have a Navy worth mentioning in the inter-War period, until Britain awarded her the right to have one in 1935, in breach of the Versailles settlement. And the USA, as used to be well-known, retreated into 'isolation' in 1920, after having made a crucial contribution to the defeat of Germany.

Churchill in 1920 described Britain's position in the world as one of mastery and he looked to several generations of magisterial British control.

If Britain "*had been ruined by defeating Germany*", the fact was apparent to nobody in 1920. The Empire had been greatly increased by conquests in the War. It was by far the biggest thing in the world, active throughout the world, and it is against that fact that its conduct of world affairs is to be judged. It was not a mere nation among the nations. It did not live in a world of its peers. It was not even first among equals. It was dominant. It had not ceded its Superpower status to anybody, least of all Germany.

When Germany became a major European Power in the late 1930s—but still nowhere near equality with Britain as a World Power—it was with the assistance of Britain, playing balance-of-power politics with Europe, that it did so. Britain was an active collaborator with Nazi Germany in the 1930s, freeing it from the Versailles restrictions which it had upheld against democratic Germany.

As to Roger Casement's "*absurd and malicious ideas*" about Germany, they were also James Connolly's ideas. If poisonous ideas about world affairs are at the core of the independence movement—and who that was involved in the Rising wrote about world affairs, other than Casement and Connolly?—surely refuting them is something concerned historians "*would have to do*". But I have never come across a pro-British critical analysis, or any kind of critical analysis, by nationalist academics of *The Crime Against Europe* or *The War Upon The German Nation*. They let the poison be and hope it won't be noticed. An attempt to refute it might activate it. It is in fact very difficult to make a case against, unless you are content with sweeping denunciations in general terms.

I know. I tried. Over forty years ago, I wrote a criticism of Connolly for his love affair with the German Empire, taking the Empire to be typified by the Herrero massacres. I was prejudiced against the German Empire by Nietzsche—even though the British war propaganda of the Great War depicted Nietzsche as the exemplar of German Imperialism. But what was called the German Empire predated what might be called German colonialism. The Empire was the federation of German States, and colonialism was not a policy of its founders.

When the Empire, under British influence, embarked on colonial

adventures, it followed the fashion of the time. Around the time that Hans Grimm formed a German colonial society, Gladstone's apparent heir in the Liberal Party, Sir Charles Dilke, published a runaway best-seller called *Greater Britain*, in which he boasted that the Anglo-Saxons were the greatest exterminators the world had ever seen. Genocide was treated as an essential component of Progress by the civilised Powers, and by all civilised states as far as I know. The term "*civilisation*" was used without embarrassment and it justified everything that was done for its advancement.

Genocide was not at issue in the war between the Great Powers in 1914. They had all engaged in great slaughters of peoples of a kind which is now condemned as genocide. Britain most of all, and perhaps Tsarist Russia least of all! It simply was not an issue in 1914, least of all a defining issue. Connolly and Casement dealt with the War as a conflict between the home states of the colonial Powers, and considered what their differences in Europe signified.

About twenty years ago I attended a weekend conference about Robert Lynd held in the Ulster People's College, Belfast—a Communist front organisation, I suppose. I had long been curious about why Connolly's *Labour In Irish History* had been published after his execution with an Introduction by Lynd, and kept in print with that Introduction by the Communist Party. The session on Lynd and Connolly was given by a recently-qualified PhD called Collins, as far as I recall. He said that Lynd had written satires on British war propaganda. In fact what Lynd wrote was British war propaganda.

While the British Liberal backbenchers were disoriented by the sudden onset of the War and didn't quite know what to make of it, Home Rule journalists, T.M. Kettle and Lynd, stepped in and showed in the London press how to write demonising Hun propaganda. Then in 1916 Lynd wrote an Introduction to the Maunsell reprint of Connolly, who had allied himself with Germany. Lynd's job was to rubbish Connolly under the guise of praise—the reverse of Mark Anthony's "*I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him*". His approach was to depict Connolly as a worthy socialist driven to despair by an event that he could not cope with.

Of course in 1916 it was current knowledge that Connolly was pro-German, and that needed to be explained away. But by 1990 fact had been wiped away: Lynd was not a British war

propagandist but a satirist of British war propaganda, and Connolly was not a pro-German war propagandist. When I ventured to say what each of them was, the PhD denounced me pretty well as a fascist for suggesting that Connolly was a supporter of German militarism.

Carragher appears to be against making the actual political literature of earlier periods available to the general reader, instead of pontificating on the basis of material to be found only in University libraries. That seems to be his point about Crozier. But what he says about Auxiliaries and Black and Tans is bizarre. The Athol Books collection was published in the context of the controversy worked up by Peter Hart and Cork University over the ambush of Auxiliaries at Kilmichael. He suggests that we "*seduced*" people into supposing that Crozier was a Black & Tan rather than an Auxie. In my Introduction I described "*Old Percy*" as "*founder and commanding General of the Auxiliary division of the Black-and-Tans in Britain's war*", and went on to describe the Auxiliaries, and Crozier's failure to get them to behave differently from the Black & Tans. Many of the people amongst whom I grew up had experienced both and the prevailing opinion was that these war-hardened Auxie veterans were a nastier version of the Black & Tans. It was Peter Hart's fancy to refer to them as "*Cadets*"—novices, apprentices—and pretend that the official pretence about them was the reality.

So no historian doubts that Bismarck's three wars were wars of aggression! The third one, by far the biggest, followed a French declaration of war on Prussia, which sought to disrupt the process of German unification. The French Emperor went down to the border and exhorted his troops to go and do once more to the Germans what his uncle had done to them, and what the Sun King had done to them before that. It was expected, or hoped, that Bavaria would support the French invasion of Prussia, instead of which it joined forces with Prussia against the French invasion and the German state was formed.

British academics who joined the propaganda factory in 1914 concocted a convoluted argument that Prussia had somehow compelled France to invade it, and that it was therefore the real aggressor. I don't recall on the spur of the moment exactly how it went. Perhaps Carragher would remind us and show how the apparent aggressive war by France on Prussia

was actually a Prussian aggression against France.

The suggestion that Communists can't be historians puts one in mind of the Rev. Kingsley's contention that he need not argue fact with Cardinal Newman because Newman, having changed from an honest Protestant into a slippery Catholic, had become a liar—or at least a person to whom lying was a legitimate tactic.

I suppose that capitalists must tend to write more comforting histories for capitalist societies than Communists, but the reason Aubane is noticed outside its own remote terrain is that capitalist histories of Ireland have in recent decades been little more than echoes of self-exonerating British histories of Ireland.

Brendan Clifford

PS: Carragher's review of *Coolacrease*, "on p4 above", was not available to me. Maybe it will turn up.

James Connolly Re-Assessed, The Irish And European Context by *Manus O'Riordan*. 60pp. **€6, £5**

Connolly And German Socialism by *Brendan Clifford*. 80pp. **€6, £5**

General F.P. Crozier: *The Men I Killed* (1937), *Irish Memoirs* and other writings. Introduction by *Brendan Clifford*. 152 pp. **€14, £11.50**

Coolacrease. The True Story of the Pearson Executions in Co. Offaly, an Incident in the War of Independence by *Paddy Heaney, Pat Muldowney, Philip O'Connor and others*. 427 pp. **€30, £25**

Carl Peters: How German East Africa Was Founded. Translated by *Philip O'Connor*. **€9, £7**

Roger Casement: *The Crime Against Europe*. With *The Crime Against Ireland* Intro. by *B. Clifford*. 184pp. **€18, £15**

Six Days Of The Irish Republic (eyewitness account of 1916), by *L.G. Redmond-Howard*. Contains a profile of Roger Casement, written during his trial; the Irish Case for the League of Nations; and a play written jointly with Harry Carson (the Ulster leader's son). Intro. by *Brendan Clifford*. 256pp. **€21, £17.50**

The Casement Diary Dogmatists. Edited by *Brendan Clifford*. 68pp. **€8, £6**

Traitor-Patriots In The Great War: Casement & Masaryk by *Brendan Clifford*. 56pp. **€6, £5**

Roger Casement: A Reassessment Of The Diaries Controversies by *Mairead Wilson*. 32pp. **€6, £5**

Casement, Alsace-Lorraine And The Great Irredentist War by *Brendan Clifford*. With extracts from *Casement's Crime Against Europe*, and works by *Rene Bazin, Coleman Phillipson* and *Nicholas Mansergh*. 48pp. **€6, £5**

Whatever you say . . .

Anthony McIntyre and Ed Moloney have put aside their little spat with *The Irish News* to fry bigger fish in the shape of the Sinn Fein President. Here there is a common purpose after all—to 'Get Adams'.

The *Irish News* has to be more circumspect in this, however. It has a large republican readership. The paper was a thing of great quality in the past, particularly in its editorials during the 1920s. But it has lately continued, under its editor Noel Doran, along the road of becoming a British tabloid, with headlines like: '*Sinn Fein Leader's brother convicted of raping daughter*' (2.10.13). Here, in the style of the British red-tops, the distinction between Gerry Adams and Sinn Fein and Liam Adams' offences are blurred as much as possible to present a feeling of intricate linking.

What next? '*Gotcha! Paedo Adams Ate My Hamster*' perhaps?

But *The Irish News* is merely a follower in the 'Get Adams' campaign. The originators of it are the participants in the Boston Tapes circus.

Ed Moloney has an article *Why did the Provos hide Liam Adams?* on his *The Broken Elbow* website which is reproduced on McIntyre's *The Pensive Quill* website. This piece originally written in 2010 is about, according to Moloney, "*the emerging pedophile scandal embroiling Liam Adams and his much better known older brother Gerry*".

McIntyre's site has a series called *The Lying* which has now run to five parts. It is fronted with feature film-type posters depicting a shady and sinister Mr. Adams lurking in various menacing poses in the darkness, rather reminiscent of how the Jew was depicted in Nazi propaganda.

The Lying (Part One) is introduced as follows:

"TPQ over the coming nights will feature the full court transcript of the cross examination of Gerry Adams during his brother Liam's trial at Belfast Crown Court... Mr. Adams has come under intense pressure to explain his behaviour in the wake of allegations from his niece that her own father had been sexually abusing her."

McIntyre's *Pensive Quill* is, of course, far from pensive in presenting this and is most interested in the "*intense pressure*" faced by Gerry Adams. Upon reading the transcripts it is clear that the "*intense pressure*" is, however, almost entirely generated in the family situation confronting Mr. Adams rather than in the perform-

ance of the QC. Gerry Adams comes across as a man with nothing to hide but who has borne a painful burden with the rest of his family. The only part of the QC's cross-examination that discomferts him is the detail of the abuse she presents to Gerry Adams, while questioning his evidence on behalf of the victim.

It makes painful reading and presumably that is the point of publishing it. But having read it, it only increased the present writer's sympathy for Adams' predicament rather than diminished it. Only Adams-haters could find any pleasure in it.

Reading it reveals why the press who are out to 'Get Adams' were so selective in their chosen extracts from the trial transcripts. The full transcripts show a man confronting a very painful issue in the private family sphere and attempting to resolve it for the family as best he could. There is not a hint of 'saving his political skin' as the Liam Adams Defence QC alleges. And it seems that all the 'Get Adams' campaigners are interested in is the cross-examining and the acute discomfort that anyone in such a situation would suffer.

Just above *The Lying (Part One)*, on *The Pensive Quill*, is a rather more interesting article by Ed Moloney about Adams' denials of his part in the IRA. Here is Moloney's fantasy politics in *Dealing with the Past Requires Truth from the British and IRA*, where the journalist expresses some sympathy for Adams' predicament:

"Throughout many years reporting on the IRA, I have never been given a satisfactory explanation why Gerry Adams chose to actively deny his membership rather than do what all his predecessors did, which was to fudge his answer: to not tell the truth while never telling a lie, to make a non-denial denial. He first adopted the outright denial approach back in the late 1970's and I can only imagine that he did not then think he would ever be propelled to his current prominence and so claiming non-involvement may not have seemed such a big deal at the time.

"But it has become a big deal, so much so that one must wonder if Gerry Adams himself regrets it. He was without doubt a military strategist of exceptional talent during the 1970's, someone whose record bears comparison with Michael Collins, and he was pragmatic, courageous and tough—some would add ruthless—enough to later lead the Provisionals out of war and into dizzying political success to the extent that he and his party now

stand on the threshold of sharing government power in both states.

"Yet he will not be remembered for this remarkable life story but for his denial of what everyone knows to be the truth.

"And it has been a self-destructive deception. There is no doubt in my mind, for instance, that his denial of their shared lives prompted both Brendan Hughes and Dolours Price to angrily spill the beans on him with allegations that pursue him everywhere.

"At this point Gerry Adams could be forgiven for feeling trapped by his years of dissembling, for feeling that if he now admitted the truth he would only make things worse.

"But to believe that may be to badly misjudge human nature and the hunger for real peace in Ireland. If he was to come clean about his past membership of the IRA and apologize for the years of deception in the appropriate way, it is just as likely that his honesty would receive the warmest of welcomes and be greeted by sympathy, hope and relief. It would be difficult even for his enemies to respond begrudgingly.

"Such a move could have a liberating impact on himself and help slice through the past's Gordian knot, pressurizing all the other parties, not least Ms Villiers, to respond with equal generosity. It would remove at a stroke the most potent weapon wielded by his political opponents in the Dail, and it would guarantee his proper place in Irish history. It could be a game-changing move."

It is clear from this piece that Moloney knows little of Britain and Adams knows her only too well.

Moloney sometimes writes a lot of sense. But the sense he writes co-exists with fantasy. Perhaps that is the Trotskyite legacy.

Earlier in the same piece in which Moloney predicts that "*Dr Haass' mission is doomed*" he gives some very good reasons for Adams' pragmatic stance over IRA membership. This comes in explaining how the British operate a great double-standard in relation to the Twenty-Eight Year War:

"Northern Secretary, Theresa Villiers put the British hurdle in place at a recent meeting of the British-Irish Association at Cambridge where she said that any mechanism for dealing with the past would need to be consistent with the rule of law. The British government, she added, 'will never put those who uphold the law on the same footing as those who seek to destroy it'. Translated, that means the British reserve the right to jail people for offenses allegedly committed between 1968 and 1998 and will not participate in a truth recovery process that regards the misbehaviour of British security forces and intelligence agencies as contributing to the Troubles.

"If Ms Villiers' statement represents the final British word, then it is really a veto on Dr Haass's work. He might as well return now to East 68th Street and resume his job as president of the Council on Foreign Relations for the logic of the NI Secretary's declaration is that the British regard themselves still at 'war' with the IRA and do not wish to see the past properly dealt with. Her statement is the antithesis of what the peace process means.

"Here is the reasoning for that claim. The IRA fought its 'war' against the British mostly by killing or trying to kill soldiers and policemen and by planting bombs to cause commercial damage while the British fought the IRA mostly by trying to put its leaders and activists behind bars.

"As a result of the peace process the IRA has stopped killing and bombing so its 'war' is over; but the British still want to put IRA members in jail. Ergo, the British are still fighting the 'war', or reserve the right to do so, and as long as this is so who could blame IRA leaders and activists for not wanting to come forward to tell the truth about the past and their part in it?

"As for British security force responsibility for the three decades and more of violence the record of unlawful killings, collusion, torture of detainees, intimidation of defense lawyers and repeated failure to properly investigate killings carried out by its forces speaks for itself. As Amnesty International put it: 'Repeated failures by the UK government to hold security forces to account... contributed to an environment of impunity and undermined the rule of law.' In other words the British helped to fuel the violence.

"If the British government insists that any mechanism for dealing with the past must involve pursuing and jailing alleged paramilitary wrongdoers from the Troubles period while its own misdeeds escape scrutiny then Northern Ireland will never be able to put its past behind it and Dr Haass's mission will fail."

So there we have it: Britain was very responsible for the War which the Republican Army fought and it is still fighting that war whilst the Republican Army has been at Peace for a decade and a half.

And it suggests that Gerry Adams is also very liable to be arrested whenever Britain sees fit since Whitehall neither recognises other combatants as legitimate or having any rights in relation to the appliance of British criminal Law to them. And the British position, despite signing the Good Friday Agreement, is that the War is not granted the status of a war. And it is still being fought by Britain, according to Moloney.

So, Gerry would be very wise to take Seamus Heaney's advice: "*Whatever you say, say nothing.*"

Pat Walsh

A British Army Undercover Unit

It is said in the British Armed Forces the individual has the right to protest about actions they might have to carry out against their better judgement. Of course they can protest but only after having carried out the said action. Now, forty years after the event, we have the *revelations* about an Undercover Army Unit known as the Military Reaction Force and its implication in the killing of unarmed civilians in Northern Ireland. What triggered this was a crude memoir by one of the operatives and reviewed at length in the *Daily Mail*.

The British media is now *revealing* these murderous operations and it is being echoed by the Irish media, including RTE. But it was common knowledge among British, Irish and foreign journalists who were staying at the Europa Hotel, Belfast, in the early part of the 1970s. I knew one American journalist personally who had served in various war-zones, including Vietnam, and who was now concentrating solely on the Belfast Republican areas in his reporting. On his travels throughout the world he was aware of shadowy military units being used against the civilian population, in Latin America for example. He was aware of what was happening in N.I. was war and not the puny *Troubles* as depicted by British and Irish journalists. He expected there would be a severe reaction from the British Army and in visiting Republican areas on a regular basis he got to the truth of it all. But he could not get editors of newspapers or magazines to print what he had discovered. Nor would radio or television North and South of the border, and in the UK and the USA, take up his offer.

I can only think of the Europa Hotel as a mini-Casablanca, back then, as portrayed in the film of that name, which starred Humphrey Bogart and Ingrid Bergman, where enemies mingled and eyed one another with suspicion. The American journalist was aware that unarmed civilians were being killed by an undercover British Army unit, the Catholic population knew it, the British journalists knew but were in the main self-censoring. Some of them seemed to be on good terms with British Army representatives in the hotel. Two of these journalists had been in the officer corp. of the Army and had *chummy* conversations with the army reps who were in effect British Army Intelligence.

Foreign journalists generally felt put upon by them to such an extent that most of them left the country.

I had stayed twice at the Europa for lengthy periods during the early 1970s while working on theatre and television projects. It wasn't my choice to be there, the company was paying.

Journalist generally milled around the breakfast room during early morning, exchanging bits of information. I sat there over a cup of coffee watching these shenanigans while the American journalist discussed the undercover business with them. He said later none of them were in the least surprised. They just continued to mill, waiting for something to happen. Above all the noise a bomb would go off somewhere in the city. That meant it was time to go to the scene. But first they made their way to the 12th floor to look over the city for smoke and flames and to pinpoint the location.

Two girls from West Belfast hung around the lobby most days and were willing to drive journalists to Republican areas for reporting purposes. That suited the American journalist fine.

I could never understand PIRA's insistence on bombing the hotel. They did it 28 times until it became known as Hardboard Hotel because of the material used to cover the blasted windows. Once I stood some distance from it when it was once again evacuated because of a bomb threat and watched the glass fall like a waterfall from the top floor. For a time it was known as Hotel Waterfall. Some guessed it was a symbol of luxury looming over the poor streets of Catholic West Belfast and that the more left of PIRA wanted it flattened. Whereas the two girls were there to shepherd journalists around and reveal to them the Republican areas under siege. Did the left hand know what the right hand was doing?

The Europa employed quite a lot of Catholic staff who were constantly worrying that the next bombing might go wrong and kill. No one had been killed in the previous attacks through warning and evacuation. They also had to worry about this new British Army undercover unit, never mind the Loyalist death squad that could be waiting as they made their way home late at night. These were the people the American journalist had spoken to first when he first booked into the hotel. Hotel staff all over the world usually know what is happening and what to look out for, he said.

Wilson John Haire
21 November, 2013

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

THE BANKS

The bankers are at it again. They have learned that they will not end up in gaol. They will be, and are now, being rewarded by high salaries and big fat pensions. Governments will protect the Bankers and will throw the tax-payers to the lions. Taxes are optional for the wealthy. A recent news item in the *London Financial Times* reports that 95% mortgages are again being given out in the UK. And, even though the European Central Bank (ECB) interest rate is almost zero, the banks are lending freely to credit card holders at exorbitant rates—Bank of Ireland VISA is 16% p.a. AIB VISA is 20% and Permanent TSB is 23%. The high percentages are to cover the high tolerance of the banks for bad debts on personal credit cards and the tolerance of various types of card frauds. This means that honest card-holders are paying for defaulters and fraudsters.

What is a worse consequence is that the huge bank lending to card-holders is depriving small and medium size companies and sole traders of loans for working capital. No business can afford to borrow at credit card rates of interest and the banks are not lending at reasonable rates for working capital.

This is why the small business economy is stalled. The Tiger bubble did burst in 2007 but it has not fully gone down yet. Businesses are still closing. Indeed the banks are closing branches and cutting staff. How is it that every small town throughout Ireland had branches of the banks and each branch could employ four or five people? There were no machines in the 1940s and 1950s. Every entry in the records had to be written out by hand twice—once in the bank's records and once in the customer's passbooks. And yet the banks were profitable in those years. The answer is that the banks were taking in deposits in all their branches. The deposits enabled the banks to lend. And all of the bank workers kept the local economies going when spending their wages locally. That is about to change. The branches are closing.

The banks are, as well as taking in deposits, borrowing from the wholesale markets and lending out expensively to credit card holders. So it can rightly be said that the Irish banks are not servicing

the economy. It is very questionable why the tax-payers were made to pay to support the banks. We were threatened with "systemic failure" if the banks were not saved. What "systemic failure" is exactly is never spelled out. But failure is evident all around us, in spite of bailing out the banks. When certain manoeuvres were carried out behind scenes in Anglo-Irish Bank, it was mutated and faded out after billions of tax-payer's money were pumped in to it—all lost. The Bond Holders, who remain unnamed, were paid off and huge loans to certain customers were written off as uncollectible and again these customers remain anonymous. Were the customers perhaps politicians, regulators, senior public servants? Why all the secrecy when the public was entitled to know who was being let off the hook by tax-payer's money?

There is absolutely no good reason why a bank, any bank, should not be subject to the ordinary commercial rules of insolvency. If a bank is insolvent it should go into liquidation and have a liquidator appointed by the creditors or by the Courts in accordance with the Companies Acts. There is no good reason why not. And yet now the ECB and the European Commission cannot agree on how to wind up a failed bank. "There are still differences between the EU leaders on who ultimately bears the responsibility for winding down a bank", we are told. The Directors of a failed bank bear the responsibility under the law. Why are the directors to be sheltered? From the consequences of their own greed and ineptitude? The foot-dragging by the politicians just doesn't stack up.

Every evening, at the close of business for the day, each bank knows exactly what is its financial position. The bank knows precisely to whom it owes money and exactly how much. The bank also knows who its customers are and exactly how much each customer owes to the bank. What the bank does not know exactly is the repayment capacity of each customer. This is the known unknown which brought the financial crisis. However, the real skill in the banking business is to reduce the known unknowns to the absolute minimum. This used to be done by the local bank manager knowing the customer and knowing the customer's business, which a local manager was in a prime position to know because all the customers' transactions were going on under the bank manager's nose. But what the banks did, in the pursuit of bonuses for top management, is they withdrew the supervisory role from the local managers. Instead they made

faceless central committees decide who should get loans and the bigger the loans the easier they were to get because these committees were not in front-line contact with customers.

The local managers were reduced to sales executives—to push out the loans. Pushing out the loans to customers who were watching property values going up and up, seemingly forever. It was like farmers stuffing geese to produce pate-de-foie-gras. The geese inevitably were killed and so were the bank customers killed financially. Except those who knew too much about politicians' and senior public servants' proclivities for accepting bribes. These were amongst those whose companies owed loans over 5 million euros which were taken over into NAMA to save political skins—and to keep them quiet NAMA paid out up to €200,000 p.a. to each director of these insolvent companies. Paid out of tax-payers pockets of course.

Where is it all going to end up? Nobody knows. The Government has been adding to the National Debt at the rate of one billion euros each month and there seems to be no intention of stopping the borrowings. A big public relations exercise was engaged in last month about "kicking out the troika" and "regaining our sovereignty" but the borrowings continue at National level. Financial waste and inefficiency is endemic and management in the public sector is not effective—not least because of the system of political patronage of jobs in the public sector. Also, at least one Minister in the Government is insolvent and probably should have been declared bankrupt but was saved, for the time being anyway, by the intervention of influential persons unnamed. How many are being protected by the anonymity given by NAMA and by Anglo-Irish and its successors?

An interesting sideshow to the financial crisis has been the brazenness of the financial commentators in the media who throughout the Celtic Tiger years failed to foresee the looming crises. Even after such abject failures the same economists and analysts are still to be seen pontificating in the media on a daily basis, as if events haven't proved that they also were either grossly incompetent or were earning their pay from deceitful propaganda.

PUBLIC SERVANT TOP-UPS.

The latest scandal to hit the fan is the payment of very substantial money to some senior public servants on top of their already excessive remuneration (excessive by our normal standards, not by their own demands for a superior life style!) Some of these top-ups were made out of publicly-

owned cash intakes such as car park machines, coffee machines and in-house shops. There was the usual very wide breaking-news, shock horror! sort of coverage but the Marian Finucane radio show on the morning of Sunday 24th November 2013 was the bottom of the pit. I overheard it at 11.30 when the panellists were discussing the Sunday newspaper coverage of the top-ups. They were laughing and skitting and sniggering in a most offensive way discussing what is in fact a great fraud on the tax-payers, Medical Card holders, sick and poor of Ireland. Maybe they were representing the views of the average Irish person? I hope not. Bread and circuses for the ordinary people? It does not stack up.

IRISH HOLOCAUST

Another reliable eye-witness report of the starvation in Ireland is 'Narrative of a Journey from Oxford to Skibbereen' by Lord Dufferin and the Hon. George F. Boyle (later Earl of Glasgow). The report was published in 1847 in Oxford and republished in 1996 by Cork Corporation and is available from Cork City Library for €3. They travelled especially to see for themselves in February 1847, because some people in Oxford said that the reports from Ireland were greatly exaggerated. They visited the graveyard and the mass graves so full that only three inches of soil covered the bodies. They visited the houses and hovels.

"We stood on the threshold and looked in; the darkness of the interior was such that we were scarcely able to distinguish objects; the walls were bare, the floor of mud, and not a vestige of furniture. The poor had pawned nearly every article of furniture which they possessed in order to obtain food; the number of tickets at the brokers is almost incredible; many have thus parted with the means of future subsistence, as in the case of some fishermen who have pawned their boats and nets, and so deprived themselves of the power of deriving benefit from the fish which abound along the coast."

The report gives cost of existence figures, etc.

The two men on their return to Oxford had their report (26 pages) printed and distributed and, between themselves and from other sympathetic people around Oxford they collected £1,000 and sent it to Skibbereen. However, even so, Bishop Wilberforce of Oxford and some others were unwilling to support Dufferin's call for a public meeting on the famine (Patrick Hickey on 'The Famine in the Skibbereen Union' in 'The Great Irish Famine', Dublin, 1995.

Michael Stack ©

TRADE UNION NOTES

ICTU v Troika ?

"The Irish Congress of Trade Unions (I.C.T.U.) has rejected an invitation to meet the troika during its latest review mission after walking out of a meeting in the summer.

"I.C.T.U. General Secretary, David Begg told the *Irish Independent* that their experience throughout the three-year bailout programme had been very negative, branding the EU-IMF representatives as "unfeeling, unreceptive and unco-operative". (*Irish Independent*, 4.11.2013)

He said the union chiefs had enjoyed good bilateral discussions with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) on its own, but that his experience of the troika as a collective had been very bad.

"We would have found the European Central Bank (ECB) and EU people particularly difficult to deal with", Mr Begg said.

"In our view, as a collective, the troika just presented as an unfeeling technocracy.

"They were really indifferent to any of the social problems that the austerity programme was putting up and they were just so single-minded about the nature of austerity." (*ibid.*)

It is the first review mission that Union chiefs have not met the troika.

Meanwhile, the ICTU General Secretary questioned the need for a so-called precautionary credit line, an overdraft facility of sorts, to ease the transition from bailout to full market access when the Government leaves the bailout at the end of the year. "I find it difficult to understand what the debate is about", he said. "At one level, if everything is so good, why would there be any need for it?"

Apprenticeships

A SIPTU proposal to extend the number and scope of apprenticeships would make a major contribution to ending the youth unemployment crisis, according to SIPTU Vice President Patricia King.

In an interview on RTÉ Radio's News at One on Monday (4th November), Patricia King, called for apprenticeships to be expanded to include the childcare, hospitality, green energy and administration sectors.

"If you look at the models in Europe, say in Germany, Denmark or Finland, they operate a very effective system known as a dual system which includes workplace training and classroom training so that your classroom training is actually related to what you are doing in the

workplace," she said. (SIPTU statement, 4.11.2013)

Skills

More than half of all multinationals based here have trouble finding Irish staff with the rights skills, a new study has shown.

The findings are from a survey by Danske Bank and the Irish Management Institute (IMI) of foreign-owned companies operating here.

Difficulty in finding employees with the right skills has emerged as a big concern for employers as more and more digital business in particular open and grow here.

"A highly skilled workforce is essential to attract and retain higher value-added activities. With 57% of firms specifying some difficulty finding the right skills, according to this survey, there is a clear need for practical action to close the gap between the worlds of education and work", said the Irish Management Institute's chief executive Dr Simon Boucher, who added:

"I strongly believe Irish educational institutions can work more directly with industry to significantly develop workforce capability."

Buses

SIPTU Dublin Bus drivers have voted against industrial action in a ballot completed on November 6, 2013. Drivers voted by 72% to 28% against taking strike action in opposition to the implementation of a cost-savings plan.

The decision to ballot for industrial action came after drivers voted to reject a new deal the previous week, though there was just a 2% margin in the results. Members of the other union representing drivers, the NBRU, voted to accept the deal and the company said it would press ahead with its plans from 17 November.

The new proposals came out of an independent report into the company's future, which warned against strike action. Cost-saving measures proposed in the report were subsequently backed by Dublin Bus, which has said cuts are necessary to reduce its €52 million deficit.

Union Rights?

"With the amount of labour legislation which has been enacted to protect workers' rights over the last 30 years, there is little need for any worker to be part of any union anyway as their rights are protected under law—and it will be interesting if young teachers realise they have nothing to gain by paying a big sub to a union" (Colm O'Rourke, School Principal and Sports commentator writing on the

ongoing ASTI dispute over the Haddington Road Agreement, *Sunday Independent*, 6.10.2013)

ESB

The ESB workers' Union has authorised the serving of notice for strike action.

The Energy Services Union said it is calling on the company management to "accept its obligations to staff and their pension fund with regard to any deficit, thus averting an all-out power strike in ESB".

The notice period will expire on Monday, December 16th at 8 am.

It is expected that power outages could occur in the weeks running up to Christmas. It would be the first such strike in 21 years.

Pensions

"The top union body in the country has delivered a blistering attack on the pensions regulator.

"The Irish Congress of Trade Unions (I.C.T.U.) said the Pensions Board was not fit for purpose and had failed to protect workers' pensions, the *Irish Independent* has learnt.

"Head of pension policy at I.C.T.U. Fergus Whelan accused the board of disregarding the views of workers, many of whom have lost their pension benefits." (*Irish Independent*, 4.10.2013)

Mr Whelan questioned the actions of the Pensions Board in regulating defined benefit schemes.

Large numbers of these schemes in the private sector have had to be restructured, with members losing pension benefits they had been expecting. About a quarter of defined benefit schemes are expected to have wound up by the end of the year.

Mr Whelan said in a letter to the Pensions Board that workers had been let down. He added:

"There is a long and dishonourable tradition in the pension market of making the simple complex for commercial reasons."

And it doesn't get any better! If a worker reaches 65 on 1st January 2014, he will not receive his State Pension until he reaches 66; if born on 1st January 1954, there is no payment until he is 67 and if he was delivered on 1st January 1960, he will have to wait until he reaches 68.

Other States, including Britain, are taking a more measured approach. The last New Labour Government proposed lowering the pension age to 66 by 2024. The more hard-line Tory chancellor, George Osborne is bringing this back to 2020, but that's still six years later than Ireland.

Century Of Smoking!

A woman has reached her 100th birthday despite smoking half a million cigarettes during her life.

Dorothy Howe took her first drag aged 16 and has puffed her way through 15 every day since, which means she has smoked about 460,000 cigarettes over the last 84 years. Dorothy, of Saltdean, East Sussex, said: "I put my health down to whisky and cigarettes" (*Press Association*, 13.11.2013).

Enjoy the Festive Season, with apologies to the HSE!

Press Release

Commemorating the Battle of Clontarf

DAIL QUESTION

Finian McGrath TD (IND, Dublin Bay North)

To ask the Minister for Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht if he will support the Clontarf 2014 group in their efforts to develop sports, arts and tourism and for the millennium of the Battle of Clontarf. - Finian McGrath.

For WRITTEN answer on Wednesday, 20th November, 2013.

Minister for Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, Jimmy Deenihan TD:

A number of events are set to take place during 2014 to commemorate the millennium anniversary of the Battle of Clontarf and the death of Brian Ború. In this regard, I am aware of plans being developed by Dublin City Council, Clare County Council, Fingal County Council, Armagh City and District Council, Waterford City Council and certain historical groups, community agencies and business interests with connections to the marking of this important point in Irish history.

Feedback from the wider community, voluntary and not-for-profit institutions and organisations associated with the planned commemoration has indicated the need for co-ordination, technical support and access to existing State services and facilities.

I would encourage the bringing together of the activities of Dublin City Council, Fáilte Ireland and other interested agencies and bodies, so as to achieve a commemorative programme that reflects the influence of the Vikings in Ireland and the Battle of Clontarf as a defining event in our history.

The national cultural institutions will play an important role in the commemorative arrangements. The National Museum

of Ireland will hold a special exhibition on Brian Ború and the Battle of Clontarf in 2014. The programme will not only present Ireland and Europe in the later Viking Age, but also examine the continuing significance of Brian Ború and Clontarf in Irish folklore and popular imagination right up to modern times.

I will be meeting with representatives of the Clontarf 2014 Committee in the coming days to discuss the issues involved in this venture.

Labour Problems

The Killarney Labour Conference of end November was heavily stage-managed, says *Phoenix* (18.10.13).

Not a single motion of the eighty-six on the preliminary agenda was critical of Ministers or of Government policy. Highly critical motions that were passed by Branches and submitted to HQ have not been accepted as "they fell foul of various technical and constitutional obstacles placed in their path".

One of these was from Dublin Bay North constituency which demanded that the party hold a special conference next year to decide whether to continue in coalition government or if they should instead present an alternative to the electorate that 'more accurately reflects Labour Party policies and values' ..."

The motion did not appear on the agenda. Instead many motions congratulate Ministers for their good work in government, "with Brendan Howlin... being lauded for his political reform agenda in a motion from Wexford".

Phoenix also reports anger at "the announcement of disciplinary measures to prevent TDs and senators from talking to journalists", concluding that opponents of the leadership suggest "the Stickies taking over the party [are] implementing Stalinist methods to quell dissent"

(*Phoenix*, 18.10.13).

GUILDS continued

And the establishment of a welfare state within capitalism was first projected in practical form by a manufacturing capitalist in the 1880s, Joseph Chamberlain, who did not think Capitalism could continue forever treating the workers as it had treated them until then" (Brendan Clifford in *"The Genesis of National Socialism"* by T. Desmond Williams, Belfast Historical & Educational Society, 2012, p.362).

KRAMER'S CONCLUSIONS

"Outsiders, whether within or just without the boroughs, countenanced or opposed by state, borough or guilds, whether of the system as a whole or of some particular group, only, gradually won for English economic society as a whole complete freedom of trade and industry. In much earlier times free-thinking individuals had sought to throw off the restrictions which the system sought to impose upon them. A 14th century tanner might assert his right as a freeman of London to trade as he pleased but he had to make good his assertion by proving his right. The tanner in question failed evidently to do this before the jury of established guildsmen whom he selected to pass upon his claim and from whose decision there seems to have been no question of appeal. But the cause of free traders of the 17th and 18th centuries was no longer left to the decisions of guild tribunals" (Kramer, p.204).

"Their cases were heard and judged in the higher tribunals of the kingdom where free trade was conceded to them as their birthright, or on the basis of their right derived from Magna Carta, {1215} or of their liberty as citizens under the common law to work freely. Upheld by the spirit of the age which condemned restraints of trade, with their ranks recruited by disaffected guildsmen who, in breaking down the monopoly of competing guildsmen, inevitably undermined the foundations upon which their own were built, free traders together gained the day, necessarily at the expense of the protected trades and handicrafts" (Ibid. p.205).

GUILD INDEPENDENCE

The Guilds had always been averse to having disputes between their members settled in courts outside of their jurisdiction. Even after the passage of the Act of 19 Henry VII, {1475-1509} which forbade the Guilds, under penalty, to "take upon them to make any acts of ordinances to restrain any person or persons to sue to

the King's Highness, or to any of his Courts, for due remedy to be had in their causes, nor put nor execute any penalty or punishment upon any of them for any such suit to be made", Guild ordinances continued to prohibit their members from suing, molesting or troubling one another without license of the wardens of their Guild (Noble, *History of the Company of Ironmongers*, p.131), or from taking disputes to the common law until their Guild wardens had heard them.

The Guilds were often able to defy the letter as well as the spirit of this law of King Henry VII {1485-1509} by reason, seemingly of the support given them by borough authorities. For example, if the records of the London goldsmiths can be credited, in 1495, the mayor of their city issued a "Bill" which forbade a person of any craft to sue another until he had complained to the wardens (Prideaux, *Memorials of the Goldsmiths' Company*, vol. i, p.32).

Although the economic privileges of the Guilds were successfully disputed in 16th century courts of law, yet in general the sentiment which favoured Guild dominance seems to have triumphed over that aroused against it. It is a matter of record that the commissioners of trade appointed in 1622 to inquire into the decay of the cloth industry decided that the companies should be maintained. (*Historical MSS. Commis. Report*, iv, Appen., p.312).

Furthermore the Act of James I of 1624 (21 James 1, c. 3, sec. ix) which destroyed monopolies, maintained the Guilds in power by exempting "Corporations Companies or Fellowships of Any Art, Trade, Occupation or Mystery" from the operation of its provisions.

"However, in the last analysis, outsiders won out all along the line only because the guild system could not consistently be carried out as originally conceived by state, borough or even the guilds for that matter. Instituted primarily to exclude outsiders, almost from the start the system had somewhere to make room for them. To the state and the boroughs, aliens were almost as valuable in their way as the guilds were in theirs. The guilds protected and developed home trade and industry and could be counted upon to divert a goodly part of the wealth gained by their enterprise and initiative to further state and borough interests, but aliens in ever-increasing numbers introduced new ideas and industries into England and helped thereby to increase her power and

prosperity both at home and abroad. So, to the end that the energies of guildsmen and aliens might secure play free enough to permit each to fulfill its destiny in the development of the whole economic scheme, a course of expediency rather than of consistency was entered upon and ordered as the interest of the one side or of the other dictated. In pursuing this policy, the state appears as ready to favour an alien group with some new concession which made for free trade, as to propitiate boroughs and guilds by confirming certain powers they enjoyed in restraint of trade, when these seemed in danger of being nullified because of a newer concession allowed an alien group" (Ibid. p.206).

"For instance, shortly after King Edward III {1327-77} and his council conceded to merchant strangers the right to trade freely throughout English cities and privileged boroughs, their charters or customs to the contrary notwithstanding, assurance was given the citizens of London that the liberties guaranteed them in Magna Carta {1215} were not to be interfered with. So the force of practically every law, charter or guild ordinance was impaired by the inclusion of a clause which protected, in one way or another, certain privileges conceded to an established group. The Elizabethan act of 1563 itself exempted not only the London companies but a company like the worsted weavers of Norwich from the operation of the apprenticeship clauses, in order that previous liberties bestowed upon them might not be prejudiced. Again, the charter granted by King Edward VI {1547-53} to the Bristol Merchant Adventurers, expressly stipulated that the ordinances drawn up by that society should in no wise prejudice the privileges or rights claimed by any person or body by virtue of an earlier grant. Ordinances were conceded to some guild groups on condition that the impugned neither the prerogatives of the crown, the laws of the realm, nor the customs of the particular city or borough in which the guild had its being" (Kramer, p.206).

If the arrival of the Guild System heralded a new dawn taking civilization out of the Dark Ages, the rise of Capitalism introduced another Dark Age for labour.

(To be continued)

The Genesis Of National Socialism by *T. Desmond Williams*. Introduction, and Appendixes on Neutrality and the Origins of National Socialism by *Brendan Clifford*. 398pp. 2012. €30, £25

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

GUILDS continued

of the chief officers. Those powers passed into the hands of the master, wardens and court of assistants.

GUILD SYSTEM AND BOROUGHS

"Men as well as masters were breaking with a system with which they had lost sympathy. Of course, the advantage lay with the masters who, by this time, had probably plenty of outside labour to draw upon. Only, in drawing upon it, they had to reckon with both exasperated journeymen and apprentices who were determined to use every method known to labour to keep their hold over trade and industry. They placed such obstructions as they could in the way of foreign workmen who were procured to take their places, and when peaceful means failed, resorted to violence, until borough authorities were obliged to intervene in the interest of local peace and order, and to end a situation which had grown intolerable for all concerned. Thus, when the guilds of Kingston-upon-Hull failed to serve the interests for which they had been created, the guilds had to go. Not all the boroughs were able or even inclined to go this far on their own initiative, even though they were rapidly losing patience with the tactics pursued by guildsmen within their boundaries. Manifestly, later-day guildsmen showed as little respect for borough ruling as for gild when their economic interests clashed and when it came to a choice between the two did not hesitate to serve the company to which they were 'sworn' rather than the borough. Guildsmen not only refused to hold office, but deliberately absented themselves from a 'Comen Hall' or from borough courts when summoned to attend" (Kramer, - p.193-94).

In other words the Guilds failed frequently to meet the obligations which they owed to their respective boroughs while demanding from the boroughs, unflinching support for their restrictive trade policy.

OUTSIDERS

"Naturally 17th century boroughs could not let the limitations of the guilds hinder their growth and development. When local guilds failed to provide sufficient money to pay for the upkeep of a borough, the authorities secured it by selling their cherished trade privileges to the aspirant willing to pay the price demanded. By admitting a distinguished stranger, one borough obtained funds to help the poor; another 'made' burgesses in order to pay for the repairing of gates or walls. By the last quarter of the century, Salisbury evidently maintained a 'committee of

revenue', not the least of whose activities had to do with admitting outsiders to free citizenship. Kinsale, too, at this time, kept a list of her non-free inhabitants, and as the need arose had a special committee, which she maintained for the purpose, offer to sell the borough's freedom to persons who should be judged 'fit to be made free'. The 'Hall', which was held at Nottingham, in 1728, seems to have been 'resolved into a committee to consider of fit persons to whom this corporation may sell or give their freedom and for what consideration.' To most boroughs at this stage, the consideration to be had, evidently demonstrated a candidate's fitness for citizenship, not his previous condition of servitude.

"Likewise, when the guilds of London or Bristol failed to provide a sufficient number of workmen to meet the demand, outsiders were admitted to make up the shortage. When a local market wanted commodities which the merchants in control could not provide, aliens were allowed in who could. In times of stress, burghal necessity evidently knew no gild law. When the Chester weavers attempted to interfere with foreign weavers whom the civic authorities had admitted to establish the manufacture of Shrewsbury cloth in their city, they learned that 'the corporation will not allow this interference'. The corporation was, evidently, as good as its word and the city weavers had to see the foreigners weave their kind of cloth in Chester. By threatening to let country bakers furnish citizens with bread thereafter, city officials of Bristol brought her defiant bakers to terms by 1616. Sooner or later the boroughs were forced to favour outsiders, even at the expense of free guildsmen, out of regard for their wealth as a whole rather than the 'community or franchise' of some particular craft or mystery, which, however important it may have seemed to its own members, to a borough was only 'one particular company'..." (Ibid. p.197-98).

TERRITORY

"Of course, at some time in their history, the boroughs were obliged to take into account the cause of outsiders who dwelt within their borders. Every community of consequence had a certain number of inhabitants who could not meet the requirements demanded of freemen, but yet had a certain status which they were taxed to support. Since a borough grew by annexing adjacent territory, it naturally annexed tenants for whom a place had to be made in community life, pending their rise to the rank of freemen" (Ibid. p.198).

"Apparently, neither collectively nor individually were aliens of that epoch readier than Englishmen to play the industrial game according to prescribed rules" (Ibid. p.200).

"And no matter how indulgent to free

guildsmen may have seemed the treatment accorded outsiders in various communities, the individual outsider saw little favour to him in a system which kept him outside in whole or in part unless he paid the exorbitant sum asked for the privilege of using undeterred a trade or industry within borough precincts. Thirty-five pounds seems a considerable sum to have paid to open a shop at Bristol in 1699, or thirty at Guildford in 1740, not to mention the fifty pounds demanded for the privilege at Abingdon in 1695" (Ibid. p.201).

"...No law compelled newcomers to live within the boroughs or corporate towns. They had always the alternative of settling outside, where free from the restraints which hemmed in guildsmen, they could defy borough and gild authorities alike, while pursuing the tenor of their own way" (Ibid. p.201).

RURAL LABOUR

"From their point of vantage at Wandsworth, Battersea and Lambeth, where plenty of country labour was to be had for the taking, the Huguenot hatters who migrated to England in 1685, contrived apparently to prosper at the expense of feltmakers within the city, who were obliged to work according to gild regulations. Non-freemen residing within a borough discovered that they could work more freely outside and still find a market for their goods within the boroughs" (Ibid. p.202).

"Master manufacturers, finding it practically impossible to work under conditions which the guilds were imposing, moved to where they could manufacture good in accordance with ideas of their own" (Ibid. p.202).

According to Adam Smith, persons in his day, desirous of having their work "*tolerably done*", had it done in the suburbs where workmen had no exclusive privileges and so nothing but their character to depend upon. (*Wealth of Nations*, vol. i, p.131).

"Capitalism was founded in England on the basis of an atomised populace, without rights or social amenities, in which the capitalist had pretty well absolute power to do as he pleased. Over generations the tormented atoms combined and eventually compelled the system to recognise their right to form Trade Unions and engage in collective bargaining over wages and working conditions. But measures to improve working conditions were not in the first instance the product of working class action, but were introduced in the 1830s by the Tory Party, which represented the landed interest against free capitalism.

continued on page 33

GUILDS continued

at the time the Elizabethan Act {1558-1603} made the seven-years' service a prerequisite to the practice of a trade or industry—the company inserted in its by-laws a provision making apprenticeship a requirement to membership in the craft (Felkin, *History of Machine-Wrought Hosiery and Lace Manufactures*, p.68).

OUTSIDERS

"The custom of admitting to membership or to office, persons who had no real connection with the particular trade or industry with which the organisation was identified had evidently become too deeply rooted in gild economy to be eradicated at this late date. In admitting, apparently at a very early period, by redemption and by patrimony, gild procedure itself furnished a way by which members could evade serving an apprenticeship."

"Not having served an apprenticeship themselves, naturally they had no particular concern in employing those who filled the requirements in that regard." (Ibid. p.188).

"Apparently, no matter what the source of their authority, guilds of the later period could not inculcate in their own members a proper regard for this fundamental requirement of gild economy and consequently failed to impress it upon outsiders" (Ibid. p.186)

"In the first quarter of the 17th century as in the last, master guildsmen themselves not only employed persons who had served little or no apprenticeship to their occupation but they took far more apprentices than gild law allowed, either for their own use or to turn over to others. Likewise, they willfully neglected to enrol apprentices in gild records, sometimes even refused them their freedom after they had served the required term; nor did guildsmen show a greater respect for gild ruling in other particulars" (Ibid. p.186).

"Many openly worked for, or with non-guildsmen, or employed outsiders instead of guildsmen, and frequently turned out articles made of inferior material. In short, guildsmen took advantage of the times no matter how peaceful or 'distracted', to disregard most rules considered vital to the maintenance of the system. Moreover, members who thus infringed gild law and order naturally tried to keep the evidence of their lawlessness from gild authorities" (Ibid. p.187).

"For this reason, they denied gild inspectors access to their premises, or assaulted those who contrived to force an entrance, or indeed even sued for 'trespass' the organisations which authorised the trespass. No wonder that in these circum-

stances gild officials lost much of their zeal for enforcing the office of search, which was frequently suspended, too, because funds were lacking, or the times unpropitious, and gradually broke down altogether" (Ibid. p.187-88).

"In addition, if the testimony of 16th century metropolitan guilds can be credited, the system of gild inspection broke down largely because all guildsmen who practiced specific callings no longer belonged to the organisation in control and on that ground could claim exemption from its jurisdiction" (Ibid. p.188).

DIVERSE INTERESTS

Another aspect which contributed to the demise of the Guild system was the—

"diversity of interests which were represented in many organisations of the period which made more difficult the task of maintaining an effective control over them all. For example, the clothworkers of London, did not openly condemn their right of search as no longer tending to the better skill of that art until the middle of the 18th century. Yet from the company's rise in the 16th century there were signs of the obstacles in the way of its power to control the different interests included in the corporation, in spite of its purpose early avowed, of furthering the common interest. Coincident with its rise there was revealed in this particular corporation, admittedly founded for the good of the 'handy Trade', a mercantile group, guilty of evading as strenuously as the handicraft groups sought to impose it, a system of inspection considered necessary to the furtherance of handicraft interests" (Ibid. p.188-9).

"In fact, the metropolitan guilds had undoubtedly become honey-combed with classes each one of which was more concerned with advancing its own particular interests, than of cooperating for the good of the whole body and often they lacked a court of appeal where individual members could be assured of an unprejudiced hearing for the redress of their grievances. This, at least, seems to have been the burden of the complaint voiced by the clockmakers about a quarter of a century after their incorporation, at which time the freemen proclaimed their condition to be worse than 'ever before they were given their charter'. For then, they said: 'such as were aggrieved sought their remedy by the law of the land and ye customs of this city, but since the power hath bin in the Courte of Assistants all manner of evils have flowed in upon us, as may appear by theis particulars'..." (Ibid. p.189).

LOSS OF CRAFT INFLUENCE

One wonders how far back the clockmakers dated this halcyon period. As late as 1627 they were still members of the

Blacksmiths' Company, and subject presumably by its governing body, which, by that time seems to have been a court of assistants. (Felkin, p.2; Overall, *History of the Clockmakers' Company*, pp.60-1).

Assistants to the number of twelve seem to have constituted a court of the company (*The Government of the Fullers, Shearmen and Clothworkers*, p.14). Tracing the beginnings of these Courts of Assistants, we find that as far back as 1376, annually after their dinner, the assembled company of grocers of London elected two Sasters and in addition six other members to give "assistance and advice" to the two Masters. (Kingdom, *The Worshipful Company of Grocers*, pt. i, p.21). In 1521, the London drapers drew up a 'Bill' containing the names of such as they were pleased "to elect and name to be assistants and of their Councill" (Johnson, *History of the Worshipful Company of Drapers*, vol. ii, p.55, Note 1).

By 1550, their ordinances were passed not by the whole 'fellyship' nor by the livery, but by the master, wardens and the Court 'of their sole authority' (Ibid., vol. ii, p.51). In accordance with the regulations, which were drawn up by the tailors of Shrewsbury in 1563, the whole Guild elected two wardens, who in their turn nominated four assistants "for advising them in the Government of the Gild". (Hibbert, *Influence and Development*, p.104). According to the terms of the Charter which King Charles I {1625-49} conceded to the Merchant Adventurers of Bristol, the power of making ordinances was restricted to the master, wardens and assistants (*Parliamentary Papers*, vol. 24, p.1204).

The freemen at large no longer had any voice in the enacting of ordinances or in the electing of officials as had been the case in former days. Thus, by 1493 a brotherhood in the clothing or livery had come into control of the London drapers' company, from whose ranks Guild masters and wardens were drawn and who could therefore dominate the yeomanry or 'Broderhode oute of the clothing.' (Herbert, *Twelve Great Livery Companies*, vol. i, p.406).

By 1647 among the London pewterers, the yeomanry were allowed to be present at the quarterly courts while the ordinances were being read and the result of the search announced. After that they appear to have retired (Welch, *History of the Pewterers' Company*, vol. ii, p.112).

In time the liverymen lost control of the government of the Guild and of the election

continued on page 34



Destruction of the Guilds

In their heyday from the 12th to the 15th century, the mediaeval Merchant and Craft Guilds gave their cities and towns good government and stable economic bases and supported charities and built schools, roads, and churches. Guilds helped build up the economic organization of Europe, enlarging the base of traders, craftsmen, merchants, artisans, and bankers that Europe prior to the transition from Feudalism to embryonic Capitalism.

By the 13th century, Merchant Guilds in western Europe comprised the wealthiest and most influential citizens in many towns and cities, and, as many urban localities became self-governing in the 12th and 13th centuries, the Guilds came to dominate their Town Councils. The Guilds were thus able to pass legislative measures regulating all economic activity in many towns.

The decline of the mediaeval Craft Guilds was a slow and tortuous process during the Renaissance {14th to 17th century} and English Reformation {16th century} periods. New Guilds were still being founded throughout Europe in the 17th century, but the 16th century had already marked a turning point in the fortunes of most Guilds, especially in Protestant England.

Apart from the destructive effects of the Reformation and the growth of the power of the State, the craft Guilds were seriously weakened by the appearance of new markets and greater capital resources. Merchants were becoming capitalistic entrepreneurs and forming companies, thus making the Merchant Guilds less important. Craft Guilds broke down as *the pace of technological innovation spread* and new opportunities for trade disrupted their hold over a particular industry.

Masters tended to become foremen or entrepreneurs, while journeymen and

apprentices became *labourers* who were paid their wages by the day: labour became a commodity. The emergence of regulated companies and other associations of wealthy merchant-capitalists thus left the Guilds increasingly isolated from the main currents of economic power.

APPRENTICESHIP SYSTEM

Apprenticeship was the basic element in the Craft Guild, since it secured the continuity of practice, tradition, and personnel on which the welfare of the Guild depended. Apprenticeships in some trades came to be highly valued, and a family would have to pay a master a large sum of money for him to enrol their son as an apprentice. Often apprenticeships came to be restricted to the sons or other relatives of masters.

In the preceding articles, which were substantially based on the writings of Stella Kramer, we have traced the gradual weakening and the loss finally by the Guilds of the chief powers upon which their system rested. In the beginning the different Guilds had been organised for the purpose of

controlling particular trades and industries, but in order to make such control effective it was found necessary to devise a system of regulation to which all who practised a calling were to conform.

"Scarcely a quarter of a century after the barbers of Bristol had secured for themselves the 'government of their craft', they appeared before city authorities with charges that many 'unlearned' were encroaching upon their craft and asked as a means of stopping the practice which they said threatened to destroy their craft, to be allowed to elect annually from among themselves two surveyors whom they might arm with powers sufficient to present to the proper gild officials, 'all manner of defaults' which they might discover. It is interesting to note, that chief among such 'defaults' they evidently reckoned that of masters taking an apprentice for 'less than the term of seven years'..." (*The English Craft Gilds, Studies in their Progress and Decline*, Stella Kramer, Columbia University Press, 1927, p.185).

"Manifestly to keep control over their occupation, these 15th century barbers established a system of inspection, the basis of which they held to be the enforcing of a rigid apprenticeship. Moreover, that 17th century organisations deemed equally essential to their welfare, the enforcement of the service, is evident from appeal for leave to incorporate it as an integral part of their regime" (*Ibid.* p.185).

In the case of the London Clockmakers, when the powers conferred by their Crown Charter proved ineffectual in preventing unskilful and unscrupulous practice, the company endeavoured to have its members finance parliamentary incorporation, but failed in the endeavour (Overall, *History of the Clockmakers' Company*, p.59).

After the framework knitters had obtained an Act of Parliament regulating framework knitting—an art not in vogue

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

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

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

33 Athol Street, Belfast BT12 4GX or

2 Newington Green Mansions, London N16 9BT

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

Subscription by Post:

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

Electronic Subscription:

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

You can also order from:

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

continued on page 35