

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

November 2013

Vol.28, No.11 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.27 No.11 ISSN 954-5891

North And South

Policing is a rough and ready business, even in a soundly-based functional democracy in a liberal state with an adversarial system of law. In Northern Ireland, which has never had democratic government, it is necessarily much rougher and readier. For half a century it was a system of Protestant communal authority slightly related to law. Then, for a further quarter of a century, it was a system of Whitehall authority, unrelated to Six County politics, operating in a war situation.

During that quarter century this journal expressed the opinion that Justice was deterred from becoming a mere administrative organ of undemocratic government by assassination.

Lord Reith, founder of the BBC, said that the best form of government was despotism tempered by assassination. While it cannot be said that Northern Ireland had anything like good government, it would be fairly true to say that it has had despotism tempered by assassination.

Professor Henry Patterson, of the New University, was once a theoretically-rigorous Marxist-Leninist revolutionary, then a leading member of Official Sinn Fein and political adviser to David Trimble when he was First Minister of the 1998 system. He now appears to be simply an academic waging the 'battle of ideas' in the Ulster Unionist interest. He recently had an article in the *Irish Times* (14th September) holding Dublin Governments responsible for the effectiveness of the Provisional campaign in the North.

(This was in accordance with the Official IRA line of the early 1970s, which declared that the Provos were a creation of the Dublin Government for the purpose of preventing the Official IRA from achieving a revolutionary socialist overthrow of the Southern State. As far as we could discover at the time, however, it was the Officials who received a large sum of money from the Dublin Government.)

The *Irish Times*, which in recent years has been trying to polish up its national credentials, which had become heavily tainted when it was discovered that in a critical situation it had sought Whitehall advice, felt obliged to publish some weeks later (8th October) a detailed rebuttal of Patterson's contentions by a representative of the Pat

continued on page 2

Irish Budget 2014

There were very few surprises in the 2014 Budget. Indeed the speeches were very similar to last year. It is obligatory for Government Ministers to begin by denouncing the previous Government for wrecking the economy (Brendan Howlin even managed to evoke some famine imagery). There is no sign of this custom changing almost three years after the February 2011 General Election.

Of course, there is an element of truth in the narrative. It is indisputable that Fianna Fáil presided over a crisis in the public finances, which necessitated the calling in of the Troika. While the International economic environment was a key factor in the crisis, some countries weathered the storm better than others. As one of the most open economies in the world Ireland was always likely to be adversely affected. This is not to deny that policy mistakes were made. Fianna Fáil must bear the lion's share of responsibility for these. But there is no evidence that the then Opposition parties—now in Government—would have done any better. Indeed the evidence of the 2007 General Election is all to the contrary.

continued on page 5

Sterling and the Euro

A Professor Writes . . .

The Professor of Economics at TCD, John O'Hagan, had an Opinion piece in the *Irish Times* on 1st October entitled: "*Don't rule out Britain joining the euro in a few years*". A natural enough question to ask is—what planet is this guy on?

He points out all the benefits of a currency union:

"A currency union, properly constituted, has potentially many advantages: such as exchange rate stability, certainty, greatly reduced transactions costs,

increased competition and greater opportunities for economies of scale in production. This applies in particular in the case of a very small economy like that of Ireland. But it also applies to larger countries like Britain."

These benefits have been obvious for ages, almost since time began—or at least since money was created. The virtues of the Euro currency union have been argued for in British politics for many years. But why has no British Governments accepted these self-evidently valid arguments when

it comes to the Euro? The Professor should surely have addressed this phenomenon. Have all British Governments been simply stupid or what? The Professor of Economics seems to think that economics will always determine people's political decisions. I suppose it goes with the territory for such a Professor to believe so. Professors of other disciplines no doubt tend to think that the fate of the world hinges on their subjects.

But this Professor's view is that of a simpleton, as the behaviour of Britain's

continued on page 7

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| North And South. Editorial | 1 |
| Irish Budget 2014. John Martin | 1 |
| A Professor Writes . . . Jack Lane | 1 |
| Readers' Letters: T.E. Lawrence: Irish? Ivor Kenna | 3 |
| Free Speech. Wilson John Haire (Poem) | 6 |
| Israel And Its Friends. Editorial | 7 |
| The Referendums. Report | 7 |
| The War On The Peace. Pat Walsh | 8 |
| Editorial Digest. (Anthony McIntyre; Credit Unions Retain Strength; Hurling Final) | 10 |
| The Thatcher Who Burnt The House Down. Walter Cobb (Poem) | 10 |
| Shorts from the Long Fellow (Journalism In Irish Independent; More Bullshit; Children Survey; Emigration Once Again; The Guarantee) | 11 |
| Annette McDonald, Some Memories. John Minahane | 12 |
| Was. Wilson John Haire (Poem) | 12 |
| Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (<i>The Raj In The Rain</i>) | 13 |
| Dublin's Ground-Breaking Bobbies. Donal Kennedy (Unpublished Letter) | 14 |
| Towards A Position On Germany, Ireland And Europe. Philip O'Connor | 15 |
| The Adams Hunt. Editorial | 19 |
| "I Did All I Could To Help My Abused Niece". Gerry Adams (Report) | 21 |
| Harris On Harris. Jack Lane | 22 |
| Biteback: Cosgrave On Ruthlessness. Manus O'Riordan Donal Kennedy: Redmond's Folly; Terence McSwiney's Funeral; De Valera In Context (Unpublished Letters) | 23 |
| Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Democracy: What Democracy?; The Budget) | 24 |

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

The State Deserts The Guilds

(back page)

Trade Union Notes

(page 25)

Finucane Centre, Margaret Urwin (Justice for the Forgotten). As we go to print there has been no published reply from Patterson.

A book about the collaboration of the Whitehall authorities in the North with Ulster Unionist militants to kill Catholics, North and South, as an anti-Republican measure, is about to be published. It is based on research into official documents by the Pat Finucane Centre and is written by Anne Cadwallader. The title is *Lethal Allies*.

Pat Finucane was a lawyer who acted for Republicans (and Loyalists) in what there was of a legal system in the North. He acted too effectively for the liking of the unrepresentative rulers of the Six Counties. A high-minded, and influentially - connected, MP, who knew that Northern Ireland was not a suitable arena for a free and skilful operation of all the theoretical resources of the British legal system, Douglas Hogg, pointed the finger at him in Parliament, and he was killed.

This killing of a lawyer, because he was an effective lawyer, in a situation

which was beyond the resources of law to cope with, but in which the State thought it expedient to maintain the pretence of the 'rule of law', has led to intensive legal scrutiny of the operations of the system by the Finucane family and their supporters.

The Finucane family was wantonly damaged by the State and is exacting revenge by accepting the State at the face value it presents and demonstrating that it has engaged in what in a functional democracy would be a system of atrocities amounting to a system of terrorism. It was not their business to deal with the political context in which this was done.

The book is to be launched by Seamus Mallon of the SDLP. The SDLP was the major political party of the Catholic community for thirty years. It purported to be, not a party of the Catholic community, but a Social Democratic and Labour Party. And Mallon, Deputy First Minister in the North in 1998-201, presented himself as a Republican of the classical rather than the Irish kind. He looked to the American Civil War as a founding event of Republican democracy.

He abhorred the idea of the unification of Ireland by force, oblivious of the fact that the unity of the American Republic was achieved by the killing of a million men in battle and untold collateral damage to civilians. As SDLP leader, he was dismally unable to deal with David Trimble's heel-dragging over the implementation of the 1998 Agreement, and his ineffectiveness set the party on the slippery slope.

He toyed with the idea of forming a Centrist alliance with the UUP against the "extremists" of Sinn Fein and the DUP, but made no serious attempt to carry it through—probably having enough sense of Northern Ireland realities, amidst all his exotic high-mindedness, to see that it was not on the cards.

Sinn Fein took over and made a functional deal with Unionists—which the SDLP had altogether failed to do. That deal had its operational logic. It involved a pragmatic acceptance that there had been a genuine war, not an outbreak of mere criminality, and that the force which the British Army failed to smash had to be a pillar of the new arrangements, i.e. Sinn Fein/IRA. But Mallon, resenting the displacement of the SDLP by Sinn Fein, would not accept that fact. He applied a kind of fetishism, or tokenism, of law and democracy, to the working arrangement made by Sinn Fein and the DUP with a view to subverting it.

Earlier this year he combined with fundamental Unionist Jim Allister to gain an Assembly motion disqualifying Special Advisers, appointed by Ministers, from serving if they had served prison terms of more than five years. This was directed at Sinn Fein and meant the replacement of a couple of advisers.

The Assembly system was carefully arranged to avert majority rule. Its rules include a blocking system to ensure that the Unionist majority could not engage in subversive harrassment of the divided (rather than shared) power system. Sinn Fein was one member short of being able to operate this on its own. The SDLP, under Mallon's influence, refused to supply that one vote. While it then abstained on Allister's motion, the effect of what it did was that it joined with the fundamentalist Traditional Unionist Voice, the UUP, NI21, Alliance and the DUP to carry a decision against Sinn Fein.

The initiative for this did not come from the DUP leadership. It came from the Unionist tail, the TUV, seconded by the nationalist tail, Mallon—two tails wagging the two dogs.

Mallon has often indulged in gestures

of dissociation from the crude political realities of the situation in which he chose to be a politician. But in his democratic gesturing he never acknowledged the overarching political reality that, in erecting the Six Counties of the United Kingdom into the anomalous constitutional entity of Northern Ireland, Britain deliberately arranged for this part of the British state to be governed undemocratically—that it set up a structure that could not be democratic.

Mallon, therefore, is a supporter of Northern Ireland. He was against the establishment of an all-Ireland state by force. He never made any serious attempt that we could see to win Protestant support for unification. And he was opposed to our campaign to bring the Six Counties within the democracy of the rest of the United Kingdom. He was therefore a supporter of Northern Ireland.

Northern Ireland was a recipe for war. What has happened in it is what always seemed likely to happen in it.

To support the existence of Northern Ireland, while denouncing the means of government which it made necessary, is not statesmanship. And Mallon has fancied himself as a statesman.

Partition was necessary if Britain was unwilling to deploy massive force against Ulster Unionism. There was, in our view, no necessity to set up the Northern Ireland system. That was a wanton act of irresponsibility as far as good government in the Six Counties was concerned—though it undoubtedly had an ulterior purpose directed towards the South.

Mallon's position, as a supporter of Northern Ireland as region of the British state excluded from the democracy of the state, is that it can be democratically governed within its own subordinate system, while all theoretical and actual sovereign power of State is exercised by Whitehall.

On 8th October he was awarded an honorary PhD by Dublin City University to mark the 15th anniversary of the Peace Process, along with Lord Trimble—who gave him the run-around when they were First and Deputy First Ministers in 1998-2001. He availed of the occasion to attack Sinn Fein for "debasement" of Republicanism (from the purity in which the SDLP maintained it!!) and for operating the Peace Process as a "Them and Us" arrangement. But the 1998 Agreement, which the SDLP played a central part in negotiating, is a carefully-structured "Them and Us" arrangement. If Mallon thought that, by joining the fundamentalist margin of

T.E. Lawrence: Irish?

I enjoyed reading Manus O'Riordan's article in *Irish Political Review* for October, 2013.

However, T.E. Lawrence of Arabia must be absolved from being called Irish.

I enclose a copy of the first page of Chapter 1 of T.E. Lawrence by B.H. Liddell Hart (Jonathan Cape 1935).

It will be seen that Lawrence's father's family, the Chapmans, had religiously kept the family line free from Irish admixture. No doubt they feared that Irish wives might lead to their descendants becoming Irish as the Anglo-Norman settlers' descendants had one.

The wisdom of this approach became apparent when many native Irish converted to Protestantism to evade the Penal Laws and other anti-Papist measures. Their descendants often married decent Protestant settlers or their descendants and produced Irish children. The great majority of the Irish population, North & South, Protestant and Catholic, is now Irish.

*

As a separate matter I welcome the appearance of *Irish Foreign Affairs* and would like to see a copy. It has not yet appeared in Housman's Bookshop, London.

Ivor Kenna

Liddell Hart On Lawrence. Born in Wales—

"he was of mixed race. His father's family were Elizabethan settlers from England, favoured in gaining land in County Meath by Walter Raleigh, a connection. During three hundred years of Irish domicile they never married into Ireland, but chose their wives from intruders such as themselves, from England, from Holland even. His mother was Island Scottish in feeling and education, but her parentage was part English, part Scandinavian..."

Irish Foreign Affairs

This quarterly magazine has appeared since 2008. London readers may be unaware of it because it is not stocked by Housman's. (Perhaps they should ask for it!)

It can be obtained on subscription in both print and electronic versions.

Price: £24 (£15.00) print, £10 (£8.00) electronic.

A cheque can be sent to the Athol Books addresses on back page, or it can be ordered through the Internet using the following link:

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

Unionism to ban Sinn Feiners with convictions from taking part in administration, he was establishing a Northern Ireland "We", then he is uniquely uniquely deluded.

Divided We Stand was the title of a booklet published around 1960. The author acknowledged the practical necessity of Partition, though he had no insight into the diabolical Northern Ireland structure which accompanied it. *Divided We Get Along* might be a description of the working arrangement made by Sinn Fein and the DUP. Under this arrangement, the Catholic community feels that it has achieved *something*. It had no such feeling during the years when Trimble was giving a helpless Mallon the run-around.

Sinn Fein has established a working relationship with a section of the Unionist leadership—a thing which the SDLP signally failed to do. And it has established a strong base for itself in the political life

of the South—which the SDLP, being Northern Irelandish, did not even attempt but which is a further ground of its resentment of Sinn Fein..

Sinn Fein is tactically flexible because its position is based on power which Whitehall failed to break and because its political horizon is not Northern Ireland. It can be practical—opportunist if you prefer—in the exercise of power because it has got power that it acquired independently of British policy. For a while the SDLP had got a semblance of power by selling itself to Whitehall as an alternative to the Provos, with the ability to undermine the Provos if conciliated. But, when its opportunity came in 1998, it failed utterly because Mallon imagined that he constituted a "We": with Trimble, and Trimble (advised by the Official IRA) was intent on subverting the Agreement which he had been compelled to sign—and which we were told he did not sign in the literal sense.

If Mallon subverts the Peace Process which he disparages, the outcome will not be an orgy of sentimental reconciliation but a resumption of something like war—and with it a resumption of the dirty tricks which are being exposed so effectively by the Pat Finucane Centre.

Northern Ireland is an inherently unstable structure, deliberately set up by Whitehall for its own purposes. Given what it was, it could only be governed in the way it was governed. It could not be governed as the rest of the state is governed, and law could not function in it as it does of the rest of the state, because it is governed apart from the life of the state. And law is never detachable from politics.

The "*Peace Process*" operated by Sinn Fein and the DUP, which Mallon attacks from an idealist position which he failed to make effective as a politician, is not a departure from the norm of democracy. It is a departure from the norm of raw communal antagonism in which the leaders of the two communities could do nothing but shout at each other. The default position of Northern Ireland, which prevails when it is not being over-ridden, does not lead to democratic peace but to war. And it is the party that was able to make war that is over-riding it for the time being, despite harassment by resentful failures.

The SDLP was in power—or at least in Office—in 1974 under the Sunningdale Agreement. It was in a power-sharing arrangement with Brian Faulkner's Unionists under Whitehall supervision. It had not made its own way to power and it did not know how to use the power that had been conferred on it. It was sulking in its Dungiven Assembly, having declared for "*united Ireland or nothing*", but it was coaxed and nudged out of its lair by Secretary of State Whitelaw and was manipulated into Northern Ireland power-sharing.

The whiff of power then went to its head, and by its conduct in Office (January-May 1974), it undermined the position of its Unionist ally. It declared that, by means of a Council of Ireland that was to be set up, it would trundle the Unionists into a United Ireland. Its Ministers posed for a photograph with members of the Dublin Government in preparation for All-Ireland Government.

When its conduct provoked general Unionist opposition to the power-sharing, and to a Strike against the establishment of the Council of Ireland which was sup-

ported by virtually the entire Protestant community, Premier Faulkner resigned. The SDLP then, declaring that the Strike was a Fascist uprising, said that it was willing to govern alone in order to ensure that there was not a repeat of the German events of 1933. Gerry Fitt became Premier. At that point Whitehall scrapped Sunningdale.

When, 24 years later, restoration of Northern Ireland Government was provided for, Seamus Mallon, described the Good Friday Agreement as "*Sunningdale for slow learners*", the implication being that the Provos had brought down the Sunningdale arrangement but were now willing to participate in a similar set-up.

We supported Sunningdale. The Provos did not. But it was not the Provos that brought it down. It was the conduct of the SDLP in Office that wrecked it, by provoking general Protestant hostility to it. We tried to warn the SDLP that it needed to change tack in order to preserve Power-Sharing, but it was lost in hubris.

The Provos eased up on their military campaign and let political events run their course. It was the posturing of the SDLP in Office, assisted by complementary posturing of the Coalition in Dublin (notably by Conor Cruise O'Brien), that provoked the Strike (the *Constitutional Stoppage*) which destroyed the Executive.

The moral is that the SDLP, having had power conferred on it, was incompetent in the exercise of that power in an intricate political situation, and this incompetence was again in evidence 25 years later, while the Provos, having achieved power through their own effort, are able to exercise it practically: *Is fear ciall ceannuithe ná ciall an muinteoire*".*

The main military event during the crisis of the Sunningdale system was the bombing of Dublin and Monaghan, which caused the greatest loss of life in the War. There is little doubt that the bombing was the work of Loyalist paramilitaries, organised by the British military. The Dublin Government, led by Liam Cosgrave, was supporting the SDLP in its conduct which was outraging the Ulster Protestant community, yet it made no arrangements to defend the Republic from attacks from the North. In a recently-published book, John Morgan, a retired Colonel of the Irish Army, traces the course of those bombings, and argues that, not only was there close collaboration between the British military and the Ulster Loyalists, but that collaboration with elements of the Gardai to leave an escape route open is a strong probability.

* Sense bought is better than sense taught.

Taoiseach Liam Cosgrave made a statement on the day of the Bombings, implying that they were the work of the IRA. That was credible only for a fraction of a second, while people were in shock. After that the Cosgrave Government, and all subsequent Governments, stifled investigation of the incident. They were all overawed by Britain and dared not risk finding it guilty.

Cosgrave has recently spoken about his father, W.T. (*Irish Times*, Oct. 13), who in 1922, after Michael Collins was killed in his mad escapade into West Cork, took over the leadership of the Provisional Government set up by Britain to enforce the 'Treaty', repudiated the complexities of Collins's approach, and consolidated the Treaty regime by means of unrestrained terrorism, free of any appearance of law, supported by Whitehall. The high points of that campaign were the killing of Erskine Childers because he was found in possession of a kind of toy pistol given to him by Collins; the killing by Government decision, on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception (Dec. 8) of four prisoners who had been held since the fall of the Four Courts in August; and the chaining of a group of prisoners-of-war at Ballyseedy in Kerry to a mine which was exploded and the survivors machine-gunned. The latter is known about because, against the odds of a million to one, there was a survivor who was overlooked.

This was done in the era of the League of Nations, under the ultimate authority of the British Parliament. A Dail elected in June 1922 was not allowed to meet until after the Treaty War—the 'Civil War'—was launched. And it was launched on the insistence of Whitehall (which is one of the reasons why Manus O'Riordan has called it the War of Foreign Intervention).

The terror worked in the short term, but it failed to engender a Treatyite mentality in the populace. The Treatyites almost lost power in 1927. They did lose it in 1932, and they never again won an election outright. In 1933 they became Fascists and were vehemently but futilely Anti-Partitionist. They returned to Office in 1948, in Coalition with Sean MacBride's Clann na Poblachta and launched another round of vehement but futile Anti-Partitionism. Then, in 1974, again in Coalition, they backed the SDLP in outraging the Unionists but left the Border undefended.

The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings, 1974,
a military analysis by John Morgan, Lt. Col (Retd.).
248pp. €20, £17.50 (postfree)
<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>

Irish Budget 2014

continued

It is an exaggeration to say that the economy was "wrecked" under Fianna Fáil. The deterioration in national income and employment is largely explained by the collapse of the building industry and the retail sector. The productive capacity of the country was not impaired.

The impression given by Ministers Noonan and Howlin is that it was left to Fine Gael and Labour to clean up the mess on their own. But the statistics do not bear out this claim. Ireland was widely admired in 2008 for obtaining 'first mover' advantage in tackling the economic crisis.

The fiscal adjustment for recent years *in billions of euro* is as follows:

| Year | Total | Cuts | Tax |
|------|-------|------|------|
| 2009 | 10.5 | 4.9 | 5.6 |
| 2010 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 0.1 |
| 2011 | 6.0 | 4.6 | 1.4 |
| 2012 | 3.8 | 2.2 | 1.6 |
| 2013 | 3.5 | 2.25 | 1.25 |
| 2014 | 2.5 | 1.6 | 0.9 |
| 2015 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 0.7 |

The bulk of the fiscal adjustment was done under Fianna Fáil. 2011 was the last budget under the previous Government. The new Government could wait almost a year before it had to introduce its own budget.

It should also be borne in mind that in the years 2009 to 2011 there was a dramatic reduction in national income as well as in employment. The fact that tax revenue actually increased in those years was as a result of quite draconian reforms in the taxation system.

The Government parties might claim that Fianna Fáil could pluck some of the "low hanging fruit"; and that from 2012 the fiscal adjustment was more difficult. But the universal social charge was not exactly an easy pick. Gerry Adams described the measure as a "terrorist act". The Fianna Fáil-led Government also put property taxes on the political agenda and thereby disabled itself from opposing vigorously the tax in opposition.

If the Fianna Fáil-led Government was so incompetent, one would expect the current Government to embark on a radical departure from the previous policies, but this has not been the case. It continued to pay unguaranteed Senior Debt. The main tax rates and credits have remained unchanged. Finance Minister Noonan has consistently argued that he inherited an income tax system that was one of the

most progressive in the OECD and therefore couldn't increase the tax rates any more, in spite of pressure from Fianna Fáil and Sinn Féin.

Noonan, on behalf of the Government, claimed credit for negotiating lower interest rates on sovereign debt as well as concessions on the Promissory Notes. Certainly, in its negotiations with its European partners, it had a realistic view of what was achievable (burning Senior Debt-holders was never going to happen), but it also can be said that the Eurozone was far more amenable to making concessions than when Fianna Fáil was in power. The Eurozone badly needed a success story like Ireland to restore confidence.

The 2014 budget was similar to previous budgets of this Government. It was politically astute and risk-averse. The main Opposition parties found it difficult to land any big punches. Of course politically "astute" is not the same as "fair". Increasing income taxes might be considered "fair", but not politically "astute". People immediately see in their payslips increases in income taxes, while other taxes are not so obvious.

In this budget there was no change in payroll taxes (this will mean that tax receipts will increase if there is any wage inflation). Indeed, on the taxation side Noonan was almost three-quarters way through his speech before any bad news was announced.

THE BAD NEWS ON TAX

In the 2013 budget Noonan announced a restriction on *top slicing relief*, which enables recipients of *ex gratia* payments (on retirement or redundancy) to be taxed at the average rate of tax instead of the marginal rate (usually 41%). At the time this writer suggested that he abolish the relief altogether, which he has done in the 2014 budget.

A more controversial measure was the restriction of relief on private Medical Insurance. The present writer has always opposed tax relief for private health insurance. The argument against this point of view is that private health members are in part financing the health service and, if premiums were too expensive, more people would cease to be insured which would reduce the resources available to the health service. My view is that there should be compulsory health insurance to finance a first-class health service, which would create a vested interest in maintaining high standards in public health.

So, I was not opposed to Noonan

restricting the relief to 1000 euro per adult and 500 euro per child. Unfortunately for him he did not present his case in the terms which I have done. He tried to claim that his measure would only affect "gold plated" schemes. This was probably his only *faux pas*. In subsequent days it was shown that even fairly basic levels of insurance would be affected by the measure.

He also increased the DIRT (Deposit Interest Retention Tax) on savings. A few years ago this withholding tax (collected by the banks) on the interest paid for savings was at the standard rate of tax (20%). In 2014 it will be at the top rate of 41%. This seems reasonable. People with substantial savings in the current environment tend to be in the higher income bracket.

Some of Noonan's reforms on private pensions were reasonable; others seemed a little harsh. Unlike in Continental Europe, the State contributory pension is not much above the non contributory pension. So employees who pay their PRSI don't really receive much of a benefit on retirement. Although the basic State pension is quite high by international standards, workers are encouraged to contribute to private pensions to maintain a reasonable standard of living on retirement. This is the justification for tax relief on private pensions. Noonan decided to restrict the tax relief to pensions under 60,000 euros per annum. I support this measure.

It is less easy to justify the levy of 0.15% on pension funds in 2014. This is on top of the 0.6% levy he already imposed, but which will be rescinded at the end of 2014. There is an argument that this is double taxation, since the funds will be taxed again when they are released as pensions. But it has to be admitted that it is a politically-astute move. Most people are barely aware of how their pensions perform in the years before their retirement.

The budget as usual acquiesced to the puritan lobby:

- 10 cent on a 20 pack of cigarettes and a pro rata increase on other tobacco products.
- 10 cent increase on pint of cider, pint of beer and standard measure of spirits.
- 50 cent increase on a standard 75cl bottle of wine.

From the Minister for Finance's point of view there is the added benefit of these measures applying nearly two months earlier than usual.

As pointed out in previous budget

articles, people feel guilty about their drink and tobacco consumption and are therefore less likely to protest against these regressive measures. Also, the 50 cent increase is inequitable as it does not take into account value: it applies to the bottle of plonk as much as the finest of wines.

Noonan defended these measures by pointing out that the VAT rate on the hospitality sector was kept at the lower rate (9% compared to 13.5%). So, only the tourists are allowed have fun!

It is difficult to disagree with the bank levy of 150 million which will apply to all banks operating in Ireland and will be proportional to deposit income. Now that the much maligned Guarantee is about to expire, the State will be losing the substantial premium payments that the participating banks were obliged to pay.

THE GOOD NEWS

The good news about the taxation side of the budget was that there was not much bad news. But on top of the lack of bad news Noonan was able to announce a few pieces of good news.

Most of the good news related to the Construction sector. The thinking appears to be that this sector is on its knees and needs some help. There will be a home renovation tax credit on expenditure on a principal private residence in 2014 and 2015. The tax credit will be equal to 13.5% of expenditure greater than 5,000 and less than 30,000 euro. The scheme is designed to benefit compliant tax payers both on the supply and demand side. But it will be of no benefit to householders on a low income.

Noonan also extended the exemption for Capital Gains Tax on purchases of property which is held for seven years. The measure was due to expire at the end of 2013, but will be extended to the end of 2014. This is probably designed to 'kick start the property market', but this writer doesn't see any social productive benefit in encouraging people to speculate in property.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE CUTS

As has been pointed out in previous budget articles most of the bad news is reserved for Labour's Minister for Public Expenditure and Reform, Brendan Howlin, to deliver. The Labour Party has accepted Fine Gael's analysis that most of the fiscal adjustment will be in the form of expenditure cuts (in 2014 1.6 billion of cuts compared to 0.9 billion in taxes).

While the headline social welfare rates remain unchanged there were some unkind cuts. The Job-Seekers' Allowance for those between 22 and 24 will drop from 144 to

100 euro a week while the rate for 25 year olds will drop from 188 to 144. The Government argues that such young people will retain their old Benefits if they go on a course, but often the waiting list for these is more than a year. There might be an argument for reducing the Unemployment Allowance for school leavers in these hard times, but many people in their mid-twenties have families. This measure may lead to increasing poverty and homelessness.

There were a plethora of other cuts which taken in isolation will not have much impact, but cumulatively will cause hardship:

- Increase of prescription charges to 2.50 with overall monthly cap of 23 euro
- Maternity benefit to be standardised to 230 euro a week. The higher rate of 262 and lower rate of 217 will be abolished.
- Bereavement grant of 850 euro axed
- 9.50 euro monthly telephone allowance will be scrapped

Most of these benefits were not specifically targeted at those on a low income. Nevertheless it is the low paid that will miss them the most.

There was some good and bad news on Medical Cards. There will be free GP care for all children 5 years old and under. On the other hand, the Government hopes to save 113 million on Medical Cards. Many Medical Cards are supplied on a discretionary basis. The justification for this is that some families with a relatively high income should be entitled to a Medical Card for a seriously ill member of the family. However, about 43% of the population have a Medical Card. Over the years it is likely that anomalies have accumulated. It doesn't seem unreasonable to review the allocation of Medical Cards in these straitened times.

CONCLUSION

Overall the budget was not as bad as many people expected. The content appeared to take the Opposition parties by surprise.

In recent months the Government, particularly Labour, has had bad ratings in the opinion polls. Such polls give an indication of the mood of the people, but in most cases people are not thinking very seriously about politics. It is only in the run-up to a vote that people begin to concentrate on the issues. For example, we saw how quickly public sentiment changed in the final stages of the referendum campaign to abolish the Seanad.

The Government Parties have been

presenting a coherent narrative to the electorate: that they rescued the economy and restored sovereignty. I happen to think the narrative is flawed. Nevertheless it is likely that the Government parties will receive a bounce once they exit from the bailout programme. I suspect Fine Gael will benefit more than Labour.

There are, of course, many potential banana skins. For example, the banks may need further recapitalisation. However, overall the economic environment is looking more benign. Unemployment has dropped from a peak of over 15% to 13.3%. Not all of this is explained by emigration: employment is expected to grow by 1.5% this year and next.

The Government is anticipating GDP growth of 2% next year; the ESRI (Economic and Social Research Institute) thinks it may be even higher.

Up until now we have been living through a vicious circle of spiralling debt. That circle may now be about to be broken. At the end of 2013 the debt to GDP ratio will have peaked at 124%. In subsequent years the figures will be as follows:

| | |
|------|--------|
| 2014 | 120 % |
| 2015 | 118.4% |
| 2016 | 114.5% |

So interest payments as a proportion of national income will decline. The State also has 25 billion in cash reserves. This was accumulated as a precaution against unexpected shocks. As the public finances begin to stabilise there will be less of a need for such a large cash reserve.

The other element in the mix is that no alternative Government has yet emerged. Has Micheál Martin the courage to withstand the wrath of Independent newspapers by considering a coalition with Sinn Féin?

Political predictions are always hazardous. But, as things stand, it is not inconceivable that the current Government could be returned after the next election, albeit with a reduced majority.

John Martin

FREE SPEECH

They talk of free speech
but what is it but
a leech
on a right-wing media
that ruts with right-wing politics,
the only difference
is whom to personally slander
and how many hits,
while to the elite
they pander.

Wilson John Haire

10.10.13

Israel And Its Friends

Tom Carew, Chairman of the Ireland-Israel Friendship League, has resigned his position because of Jewish criticism of his criticism of mild harassment by Israeli soldiers of EU diplomatic representatives visiting Palestinians in the West Bank. Jewish critics described his criticism as an irrational, mischief-making libel on Israel. Carew said that: "*the bitter personal bile... leaves me quite speechless*". He compared it to the "*kind of poison which led to the murder*" of Yitzak Rabin and expressed his determination "*not to yield to intimidation...*" (IT 1.10.13).

While he was chairing the Ireland-Israel Friendship League, Carew himself engaged in some attempts at intimidation. Zionist propaganda in the Republic has been countered in the Republic by the Ireland Palestine Solidarity Campaign and Sadaka—The Ireland-Palestine Alliance. Carew tried to get a prominent then member of the IPSC, Philip O'Connor, dismissed from his job as head of the Dublin Employment Pact. In doing this, he only did what active supporters of Israel do as a matter of course everywhere and all the time.

In a statement justifying his resignation, Carew said:

"It truly amazes me that you cannot accept that you can admire the original State of Israel, its founders and its core values and not be repulsed—on moral grounds—at the dominant ideology which has taken over in the past three decades, that of the Greater Israel movement and settler project. It is the ultra-nationalist forces who have abandoned the founding values and who are its worst enemies..." (ibid).

His Jewish critics have reason for describing him as "*irrational*". What Israel has been doing for the past 30 years is very mild compared to what it had been doing before that. The "*Greater Israel movement*" was not invented in the 1980s. It was always the "*value*" at the core of Zionism.

The territory awarded to the Zionist movement by the United Nations for the establishment of a Jewish state was accepted as a first instalment—a base area. No Zionist accepted it as meeting the terms of God's award to Moses.

The division of Palestine made by the UN was heavily in favour of Zionism. This meant that the territory designated for a Jewish state in the 1947 UN Partition included a Palestinian minority that was much larger than the Catholic minority in

Protestant Northern Ireland. The first thing that had to be done to make the construction of a state that was thoroughly Jewish possible in that area was a drastic ethnic cleansing of Palestinians. The means by which that was done was described by an Israeli historian, Benny Morris, about a quarter of a century ago—before he was brought to order.

The ethnic cleansing of the territory awarded to a Jewish state was accompanied by a war of conquest against the territory awarded to the native population. The conquest of the whole of Palestine by Israel was prevented by the Jordanian/British Army. The ceasefire line of the Israel/Jordan War of 1948 was then accepted *de facto* by the "*international community*", though not by Israel, as establishing the border of the Jewish state.

Then in 1972 Israel conquered the rest of Palestine in a pre-emptive war and opened it up to Jewish settlement. A pre-emptive war is a defensive war against an attack which has not been made.

In the light of all that, the hassling by Israeli soldiers of EU representatives making a token gesture in support of the Palestinians seems a very slight cause for Carew's extreme reaction.

If the EU wanted to impose limits on Jewish nationalist activities in Palestine, it could do so. If it was in earnest about a Palestinian State, it could easily give it reality by defining borders for the Jewish State and compelling Israel by means of economic and other sanctions to withdraw within these orders. It could engage in direct trade with Palestine, ignoring Israeli restrictions. Instead of doing that, the EU privileges Israel in practice, treating it as part of Europe, while tut-tutting diplomatically and indulging in trivial gestures.

Tom Carew is the second Irish spokesman for the Zionist cause in Dublin who has become disillusioned. The first was Dermot Meleady, the second volume of whose hagiography of John Redmond is to be published shortly. It will be interesting to see how he handles the 1917 Balfour Declaration. (We assume that his determined silence in recent years, when Israel was much in need of propaganda defenders, is a symptom of disillusionment.)

It appears that both Meleady and Carew turned towards Zionism in their revulsion against the war waged by the Catholic minority in the North against the undemocratic system of government to which it was subjected in 1921, and under which it suffered quietly for almost half a century. In this irrationality they followed the example of Conor Cruise O'Brien.

The Referendums

Senate Abolition

Richard Bruton and Alan Shatter between them lost the Referendum to abolish the Senate. Alan Shatter did it by the obscure way he phrased the question: Instead of simply asking *Do you want to abolish the Senate*. Voters were asked "*Do you approve of the proposal to amend the Constitution*" in the "*Thirty-second Amendment of the Constitution (Abolition of Seanad Éireann) Bill 2013*".

Some people thought they were voting to abolish the Senate, when in fact they were voting against abolition. These failures can be laid at the door of Minister for Justice Shatter and the rest of the Cabinet.

A second big mistake, for which Minister Bruton was responsible, was a failure to insist that Taoiseach Enda Kenny defend his radical proposal to the electorate in debate.

In the upshot, voting was as follows: 591,937, 48.2% in favour, 634,437, 51.7% against. Turnout: 39.17%, 39.17% of electorate of 3,167,384.

New Appeal Court

With virtually no opposition to the proposal to establish a further layer of judicial intervention, despite similar flaws in the wording to the Senate ballot, this amendment passed by 795,008, 65.2% to 425,047, 34.8%. Turnout 39.15%.

There were 20,080 invalid papers, compared with 14,355 in the Senate poll.

A Professor Writes

continued

political class in relation to the Euro proves beyond all doubt that economics does *not* determine political behaviour. A British Eurosceptic once exclaimed that he would rather eat grass than join the Euro, whatever its economic benefits. That is the spirit that motivates the British attitude to the Euro. The Professor may think it stupid, but it is a political fact and that is what matters. Stupid or not, as the case may be, stupidity is as powerful a force in political life as intelligence and the power of either is what matters in the political world. It is the art of politics to utilise both for a purpose. The Euro is a political project as everyone knows and Britain has never accepted the political project in the first place and has done everything in its power to prevent it. So why should it not continue to do so now?

The Professor's naiveté might be

explained when he goes on to present what he regards as the reason why the EU exists in the first place. Conveniently he discovered, or rediscovered, this while on holiday this year:

"Summer travels vividly reminded me once again of the origins of the European project. Visits to Germany made me realise how recent in fact is the second World War, when a European conflict led to the loss of 20 million European lives. A visit to Slovenia brought back how very recent were the Balkan Wars and how fragile the situation still is in that region"

The Professor should really be teaching in a nursery if he thinks this explains the origin of the European project. Britain certainly never considered joining the project because of the devastation of WWII. Why should it? It never accepted any responsibility for that devastation. That is why it, not only did not join any attempt at European unity after the War, but did everything possible to prevent it happening. When the EEC was formed in 1956 it set up EFTA [European Free Trade Association] to scupper it.

Neither did the founding fathers of the project initiate the project just because of the devastation of WWII and WWI. They did it to get rid of the *cause* of those devastating wars. Their object was to build a political structure that would exclude any more British meddling in their affairs which is what had caused the devastations in the first place.

Britain joined later as its prestige declined sharply after being put in its place by Russia and the US over the Suez invasion and after failing to obstruct the growth of the EEC which it saw going from strength to strength. When it could not beat them it joined them. Then, after a few years it began a campaign to change the whole direction of the project and it succeeded, not because of the current European leaders remembering the lessons of the World Wars but precisely because they *forgot* the real lessons that were learned by the post-Wars leaders who set up the European project and who had experienced these two Wars at first hand and realised who was responsible.

If the project's *raison d'être* depended on looking back to the consequences of the two World War, its impetus would inevitably fade away as the memory of those consequences diminishes.

What made the Professor's comments particularly ludicrous when he wrote them was that the Tory Party conference began two days earlier and it was reported the day before that:

"Cameron and Hague seek to remove 'ever closer union' from the EU treaties

"David Cameron on Sunday vowed to remove the commitment to 'ever closer union' from the EU treaty. In his speech to the Conservative Party Conference, William Hague also called for an end to the doctrine, saying that, 'People used to think there was only one destination—a federal Europe—and the only question was whether you got there in the fast lane or slow lane. They don't think that any more. Governments across Europe are talking about power coming back to the countries of Europe.' The FT quotes Open Europe Director Mats Persson as saying that removing ever closer union from the treaties would have judicial significance since it could force the ECJ in particular to drop its bias for more centralisation. Mats is also cited by Polish daily *Gazeta Wyborcza*. On his *Telegraph* blog, Mats added that, politically, 'It would finally kill the idea, championed by the likes of Delors and Prodi, that the EU is like a

bicycle: it either moves forward in one direction or it falls'." (Open Europe, 30 September.)

In view of these attitudes by the leaders of the British Government, why and how is there likely to be a 'road to Damascus' moment "*in a few years*" in Britain that would see all this reversed? It is a pipedream.

But Britain will not do the EU a favour and simply leave it. It is much too successful doing within it what it failed to do originally outside it—destroy it by creating a constant existential problem for it with no prospect of the present European leadership having the confidence to challenge this. This is what Britain does naturally and does best when it comes to Europe. And the Professor's nonsense helps to hide this elemental fact.

Jack Lane

The War On The Peace

What is happening at the moment is most accurately described as *the War on the Peace*.

The war on the Peace could be alternatively called *the war on the War*—or the war on the War that established the Peace. That is the war on the War that ended in more than a draw for the Republican Army that fought it and the community that produced that Army and helped sustain it until it had altered the position of the Catholics in 'Northern Ireland' to a degree that would not have been imagined possible when it began.

But whatever the war on the Peace is called its objective seems to be to disturb that Peace by undermining those who were primarily responsible for achieving it. And to hell with the consequences! As long as it pushes those Northern Fenians back to where they belong in the box marked '*sealed in 1921. Not to be opened under any circumstance!*'

Down at Dublin City University the twin leaders of the thoroughly dysfunctional First Executive, David Trimble and Seamus Mallon, receiving Honorary Doctorates, joined in the war on the Peace to criticise what was, until recently, the functional Executive of the DUP and Sinn Fein.

This was Mallon's first intervention since he took a hand in the course of the Special Advisers Bill earlier this year to remind the current SDLP leader, Alistair

McDonnell, about what he should be doing. That intervention succeeded in making McDonnell draw back from opposing Jim Allister's Bill, breaking the Nationalist bloc and giving a great victory to Unionism, for the first time in years.

That victory stirred up the Unionist fundamentalists to revert back to their fundamentals in their quest for retribution against the Croppies who could not be made to lie down. And they have been threatening the functional Robinson/Mc Guinness coalition ever since: The functional coalition that was making the Peace work.

Up until then Robinson had risen above such fundamentals. Big Ian had been a demander of Republicans wearing 'sack cloth and ashes' before coming into Government with Martin McGuinness when he abandoned this position for a higher purpose. That higher purpose was to implicate Sinn Fein in the government of 'Northern Ireland' and thereby quell the Republican storm and halt its momentum.

Robinson gave an indication of the thinking behind this policy in a speech to Castlereagh Council recently:

"Insisting that the Union was stronger than ever, he cautioned unionists not to 'turn the clock back to a bygone era' and urged them to have more self confidence. 'Unionism has historically had a siege mentality,' he said. 'When we were being besieged it was the right response. But when we are in a constitutionally safe

and stable position it poses as a threat to our future development. Demographic changes and social change mean that we need to build bigger and broader coalitions and not to retreat into an ever-diminishing core.'

"He said unionism should not be defined simply by the issues of 'flags and parades' but by what he described as the benefits of living in the UK. 'Unionism needs to think and act strategically... because if unionists are not seen to make Northern Ireland work within the Union then no one will. Unionism will only succeed if it is a broad coalition of interests. I accept that not every person who wishes to remain part of the United Kingdom will share my affection for the national flag or even my cultural heritage. My responsibility as leader of the largest unionist party is to seek to hold that broad coalition together for it is only the capacity to bring together those with differing views under a common banner that gives unionism its strength.'

"Mr Robinson... challenged the view that unionist culture was being eroded. 'Unionists are the purveyors of unionist culture. Nobody can take our culture away from us. It's within us. It's our values. It's our art and music. It's our beliefs. It's our history. It's how we express ourselves. It's our way of life. Outsiders might try—and from time to time succeed—in limiting our cultural expression in a specific place or manner but they have no power to stop us increasing our expression in other ways. Such a nationalist strategy doesn't make me feel culturally diminished. It just makes me angry. Angry that people cannot respect and tolerate diversity. But that anger should be channelled into overcoming such intolerance...' The First Minister said unionists and nationalists had to work together to secure progress.

"Mr Robinson said it was foolish to think that the collapse of the Assembly would not result in further conflict. 'Happily, it's only an academic argument but I have absolutely no doubt that if the Assembly were to fall it would leave a void which every malign force would seek to exploit and profit from,' he said. 'Paramilitary organisations which are presently contained would be reinforced and bracing themselves for an opening to wage terror'." (Belfast Tel. 19.10.13)

There is much sense in Robinson's argument to Unionism. The former days are over where the 'minority' could be presided over as a second-class community. They are no longer a 'minority' and soon may be a majority and as a result of the Republican War they are no longer second-class. So Unionism has to take account of them and even court them, or a section of them, to survive.

Robinson is also aware of the antagonising effects of 'Protestant culture' on Catholics. Whilst many aspects of the

British State are attractive to Northern Catholics, the Ulsterish aspect of Britishness repels them. How can they be effectively courted when their noses are being rubbed in it by Loyalist bandmen thundering Anti-Papist tunes outside Catholic chapels, and alien flags being waved in their faces?

The problem is that in 1920, when the Six Counties was placed in semi-detachment from the UK by Westminster, what the British left Unionism with was the symbols of Britishness. And there has been an ever-increasing desire to flaunt the left-overs in the faces of the Fenians to reassure themselves of their 'Britishness'.

It was not those who have the Union flag waived at them who took away the Union. The Northern Catholics led by Joe Devlin were very British and Imperial in those days. The AOH were helping to integrate Ireland into the developing welfare state and West Belfast was one of the great recruiting centres for Britain's Great War. It boasted of being more loyal to England's cause than the loyalists.

But they don't make Northern Catholics like that any more. 'Northern Ireland' saw to that. In fact, the major political effect of 'Northern Ireland' has been to make its inhabitants less and less British as the years rolled by. And perhaps that was the devious point of it all along.

The First Minister is aware that the flag dispute set off a chain of events that has resulted in many in the DUP, who were never confident in the potential of the Paisley/Robinson strategy to blunt Republicanism, losing their nerve. After the Special Advisers victory they started mutinying and Robinson had to ditch the Maze Peace Centre to steady the ship.

The success of the Robinson project depends on Unionism being amenable to Six County Catholics and making 'Northern Ireland' possible for them to live in contentedly. And that means holding a tight control over all the instinctive reflexes of Unionism.

That is a difficult project to see through. The nature of 'Northern Ireland' and its communal blocs makes it all but impossible to sustain. And it is possible that it might still be all in vain: Catholics might just become a majority and then pursue their national dream.

But fair play to Mr. Robinson for what he is attempting. He has spoken and saved his Soul—and many lives.

We can understand why Trimble is so pleased to see the DUP fundamentalists revolting against the DUP accommodation-

ists. Trimble proved incapable of making an accommodation even with the SDLP, under Mallon's leadership, by chasing a humiliation of the Republican Army in the decommissioning crusade he pursued until his party's melt-down in the course of it.

He was at one time made an offer by Mallon that he 'could not refuse', an offer that would have created a UUP/SDLP coalition. But he succeeded in refusing it. Having turned down Mallon, the Republican Army then outwitted him in leaving the stage in an orderly and dignified manner and decommissioning on its own terms. Sinn Fein managed to turn the Republican retreat from the battlefield into political advantage, over-turning its secondary position vis-à-vis Mallon's SDLP into ascendancy. And, by smashing his own party and the SDLP along with it in chasing an illusory victory, Trimble brought the DUP into the leading role to secure the Peace and construct a functional arrangement with Sinn Fein.

The picture in the *Belfast Telegraph* that sat above the report on Trimble's and Mallon's views showed the two doing a jig in Dublin, reminiscent of Trimble's notorious victory dance with Paisley down the Garvaghy Road. But this more recent dance was more a loser's jig.

It is undeniable that all the chief agitators involved in the current war on the Peace were responsible for the actual War in one way or another. The Unionists began it with their reckless behaviour in August 1969; The British set its context in 1920 and facilitated it by their response in the months after August 1969. The Irish Government and Fianna Fail in particular, according to Professor Patterson, did nothing to stop it and much to encourage it. And the SDLP/Nationalist Party started it.

It might surprise the reader to know that the SDLP started the War. But that is true. How do we know that? Because they have said it. Or rather Austin Currie has said it. He started the War when actually a member of the Nationalist Party. But more than anyone else Currie was the SDLP in embryo.

Here is Currie in the first page of his autobiography, *All Hell Will Break Loose*:

"On Wednesday 19 June 1968, near the end of an acrimonious debate in the Stormont Parliament, I was ordered by the Speaker to leave the House. As I left, I angrily threw my speaking notes at the jeering Unionist benches and shouted, 'All hell will break loose, and by God I will lead it' ... I didn't wish to hang

around anyway. I knew what I had to do.

"Had I known the consequences of what I intended to do later that day, at Caledon, would I have proceeded with it? I have asked myself that question many, many times over the years. Would I have gone ahead had I known, or even suspected, that the action I was about to take would initiate a process that would lead to the loss of nearly four thousand lives? Would I have gone ahead had I known that my intended action and other actions stemming from it would transform the political scene in Northern Ireland and destroy a political regime which, at that time, appeared permanent and unchallengeable?... These are some of the questions I have wrestled with for more than thirty years..." (p.9-10)

This is all very honest and refreshing—although Currie answers his own question that he would not have occupied the house at Caledon and brought direct action into play against the Stormont system if he knew all the trouble he was going to cause.

But this also suggests that without the trouble there would still be the same "political regime" that appeared "permanent and unchallengeable".

The Republican War therefore was a necessary event in the Great Transformation of the Catholic community.

The current aim of the war on the Peace that came out of the Republican War seems to be to 'Get Adams' and to 'Smash Sinn Fein'. In the process, it is presumably calculated, that this will reduce the Northern Catholic community to the kind of position they were in up until the Great Transformation. They will be contained and a quiet life will be had by all.

But if Adams were to be 'Got', and if Sinn Fein were to be 'Smashed', what then?

It should be understood that if the accommodationist constitutional route taken by Sinn Fein should prove to be a blind alley, that will not be the end of the matter. It is in the nature of the entity called 'Northern Ireland' that that should be the case. Republicanism is being quietly reconstituted in its heartland for the day when, if the present road leads to nowhere, something new will spring up.

Peter Robinson is right in his warnings about the alternative to the present. He understands the nature of things in 'Northern Ireland' and he is explicit about it in his speech at Castlereagh. It is far too late to put the Northern Catholics back in their box.

Pat Walsh

Editorial Digest

Anthony McIntyre: *You Read It Here First.* In January 2012 *Irish Political Review* reported on the Priory Hall (Dublin) botched building development and noted that an *Irish News* report of 18th October 2011 had failed to mention the role played by a dissident republican, Lord Bew's protege, while slating former Hunger Striker Thomas McFeeley. We noted:

"McIntyre, a Site Manager for Coalport Development, has been described by the Company itself as having overseen on its behalf "all facets of constructing building sites from initial stages to completion". He was its lead agent at Priory Hall from 2007 to 2011. It is said that information about McIntyre's role in the Priory project has been removed from the Internet since the project gained notoriety.

It is hard to escape the conclusion that the *Irish News* shielded McIntyre from negative publicity because his politics suits its general anti-Sinn Fein propaganda offensive..."

Now, two years after the event, the *Irish News* (2.10.13, 7.10.13) has finally caught up with the McIntyre angle! However, the paper went easy on him: it did not mention that he was the lead agent on the development for four years. McIntyre told the paper that he had asked his friend McFeeley for a job after being unemployed for a year. He admitted he had "no experience" in the building trade and said "I regret my role in the project".

Credit Unions retain strength. Prime Time on 30th September reported on Credit Unions. One is in very serious trouble (Newbridge). But it had left the League of Credit Unions and begun to act as a bank. The Chief Executive Officer of the League—Kieron Brennan—gave a very robust defence of the movement. Irish Credit Unions have 2.8m members, which is pretty much

Two New Books: related to Turkish history from Athol Books:

Preposterous Paradoxes Of Ambassador Morgenthau,

a factual story about politics, propaganda and distortions
by *Sükrü Server Aya*.
242pp (hbk). Illustrated. **€27, £22,50**

Twisted Law versus

Documented History, Geoffrey Robertson's opinion on genocide against proven facts
by *Sükrü Server Aya*.
96pp. Illustrated. **€12, £9**

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

the entire adult population. Prime Time had a 'shock horror' report on the escalation of loans in arrears from 8% in 2008 to 20% today, with total loans in arrears of 700m. But Brennan pointed out that the CUs in the League had built up reserves of 1.5bn and could cover any major default without recourse to Government ("taxpayer") support.

Hurling Final

"Sporting combatants playing for love not money, with only helmets for protection, clash with ash sticks while trying to catch a ball consisting of cork wrapped in thick leather flying through the air at a terrifying velocity. Welcome to the ancient Irish game of hurling, arguably the fastest contact sport played on grass. Last weekend, 82,000 people wearing the red and white of Cork or the yellow and blue of Clare watched their heroes play out what many regard as the greatest All-Ireland hurling final... As Premier League soccer is again soiled with prima donna antics—see the scratch-and-send-off controversy of Torres at Spurs at the weekend—the hand-eye coordination and the courage and commitment of Cork and Clare were a shining example of sportsmanship" (Guardian Editorial 2.10.13)

The Thatcher Who Burnt The House Down

Ashes to ashes, iron to dust
The Queen of Coolheart wrecked our trust
A nation like a family
Now sniggers at dishonesty
Now rants about the downcast poor
And views the rich with greedy awe
The grocer's daughter loves Shirley Porter*
And supermarkets for grocer slaughter
A skyscraper wasteland gleams with pride
With Fools Gold crafted deep inside
The moon gleams emptily on empty hearts
Not a penny for their thoughts or empty plots
Nation to Ashes, Rust In Peace
Banks still hollow from the Golden Fleece

Dame Shirley Porter was heir to the Tesco supermarket fortune. Not close to Thatcher, she was however one of the most vicious enforcers of her policies. And got a criminal conviction for the Westminster City Council gerrymandering scandal. She is unrelated to the Mrs Porter of T S Elliot's *The Waste Land*, who was probably a nice woman who happened to get entangled in a disturbed man's neuroticism. "Rust in Peace" is someone else's slogan from the Falls Road, Belfast, and widely reproduced.

Walter Cobb

Shorts

from
the Long Fellow

JOURNALISM IN *IRISH INDEPENDENT*

Just when it is thought that standards in journalism cannot descend any lower, the *Irish Independent* demonstrates that there are new unimagined depths in which it is possible to wallow.

The newspaper and its sister paper have been busy promoting an autobiography by Eamon Dunphy. An article about the book in the *Irish Independent* (7.10.13) has the following headline:

"Haughey tipped off wealthy friends before sterling devaluation."

The article goes on to quote from Dunphy's book to the effect that Haughey made a killing from Britain's 1967 devaluation:

"...Harold Wilson's government decided to devalue on November 18, 1967, the Irish government was given twenty-four hours' notice.

"Charlie was Minister for Finance. He passed the information on to a small group of wealthy Irish businessmen who made a fortune on the currency markets.

"They 'looked after' the Man of Destiny who tipped them off

"A year later with the heat off, Charlie began negotiations to purchase Abbeville, the mansion of his dreams.

"In 1969, he moved from his modest semi-D in the modest suburb of Raheny" etc. etc.

What is the evidence for this shocking allegation? He heard it from an unnamed source in a bar (the Horseshoe Bar). And that's all.

MORE BULLSHIT

Working on the principle that if enough bullshit is thrown at a wall some of it will stick Eamon Delaney (former Editor of former magazine *Magill*) repeated Dunphy's allegations (*Irish Independent*, 10.10.13). This was "*long a rumour*" (so it must be true?). And Dunphy deserves "*credit*" for publishing this rumour about a dead man who can't defend himself. Delaney goes on to claim:

"Charlie moved from his ordinary semi-D in the modest suburb of Raheny into the palatial James Gandon designed mansion of Abbeville".

The story, of course, is pure fantasy. It projects current preoccupations and prejudices back to 1967. Business was not global then. Financial markets and

telephone systems were rudimentary and computers were largely unknown. There was no round-the-clock trading.

The Irish Government was given advance notice of Sterling devaluation, but only after the financial markets had closed on the Friday. So there was no possibility of anyone in the Government gaining financial advantage.

The facts of the matter are that Haughey did not move from an "*ordinary semi-D*" into Abbeville. Before he bought Abbeville he owned "*Grangemore*", a large Victorian home on a 45 acre estate. He bought this in 1960 and sold it for £200,000 in 1969. In the same year he bought Abbeville for £120,000: £80,000 LESS than he sold Grangemore (see *London Independent*, 14.6.06).

CHILDREN SURVEY

Has the *Irish Independent* a policy of being negative? A report on a NUI Galway survey of health behaviour of Children between 10 and 17 began with the headline:

"More than a quarter of school children admit to getting drunk" (24.9.13).

So, it's not just ageing journalists! However, in the body of the report we learn:

"As many as 28.3pc in the latest survey admit they have been drunk, down just slightly from 29.3pc of an earlier generation of school-goers in 1998".

So although 28.3% might be considered high, the trend is at worst stable and possibly decreasing.

In similar negative vein the report pointed out that the survey found only 50% took exercise more than four times a week compared to 53.5% in 1998.

It's only towards the end of the report that some positive trends are revealed in this survey which interviewed 40,000 children covering a period between 1998 and 2010:

- 12% of schoolgoers smoke compared to 21% in 1998
- 8% smoke cannabis compared to 10% in 1998
- 16% admit to being bullied, 24% in 1998

Children are more communicative with their parents, in particular the father (60% compared to 42% in 1998). The corresponding figures for mothers are 82% and 74%.

Contrary to conventional wisdom, young people are not getting worse every year!

EMIGRATION ONCE AGAIN

A study by *University College Cork* and the *Irish Research Council* on

emigration gives some interesting insights into the current wave (*Irish Independent*, 27.9.13).

The subject of emigration has a deep historical resonance. In the national memory it dredges up images of coffin ships and famine. However, the nature of emigration has changed dramatically since the 1840s. In the nineteenth century the country was a source of cheap labour for Britain. It felt like Britain was sucking the lifeblood of the country, even after independence. During the 1950s the population of the country had reached its nadir of 2.8 million. But from then on Ireland largely ceased to be Britain's cheap source of labour. In the 1960s Britain had to replenish its stock of labour from other ex-colonies in Asia and the Caribbean. Since the 1950s the population of the Republic of Ireland has been steadily increasing and is now at 4.6 million.

The 1970s was the first decade in which there was net immigration (104,000 more people coming into the country than out). Net emigration resumed during the 1980s (-208,000). However, although Britain remained the most popular destination, a higher proportion of emigrants went to America and continental Europe than previous waves of emigration. In the 1990s net immigration returned (+37,400) and in the first decade of the 21st century we had net immigration of 353,200.

As was pointed out last month, net emigration only resumed in 2010. But unlike in the 1980s the emigration is accompanied by high immigration. For example, in the 12 months to April 2013 56,000 people immigrated into the State (89,000 emigrated).

The UCC report indicates that many emigrants are now going to the Middle East and Asia. The most striking statistic is that only 23% of emigrants were unemployed in Ireland. Other statistics suggest that the current wave is a middle class phenomenon. For example, 62pc of Irish emigrants hold a third level qualification. The general impression is that most of the emigrants wanted to improve their standard of living. The decision in many cases is a choice rather than an act of desperation.

THE GUARANTEE

The fifth anniversary of the Bank Guarantee passed without much comment. The Long Fellow has always felt that there was an emotional need by the people to distil all the causes of the recession into the poker game that was played out in September 2008. But in fact practically all the damage was done by 2007.

The demonisation of the Guarantee at the last General Election suited the opposition parties who are now in government. The Labour Party, in particular, could claim that it voted against the Guarantee and instead proposed nationalisation, which is in fact a guarantee by another means.

Some form of guarantee was necessary. The consequences for the economy would

have been far worse if the banking system had been allowed collapse.

A key fact is that the current Government has repaid in full Senior Debt *not* covered by the Guarantee. So the idea that the Guarantee restricted policy decisions that otherwise would have been made is bogus.

No wonder the fifth anniversary was shrouded in a discreet veil of silence!

Annette Macdonald, Some Memories

I am sure that Annette Macdonald made an impression on everyone who knew her. I met her in Dublin in the early 1970s. In a crumbling old building on Waterloo Road, at the shabbier everyman's end of posh Ballsbridge, I shared a ground floor flat with some other British and Irish Communist Organisation (B&ICO) members over the years, where we edited various B&ICO magazines. We possessed an electric typewriter, and Annette used to come round regularly to type the articles. I remember that she was calm and sensible, and whatever she was doing she did well. She did not (as far as I remember) complain about the draughty, dusty, uncomfortable working environment. Always she was good-humoured and patient, which was required in anyone having to deal with me as Editor. In the course of time she also learned to handle the printing machine that was kept in a small office in central Belfast, and she used to go regularly every month to print the various magazines and bring them back to our own small office in Dublin for collation, stapling and distribution.

I had no knowledge of Annette's background and there was no reason to ask, but I assumed she was of working class origin. From a rural background myself, I had no contact with the Dublin working class until I was 20. Afterwards my acquaintance proceeded on two levels: work and politics. I did two years in a tyre-making plant in Tullaght. Later, when my working life became more irregular, I did countless Christmas stints in the Postal Sorting Office in Sheriff Street, a job I enjoyed like no other because of the people I met there (now, alas, that Sorting Office is no more, replaced by the dehumanised modern Mail Centre off the Naas Road).

I found my workmates strange, and the feeling was mutual. But they were friendly, tolerant and generous. They deviated from the model workers of the *Communist Manifesto*: you certainly couldn't say that they had no country. They were recognisably from a type of Irish Catholic

community, though it differed in some matters of custom and tradition from mine. For example, I had relatives in Boston, whereas theirs would have been in Liverpool, Manchester and Birmingham. Most of them were familiar with the other side of the water. One of the songs that I heard sung marvellously in Tullaght, with piercing feeling, was *Liverpool Town*: "I wish I was back in Liverpool..."

My workmates showed no particular interest in creating a new type of society in Ireland. I gathered that when elections came round they voted overwhelmingly for the three old reliables, Fianna Fáil, Fine Gael and Labour. Politically, they had that sense of being citizens which I didn't have myself. (However, one must say that official political society and its agents did not reciprocate their trust very well, as was shown when the heroin plague broke out in the early 1980s. Many of my workmates lived in one of the communities that were hardest hit. To a certain extent mass heroin addiction grew from a weakness in that old-fashioned working class life: frequently people lived their out-of-work lives in a spirit of carefree hedonism, which made them wonderful drinking companions, but now and again some associated problems became evident. Behind that cheerful hedonism there was a kind of despair, which took a terrible form in the next generation. But the official response, or non-response, was appalling.)

The young workers who were in or around, or passed through, Dublin Branch of the B&ICO in the early 1970s were of a different type. (I gathered there had been many more of them in the late 1960s, connected with the Dublin Housing Action Campaign, where B&ICO members were prominent.) They were politically earnest and wanted change. All of them had some kind of overview of Irish society as it then was, as a society which was hostile to them and their peers and was denying them scope. One noticed a constant drift of them to England, partly because it was much easier over there to get a university

education. But I also knew people who reacted so forcefully to the humiliating aspect of working class life that nothing but revolution would do them. They were genuinely ready for it. When the revolution didn't come they had no great interest in change on the individual level. They found things to do, mostly unconnected with politics, but life had lost its savour.

Temperamentally, I think, Annette was one of the radical reformists. She gained confidence over time, spoke more about politics, and took a place on the Executive of the Democratic Socialist Party, led by Jim Kemmy, when it was formed in 1981. I think she had clear ideas of what she found wrong in Ireland and what she wanted to change—and certainly she had in mind not only her own generation but also the next. And she did contribute to change. The DSP did not achieve its original aims, any more than did its Workers' Party rivals, and the party did not become a main feature, or a long-lasting feature, of the Irish political map. However, the pressures exerted by the DSP and Workers Party' did count for something. The modern democratic impulse, which in the 20th century was mainly the upward thrust of the great and constantly growing urban populations, had produced the landmark event of the Welfare State in postwar Britain and Europe. That story was missing some episodes in the Irish Republic, and DSP and Workers' Party activities helped to change the political culture. Without them, working class communities would have got less from the Celtic Tiger.

John Minahane

WAS

Maybe you forgot name-change Volgograd, then that suicide bomber hit a bus in what is now an obscure city, thus, Red Rum became a mule without regard. Down there in southern Russia it seems to hide from its illustrious history. Survived the Nazi onslaught. Now in its disguise the British media has put it in formaldehyde. As Stalingrad it bared the truth and showed who had won WW2. But they who had inherited bravery sowed doubt and brought the country down to rue its demise as a world power and its mode became a gangster capitalism view.

Was.

Wilson John Haire
24th October, 2013

es ahora *

'The Raj in the Rain.'

"The only, but crucial, difference between families like the Gore-Booths and the landed families of England was that in Ireland their position, although outwardly secure, was held, not freely given. Their forebears had come adventurously and taken possession of conquered lands. 'The Irish landlords continued to be colonists. The very building of their houses, the planting of their trees, the making of the high walls about their estates (raised by incredibly cheap labour of the natives whom their ancestors had tried to exterminate) declared their intention ... the Irish landlords lived within their demesnes, making a world of their own, with Ireland outside their gates'.

'Seventy Years Young'
Elizabeth Countess of Fingall.

Ireland today seems awash with Summer Schools commemorating an Ireland of the *British past* from Anthony Trollope in Carrick-on-Shannon, Jane Austen in Fota House, Cork, to Trevor/Bowen in Mitchelstown, and Kinsale Arts Festival where the documentary above was shown to a packed room—about 200 people in Acton's Hotel, Kinsale. The documentary was directed by Patrick Cooney, a London east-end-er who first wrote an article of the same name in the magazine of the *Guardian*, 10th November 2001, which subsequently sparked his interest in the Anglo-Irish and which led him over the next ten years "*dropping in and out of the lives of four members of that caste*" for his documentary.

They were Sir Josslyn Gore Booth, who sold Lissadell House in 2003 (subject of much controversy at the time), Mark Bence Jones of Glenville Park in Co. Cork, Sir John Leslie of Castle Leslie, and finally Olivia Durdin-Robertson of Huntington Castle. *'The Raj in the Rain'* according to its blurb in Kinsale Arts Festival 2013, 6-14th July brochure offers "*an affectionate, insightful and frequently bizarre portrait of a dwindling tribe—the Anglo-Irish ascendancy ... as they potter around their crumbling piles contemplating their lot*".

In the *Irish Examiner*, 11th July 2013, there was an article about the forthcoming documentary under the heading '*A glimpse of life inside the Big House*' by a Richard Fitzpatrick. Quoting Patrick Cooney, the former accepts that the Anglo-Irish "*had lives of privilege ... but there's nothing*

remotely snobby about them. The difference with their English counterparts is they realised they had to assimilate". Where Cooney got the latter notion, it would be difficult to say because his own film shows that they still reside inside their big houses, though in far lesser numbers and in incredibly reduced circumstances.

Cooney also states:

"...the house owns the inhabitants and they only live in a small part of it normally. You essentially become a museum curator, a caretaker or in the case of the younger generation who are going to make a go of the houses, an entertainment manager. That enables you to keep a roof over your head but would you fancy that? You have an incredible amount of responsibility to previous generations to keep it going even when you want to break the link. Sir Josslyn Gore Booth had to make that decision after 400 years. He said he didn't want to put this weight around the necks of his children."

At the screening of the documentary in Kinsale on 14th July 2013, Patrick Cooney literally shocked the audience into silence by jumping onto the stage to introduce his work and—as this was Bastille Day—he joyfully exclaimed: "*Up the Republic*". I wondered if he knew that most of the people there would find this utterly uncomfortable if not repellent. As the screening was the director's cut and went on for over two hours from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m., I found it impossible to stay on for the discussion afterwards, starting at 5 p.m. billed as '*Big Empty Houses: The Anglo-Irish in the 21st century*'.

The speakers were Cooney himself, members of the cast, Ruth Dudley-Edwards, who was described in the impossibly glossy Kinsale Arts Festival brochure as: "*Historian, journalist, and broadcaster who appears frequently on radio and television and is author of satirical crime novel 'The Anglo-Irish Murders'. She feels both Irish and English and greatly enjoys being part of both cultures.*"

Chairing the discussion was "*author and historian Patrick Guinness the Hiberno-English president of the Irish Georgian Society and author of the biography 'Arthur Guinness'*"

The documentary was later shown on RTE1 and had been edited down to a mere 62 minutes and was reviewed in the *Sunday Business Post*, 22nd October 2013 by their TV critic Emmanuel Kehoe. Kehoe began his review by stating:

"There must have been a time when the Anglo-Irish ascendancy thought they'd

go on forever, living in a curious land, neither Irish nor British. As Irish society changed in the 19th century, the growth of the British Empire gave them a practical *raison d'être*, and they turned their energies into being part of that empire, feeding its soldiers and administrators, while at home their world began a slow decline."

I found *'The Raj in the Rain'* an exceptional piece of filming. Patrick Cooney absented himself completely from the screen and just pointed the camera at the people he was filming and basically followed them about, leaving them to talk away as if to themselves almost. Kehoe stated that Olivia Durdin-Robertson of Huntington Castle was absent from the version shown on RTE and this was all to the good. Because she—without any help from Cooney—made herself such an object of ridicule by claiming to be a follower of the Fellowship of Isis, which she founded with her sister-in-law Pamela Berkley. And she kept up the pagan lark with scenes of her followers chanting and leaping around the gardens until it became quite tedious. I suspect that—with all her talk of her being a great eccentric—she may have been having us all on. When it came down to talk of her people she was quite lucid and rather hardnosed. She claimed that she didn't leave England until 1917 and when she was 6 or 7 she saw this picture of a city in flames and underneath there was a name called the Devil, "*looking quite pleased with himself wearing steel eye glasses, saturnine features*". What flashed up on screen was of course a photo of . . . Éamon de Valera.

When she asked her mother if they were going to move, the latter lied and said they were not but immediately Olivia knew this was the first lie her mother had ever told her. So they went to live in this exciting place called '*The Republic*'. Her family were Liberals and determined to get on with everyone and be friendly with the Catholics, the nationalists and the Anglo-Irish. The people lived in cabins and were quite undernourished—it all looked very mediaeval Japanese—and I was aware of the rich Catholics who had been pro-British and they were called '*The Foxrocity*' because they all lived in Foxrock and the English didn't know of the existence of these Irish.

The English in their schools went around doing masturbation and homosexuality but the Irish didn't and "*when I asked why, I was told the Irish practised ordinary sex from the word go*". Olivia said that the wicked old Protestant settlers came in and took the land because they

thought it OK to do so and Lord Esmonde went over to Protestantism and was known thereafter as "*wicked old Lord Esmonde*". The Durdins were originally Huguenot and had heaps of money, just as the Esmondés ran out of theirs. She also found that Sir Walter Raleigh was her ancestor as well. Olivia saw herself as Anglo/Scotti/Welsh/Irish and therefore completely Gaelic. She showed us around her books on magic/paganism (very few really and all paperbacks), her robes, more robbery things and her beloved masks which she got from New Orleans.

While I found Mark Bence Jones, the historian of Anglo-Ireland as he called himself, and Sir John Leslie—97 this year like Olivia Durdin Robertson—interesting, the most fascinating man by far was Sir Josslyn Gore Booth. He truly had the funniest throw-away remarks and his self-deprecation was to me anyway touching and in a funny way—poignant. There were times when I felt the camera's intrusion—and therefore mine as viewer—was quite exploitative but certainly Josslyn made the film his own. His aristocratic dress-sense (according to Kehoe "*green Loden coat and red trousers*") and his languid take on life in a near ruin—with the family rattling about upstairs in a few habitable rooms was quite Molly Keaneish 'Good Behaviour'. Josslyn was a city of London head-hunter before he came into his inheritance as the fifth Baronet.

Because Cooney cleverly went from one family to another and back again, there was this rather disjointed narrative, but it managed to maintain our attention rather than dissipate it and thus gave it its very entertaining arc. I think it better in giving an account of the documentary that I will follow each subject therefore sustaining a linear narrative thus giving readers a better feel textually.

Sir Josslyn Gore Booth of Lissadell House spoke with a very British upper-class accent and told us of how the first Gore was an Elizabethan adventurer/soldier who came over with the Tudor conquest of Ireland, was "*granted*" land and begat a dynasty. While speaking, the camera shot some stunning portraits hanging on peeling walls and then panned to spider's cobwebs, leaking ceilings, ruined timbers and crumbling masonry. Josslyn stated that his ancestors were neither resident nor absentee—they were in London, Dublin or Bath part of the time. He also pointed out that the architect of the house was Francis Goodwin, who had never previously designed a house but had designed Town Halls and therefore

Josslyn contended that Lissadell looks and feels exactly like a Town Hall with its huge hall with ceilings going all the way up to the roof. Yeats described it as like a church but it doesn't feel like a house—it's an institutional building with chimney pieces that are just inexplicable with no style at all.

His father and aunts lived only in two rooms with the former living mainly in the kitchen. He thought the house so full of "*junk*" and the dining room had never been the same since Casimer Markievicz painted his awful murals. His self-portrait was totally out of proportion, his brother-in-law Mordaunt—again totally out of proportion. (I can testify that seeing them Josslyn was absolutely right!) Mr. Campbell the head-woodman was also painted as was the famous butler Mr. Kilgallon, who accompanied Sir Henry to the Arctic and on all his fishing expeditions to Norway and Greenland with absolutely no modern navigational aids—the camera panned to a photo of a group of about ten men all on the sailing boat and these expeditions went on from the late 1870s to the early 1890s.

The billiard room became Sir Henry's room and all his specimens of bear, huge fish—some salmon and a bottlenose whale—about which Josslyn was doubtful—were stuffed and exhibited. Josslyn dryly remarked that these expeditions, that occurred every other year, weren't particularly productive commercial enterprises. And he thought that the main problem of his ancestors were that they didn't have anything to do—they *lacked purpose in life*—and himself smoking a large cigar thought that perhaps this also could be true of himself. There is a scene in the film which was filmed in the local pub where a well-lubricated Josslyn was talking with some locals. He slurred that he was politically incorrect and when the man sitting beside him had his mobile ring and went off to take the call, Josslyn threw his arms rather dangerously close to the glasses on the table and went off on a riff about the horrors of technology which he won't have anything to do with.

The next shot saw him at home speaking very lucidly about himself. He thought of himself as British, certainly neither Irish nor English but his inheritance tied him to Lissadell and he spoke about his family's loyalty to the British Empire which he accepted was something today which seemed impossibly remote. He stated that he didn't think in Irish terms—

"I look at things through a very inflexible and rigid template—glass in hand—I find it very difficult to articulate

but the issue of ownership of land is not the right issue because if you occupy land you have got to make a return on it whether you own it, your neighbour owns it or whether some distant institution owns it. I was always taught that you had obligations as well as privileges. I am a landlord and I have views that reflect my interests to some extent."

He then looks through family albums and shows us "*the unmistakable figure of Thomas Kilgallon—the butler who always looks like some figure from Russia with his beard and his commanding presence*". He didn't know many of the people, pictured on horses invariably, and then there is a letter from Mr. Kilgallon to Lady Gore Booth upon his retirement in 1929. It was in the 50s that everything caved in and collapsed—both his father and his uncle were schitzos and he was always afraid that was going to happen to him. When he was about to get married he went to the doctor and asked him if they had children were they likely to go that way? He doesn't record the doctor's answer but he obviously went ahead and he now has children: they could be heard in the background with their chatter.

Josslyn talked to the local tourism people and they encouraged him to try mediaeval banquets like Bunratty Castle. What follows were undoubtedly the highlights of the film as Josslyn stuffed turkeys and took breaks smoking his cigar and trying to get people to sit down in time before the meal became inedible.

To be continued in next month's
Irish Political Review

Julianne Herlihy ©

Dublin's Ground-Breaking Bobbies

Conor Brady's piece on the Dublin Metropolitan Police (22 October) was very interesting. He observes that native-born citizens of the capital rarely joined the force.

The contempt in which some citizens held it was reflected in James Joyce's "DUBLINERS" which had recruits at the Depot catch their dinners, - cabbages, on shovels.

But his contemporary, Tom Kettle, went further in his Maiden Speech at Westminster when he said the DMP should not be charged on the Municipal Rates, but on the Imperial War Office budget..

Donal Kennedy
22.10.13, *Irish Times*
Unpublished Letter

Towards a position on Germany, Ireland and Europe

GERMAN SOCIAL MODEL

* The German social model is not a post-war creation. Its roots are in Prussian paternalism and South German Catholic urban craft guilds. A century before Marx extolled the introduction of the factory inspection system in England, a bureaucracy of factory and mine inspectorates had been put in place in Prussia by Frederick the Great. The Prussian "reformers" of the early 19th century (Gneisenau/Stein etc.) led the revival of Prussia on an economic model of state-controlled capitalism that already included state education, social institutions and welfare provision.

* The Prussian social model was expanded through the 19th century in a series of compromises with the Catholic Church after Prussia absorbed the rapidly industrialising regions of the Catholic Rhineland and the Protestant Ruhr. Southern Germany had developed its own self-administering social-economic institutions inherited from the Guilds of the pre-unification period. These systems were united into a somewhat forced national system following unification in 1871. Bismarck's welfare system was simply expanding this already existing complex of social arrangements into a national system. Socialists somewhat perversely initially opposed the Bismarck system because of its "*paternalism*". This opposition later disappeared when Trade Unions were given a central role in co-administering it.

* The German welfare state, as institutionalised with German unification in the 1870s, survived and developed to the present era unchanged in its essential structures. Even Hitler made few changes to it, apart from replacing the Trade Unions with an autocratic "corporatism" and excluding groups from its benefits on racial grounds. The apprenticeship system of today was actually modernised and perfected in the 1930s under fascism on the basis of model schools created in the Weimar era. The German social model thus pre-dates and has survived a number of changes of political regime.

* German capitalism has also retained its essential structure through various political regimes. This has included compulsory membership of Chambers of Industry and Commerce and of Chambers of Trade. These institutions regulate the licensing of companies, the rules of trade, and

industrial training and apprenticeship systems. Banks are integrated locally and represented on Boards of companies as providers of investment capital. The German corporate capitalism and financial institutions known today emerged through the Guild system and evolved since industrialisation began. These institutions have also evolved with little change (outside of heavy industry) through the Kaiser, Weimar, Third Reich and post-war eras to the present day.

* German (and North European) forms of capitalism involve organised collaboration of the social classes through their institutions. Trade Unionism retains a central role in Germany, not least because of its continued strength outside the public service in the vanguard industries of the economy (engineering and electronics, chemicals, construction, transport). While the actual membership strength of German Trade Unionism is not particularly high (25%), it predominates in the public service and vanguard industries. In addition, over 50% of workers are directly covered by collective agreements, while a further 25%, while not directly covered, are employed under collective bargaining conditions automatically applied by employers following the "norms" set through collective bargaining for their sector.

In large scale industry (over 2,000 employees) Supervisory Boards are composed 50:50 of Trade Union and employer representatives (*Mitbestimmung*). In smaller companies, worker representatives form 1/3 of the Board. This is matched by workplace Works Councils which have a considerable right of consultation in company decision making. *Mitbestimmung* has a long tradition going back to World War One and its expansion has always been a central demand of the unions. Its modern structured form was introduced in the 1950s and greatly expanded in the 1970s under the Brandt/Schmidt Governments. Parity co-determination in the (disgraced) Coal and Steel industries was conceded by Adenauer as a *quid pro quo* for Trade Union support for the creation of the Coal and Steel Community (the precursor of the EEC).

* Repeated attempts to change German capitalism into a system more in line with Anglo-American liberalism have had

some, limited, success. The stock exchange plays a bigger role today, but the great majority of SMEs [small and medium enterprises]—the backbone of German industry—remains family owned, tied through banks to local savings, and socially integrated in the local economy. Globalisation has also internationalised some firms and banks but these also remain the exception.

* The German 'social model' has also taken some hits in the process of globalisation. The welfare reforms under Blairite Anglo-Saxon Liberal influence of the SPD/Green Government of Gerhard Schröder (1998-2005) had some basis in necessity (an activist approach to long-term unemployment) but in the form they took impoverished that section of society with a marginal or precarious foothold in the labour market. Governments since have been attempting to reform the reforms to rectify the social damage they caused.

* The economic structures and welfare state provision of the 'German model' also shape general services and social supports. Housing is provided through a highly controlled system of rents and a controlled housing market. The provision of child-care, family welfare, education and pensions are among the most stable, social and equitable in Europe.

* Most Western and Northern European countries have socio-economic systems derivative of the Guild/Bismarck model. They differ from the German system in degree rather than in principle. Some have a greater degree of direct State provision (Scandinavia) or more liberal and less compulsory structures of delivery (Holland). But tripartite representative structures in politics, public administration (shared "consensual" party-based political directorates) and industry ("industrial democracy") are common to them all, regardless of whether the political cultures are predominantly Catholic or Protestant. The expansion of the German system of industrial democracy—*Mitbestimmung*—in 1976 was followed by comparable reforms in most North European countries (while the more "radical" Bullock Report in Britain at the same time was never implemented due to Trade Union opposition to "class collaboration"). Most central and east European states—which had evolved historically under Prussian or Habsburg influence and which experimented with radical forms along Anglo-Saxon liberal lines in the 1990s after the fall of their Soviet communist regimes (Poland, Slovenia, Czechia, Slovakia etc.)—are now slowly evolving back towards

north European forms of corporatism.

* The socio-economic structure of Germany today is substantially the same one it was in 1915 when it was extolled by Connolly as one providing a superior material existence and far greater degree of social security, educational and skilling supports, and space for cultural development than that provided by Manchester capitalism.

GERMAN SOCIALISM

* If Global Capitalism is the modern expression of the Lockian/Hobbsian Anglo-American Enlightenment and is Anglo-American culture in the modern world, European Socialism is the modern form of German political culture.

* "*Scientific Socialism*" was a nineteenth century German creation. Lenin sought to expand its "*sources and component parts*" to include French radicalism and British political economy, but Marxism is essentially German philosophy, all the more so given the lengths the Germans Marx/Engels went to in differentiating the two (by "*inverting the dialectic*").

* "*Scientific Socialism*" produced Social Democracy which universalised Bismarck's welfare state and remains the essence of the politico-social system of northern Europe. German Social Democracy came about as an amalgamation of the State-orientated socialism of the Prussian Lassalle's workers' movement with the 1848-inspired southern Saxon Liberal socialists of (Liebknecht etc.).

* Both the apocalyptic ("revolutionary") and Fabian (liberal reformist) aspects of Marxism—as well as its philosophical atheism—were a product of the strong Jewish philosophical influence. Its austere moralising is an inheritance of its Protestantism. The influence of the Russian Revolution and the removal of the Jews from Europe first undermined, and then ended, the revolutionary mission of Social Democracy. The SPD was also crucially weakened after 1945 by the "loss" of some of its greatest strongholds to East Germany (Berlin, Saxon and Thuringia) or to ethnic cleansing and absorption into Poland (Silesia, Breslau/Wroclaw).

* Since the 1950s North European Social Democracy has been a conservative force tied to the labour movement and managing/defending the welfare state and Keynesian consumer capitalism. It is malleable by outside forces—especially liberal universalism—and most likely to engage in dangerous projects aimed at spreading Goodness in the world. It reigned supreme in Northern Europe from the 1950s to early 1980s due

to the leverage it acquired through the threat represented by the existence of Soviet Russia—the fourth (silent) social partner in European tripartitism. Social Democracy has declined since the decline of Soviet Russia.

* Social Democracy, despite its liberal universalism, has always struggled with the idea of "Europe" and has tended to simply 'manage' the European integration process it occasionally inherits. But the European 'project' was devised primarily by (mostly Catholic Christian Democratic) others. The most Social Democratic (and most Protestant) states (Scandinavia) have been the most reluctant Europeans. The German SPD initially opposed European integration as a Catholic reactionary project, but embraced it to some extent under Brandt/Schmidt. The SPD is always inclined to dream eastwards. A tradition of 'National Bolshevism' underlies this, but this has never been coherent enough to have a practical outcome. Its negative effect has been SPD ambivalence and suspicions towards deeper European integration. The SPD traditionally saw the European project as a Catholic reactionary one. The SPD flourished in Protestant Germany while struggling to gain a foothold in Catholic Germany (even its highly industrial parts) until the decline of Catholicism in the late 20th century. These factors are reflected in SPD attitudes in the current crisis, in its moral disapproval of bailouts, the Irish corporate tax regime, and its general antipathy to the irresponsibility of Catholic countries.

* French socialists might seem to be different, but until global capitalism ended their national project of "socialism in one country" in the early 1980s, Mitterand himself had been a Eurosceptic and Euro minimalist. Then Mitterand—who was always something more complex than simply a socialist, having been a Vichy official—drew the lessons from this 1980s experience and made common cause with Kohl to build "Social Europe" instead. The SPD was appalled at the Single Market aspect of the project. Mitterand put the former Christian Trade Union official, Jacques Delors, in charge of the project, much to the satisfaction of Kohl.

* German Social Democracy has rarely been able to grasp Ireland. The Marxist Kautsky was bewildered (in 1922) by the nationalist and land-and-labour impulses of Irish labour—not to mention its Catholicism—and wondered where it was all heading. Why couldn't they just be sensible and stay with the obviously more rational British movement? The rationalist intel-

lectual leaders of the 20th century SPD from Bernstein to Willi Eichler (who wrote the Godesberg Programme and formed Willi Brandt) were absolute Anglophiles but never statesmen. The only post-war German socialist statesman, Helmut Schmidt, a former Wehrmacht officer and an admirer of Karl Popper, on the other hand, got on like a house on fire with Haughey, but this was an exception. The German 'quality' national newspapers closest to the SPD are the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* and *Die Zeit*. The *Süddeutsche* has spread the Fintan O'Toole/Eddie Hobbes take on the Irish crisis and promoted scepticism in the SPD towards the credibility of the Irish bailout and recovery.

* The German Left Party is the remnant of German communism. Its position opposing "austerity" is as mindless as that of the Irish Left and its support for crisis Troika countries appears purely polemical. While the party is based on a now fading East German resentment at the process of re-unification, this aspect is fading. But the Left Party remains a repository of the substantial German communist tradition and will continue to play a useful role in this regard. While it is extremely critical of the 'market', it does not seek its abolition, and instead seeks its greater regulation. The Left Party commands about 8-9% of the popular vote, concentrated mainly in some regions of the former East Germany.

GERMAN CHRISTIAN DEMOCRATS

* German Christian Democracy (CDU) is not well described as a 'conservative' party, given the connotations in a British context of that term. It actually arose as an alternative counter-capitalist movement to Marxism, initially encouraged by the Church. With industrialisation it produced its own vast social organisations (analogous to the socialist ones, but more similar to Ireland) and its own labour and Trade Union movement.

* The Christian labour movement was predominant in the Catholic regions of western Germany. In the post-WW1 crisis years, 'Christian' workers were often the most liable to switch to the Communists, especially in centres of heavy industry such as the Rhineland and Ruhr.

* In 1950 Adenauer conceded industrial democracy (*Mitbestimmung*) in the coal and steel and industries (disgraced by their association with the Third Reich) as the *quid pro quo* for Trade Union support for the European Coal and Steel Community (forerunner of the EEC), to the outrage and opposition of the SPD.

* Southern German capitalism is over-

whelmingly medium scale and family owned. It has evolved from mediaeval conditions and implements industrial relations structures as a matter of course. 25% of German workers are organised in Trade Unions, but regionally agreed collective agreements apply to over 75%.

* The CDU can be said to be the party of corporatist, collaborative capitalism. The party of 'pure capitalism' is the Liberal FDP, which failed to breach the 5% hurdle to enter the Bundestag for the first time in 2013. The roots of the FDP are in 19th century Liberal 'Progressivism' which contained a strong Jewish influence. Liberal (Anglo-Saxon) capitalism is a highly volatile interest in Germany but a minority political force.

* The CDU is not predominantly a Catholic party, though its major single component was the old pre-Hitler Catholic "*Zentrum*". It was consciously created as an 'inter-confessional' party in 1945. German Protestantism had traditionally been more nationalist and Prussian orientated, with Liberal offshoots in majority Catholic regions or traditionally Anglophile regions (Hamburg and the Hanseatic trading ports). The major parties of German Protestantism before 1933 were the right-wing German National People's Party and the National Liberals. Protestant authority was undermined and largely disgraced by its more fulsome embracing of the Third Reich. The fractured Protestant bourgeois elements rallied to the new CDU after the war as did the Christian (Catholic and Protestant) labour movements. Protestant left liberalism re-oriented towards the SPD.

* The German Catholic view of Ireland is well formed. German Catholics are surprisingly well informed (far more than modern Irish ones) about the role of the Irish saints in bringing Christianity and 'learning' to early mediaeval Germany. This is still celebrated throughout Germany and Austria and the subject of numerous Church memorials.

* The thoroughly benevolent modern German Catholic view of Ireland is reflected in Heinrich Böll's "*Irish Diary*" (*Irishes Tagebuch*) which has been printed in editions of millions. The modest Irish contribution to relieving post-war distress in Germany is also well known (before the Marshall Plan Ireland was one of the few countries to respond to pleas for aid from German Catholic charities).

* CDU Chancellors have been invariably well disposed towards Ireland. In the modern era very few are unaware of Haughey's role in securing EU support for

German reunification in 1990. This benevolence is reflected in Merkel's attitude to the country, a position she is currently having to defend in coalition negotiations against the puritanical instincts of the Social Democrats.

* Merkel is an unusual CDU chancellor as much for being Protestant as East German. But, while raised in East Germany, where she participated in socialist movements and institutions, she is the daughter of a Hamburg pastor who moved there for ideological reasons in the early 1950s. The family had been closely connected with anti-Nazi Protestant intellectual circles.

IRELAND AND GERMANY

* Ireland has never had a grievance with Germany.

* The *Young Irelanders* extolled German Romanticism and created a lasting Germanophile element in Irish national culture.

* German academics played a central role in reviving the Irish language, establishing its Indo-European roots and rediscovering and codifying its grammar.

* Connolly and Casement recognised the realities of the 1914 situation and described the war as a British led "*conspiracy*" to destroy the German culture and its potential to become a common European culture. Through this they created a robust basis for the Irish Republican strategy towards Europe that remains valid.

* Germany and Austria were the "*gallant allies*" of the 1916 Rising.

* The anti-Treaty forces were substantially armed through Joseph Briscoe's German-American business contacts.

* The Free State introduced German industrial and administrative experts as a counter-weight to English influences in the project of state building and industrialisation.

* De Valera's role on the international stage in the 1930s and his neutrality policy are inconceivable without the Republican understanding of geopolitics developed by Casement-Connolly.

* Irish understanding of German history remains the basis for an independent Irish foreign policy, which can only exist at odds with British intentions in the world. Haughey's adeptness at developing the German orientation of Irish politics has invariably included a message of 'understanding' for the German past. On his first official visit to Germany for an in-depth meeting with Helmut Schmidt in 1981 he insisted that the German Foreign Office arrange a meeting for him with the sur-

living crew members of the Heinkel bomber that crashed off Inishvickillane, an island off Kerry he now owned. The German officials were taken aback, but the resulting press publicity was a great hit. (Similar views of sharing historical tragedy enables a meeting of minds on a basis of equality.)

* Haughey cemented the German orientation of Irish policy with the establishment of Social Partnership on the German model. The major principles of this—as discussed between Haughey and Schmidt—are a strong state, class collaboration in social and economic development, a "*sound money*" policy, competitiveness and efficiency-based growth, and the building of a social security State as resources allow. The then Irish Trade Union leadership under the overwhelming influence of the Republican Phil Flynn and a group of Larkinites marginalised British influences in the Irish Union movement and embraced the strategy offered by Haughey.

* Irish Republican attitudes to Germany are devoid of serious 'Nazi' sympathies, as Irish Catholicism in its vigorous phase was as impervious as German Catholicism to the attractions of paganism, regardless of how elaborate its rituals.

* Haughey's role in securing EU support for German re-unification at the Dublin Summit in 1990 is not forgotten by German Christian Democrats.

* When the Irish lost the run of themselves after 2002 (not least by decoupling Irish wage growth from the previously-agreed German benchmark) and enriched themselves, the Ahern-McCreevy-Harney leadership oversaw a massive dismantling of German-Irish relations.

GERMANY AND THE CRISIS

* Germany has made industrial manufacturing strength and 'sound money' the core values of its recovery strategy for Europe.

* Germany has focused on the Eurozone and dominated it, while playing along with EU structures. All serious and substantial developments are occurring in the Eurozone while the EU strains to remain a player at the table. Germany for political reasons must be careful to avoid doing anything to disabuse supporters of the EU of their illusions.

* Germany under Merkel/Schäuble leadership created an alliance with France under Sarkozy to save the Euro. This meant institutionalising the Eurozone outside the EU Treaties through the Fiscal Pact, setting fiscal rules to maintain the value of the Euro and see off the clamour

for flooding the continent with "*cheap money*", drawing a clear line that no country (including Greece) would be expelled from the currency, establishing a programme for a full banking union by the end of 2014 (which is being quietly implemented in detail), making it clear that the Euro was more important than British EU membership and 'doing everything' to ensure its future.

* Despite the highly refined and intellectually impressive onslaught against it by the Anglo-American interest—as articulated by the *Financial Times*, *WSJ* etc.—the Euro has survived and been strengthened by the German strategy. The widespread derisive babble, forecasting the collapse of the Euro and denouncing German bungling and indecisiveness has fallen silent.

* The German position will be tested as the contradictions between the Eurozone and the "EU" evolve.

* Ireland—despite a torrent of negative commentary from academics and the media derivative of Anglo-Saxon 'thinking'—reacted politically to the crisis with determination to get through it and recover. The 2008 decisions of the Fianna Fail-Green Government were not reversed but implemented consistently by the succeeding Fine Gael-Labour government. An instinct to sail close to the German position—a consequence of the Europe strategy developed in the Haughey years and recently re-articulated by the IIEA chief Brendan Halligan in the face of Independent House Germanophobia—was consistently followed through and has laid the basis for capitalist recovery. Irish opinion has rebounded to its default Germanophile position.

EXPORTING THE GERMAN INDUSTRIAL APPRENTICESHIP MODEL

* An idea popular among CDU leaders as part of their European recovery strategy is that the German apprenticeship model is an 'export winner' that should be introduced across the EU. This is now being implemented at a modest level both through bilateral agreements with Italy, Spain, Greece and Portugal, as well as through a substantial EU programme under the European Social Fund.

* Elements in Irish business and Irish Trade Unionism have welcomed this and sought clarification from Government of its stated intention to pursue such an approach. While ICTU has been advocating an expansion of the apprenticeship system along Dutch-Austrian lines (the term 'German' still sticks in their gullets),

SIPTU has now grasped the nettle and is seeking the development of a German-style dual system of industrial training. Irish Labour Party politicians have also been advocating the introduction of a German-style dual system of apprenticeship training.

* It remains to be seen how effective these developments will prove to be. Irish proposals still foresee a predominantly state-funded system and lack the essential element of compulsory employer registration with Chambers of Crafts and Chambers of Industry which alone can ensure widespread participation.

IRELAND AND THE GERMAN SOCIAL MODEL

* Ireland developed as an impoverished periphery of the UK economy. Its rudimentary social provision followed the British model, but in reality was a dysfunctional reflection of it. Ireland in the late 19th century had a density of workhouses (and of psychiatric institutionalisation) equivalent to 10 times the British level as a result of widespread destitution.

* The Irish welfare system after 1922 developed along British lines but without the resources to be as generous. When resources allowed, it sought to catch up. This trend was disrupted by the Haughey/Flynn Social Partnership which started a different trajectory towards a European-style social security system. Today the Irish and British welfare states have diverged fundamentally with the former providing more substantial cover. Politicians and political strategists are thinking in terms of further divergence from Britain and greater convergence with North European models, but the major reforms required might require a level of political imagination and will which is not as sufficiently in evidence.

* Ireland does not need to 'import' the German model. Through Social Partnership it has developed a substantial welfare state, health service, labour market and education/training system of its own. Given that these are recent modifications or creations, many rough edges remain, which also means the scope for continued reform is large. The essential point is that the North European orientation developed in the 1990s has struck deep roots which will not easily be destroyed. These have produced a system which does not need replacement, but rather improvement, and is increasingly compatible with the German and North European social models. For socialists, it is important to ensure that

each improvement and modification is towards convergence with North European norms rather than towards British practices. Industrial training is a test case in point.

SUMMARY

* The German social model, and the modified form it takes in many European countries, has a strong currency in Ireland and a material basis in the social and industrial structures developed under Social Partnership in Ireland (itself a German inspiration) since the late 1980s.

* Irish Republicanism and some elements of Irish Socialism have involved strong German elements which predispose political and social developments to converge with European socialism.

* The barriers to the development of the Irish social model are residual British influence in the Irish social system and among the academic/media 'elite'.

* The German social model is not a product of German socialism but is best understood as a consensus between Social and Christian Democrats, similar to the development of Irish Social Partnership which developed also as a consensus.

* German leadership in resolving the Euro crisis, and in doing so on a basis of industrial strength and 'sound money' principles, has succeeded to date and confirmed the German orientation of Irish development initiated by Haughey/Flynn in the 1980s. Participation centrally in the further development of the Eurozone is in the Irish interest.

Philip O'Connor

This article is meant to promote discussion, and criticisms or other comments would be very welcome

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

SALES

On-line sales of books, pamphlets and magazines:

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

The Adams Hunt

A serious attempt is being made to implicate Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams in a case of child sex abuse! Those making the attempt include Fianna Fail leader Micheal Martin and his *entourage*; the *Irish Independent/Sunday Independent*, in which Official Republicans play a prominent part; Dissidents from the Provisional Republican movement—with Anthony McIntyre as their voice—who attack Adams for hijacking the movement and making peace; and the Belfast *Irish News*, which retains a basically Redmondite view and resents the growth of a Sinn Fein milieu all around it and which, under its lightweight Editor Noel Doran, uses every indirect opportunity which presents itself to make oblique anti-Sinn Fein propaganda

This is an incongruous alliance, fed by conflicting motives. But it exists.

The publicly-established facts of the paedophilia case in which it is being attempted to implicate Gerry Adams are, as far as we have been able to ascertain them as follows:

In January 1987—that is, 26 years ago—Aine Adams and her mother went to the police in Grosvenor Road, Belfast, and made an allegation of child sex abuse against Aine's father, Liam, who is Gerry's brother. They also told Belfast Social Services. The following month Aine retracted the allegation, but was told by the police that it would remain on record.

Aine was about 14 at this time. Her allegation referred to an earlier period, between her fourth and tenth years.

The allegation lay unprosecuted on the police record for about 20 years.

During this period Liam Adams separated from his wife, married again, and had another family.

In January 2006 Aine went to the police again and asked for the allegation to be prosecuted. In November 2007, almost two years later, the police arrested Liam Adams. They questioned him about the allegations. He denied everything and moved to the South.

A year after that, in December 2009, Aine went on British television with the allegation against her father, thus discarding her right to anonymity.

In March 2010 Liam Adams was arrested in the South on an extradition warrant. He appealed against extradition. The appeal was rejected in October 2011.

Liam Adams was transferred to Belfast, where he faced trial in April of this year. The trial collapsed on some legal point on April 25th after it had been in progress for some time. A second trial was held, and on October 1st Liam Adams was found guilty on all charges by a majority verdict.

The case that Gerry Adams was implicated in paedophilia rests entirely on the fact that at the first trial he gave evidence in support of his niece, against his brother. He said that in 2000 his brother had admitted to him that he had sexually abused Aine. Aine had previously told him that she had been sexually abused by her father, but this was some years after she made and then withdrew the allegation to the police.

The suggestion then, put with particular vehemence by the *Sunday Independent* (whose columnist, Eilis Hanlon, has had a long standing personal animus against Gerry Adams that is somehow connected with the fact that her sister had once been Adams' secretary) is that Adams tried to conceal a child rape. And it is hinted that this is only the tip of the iceberg and that Provisional Republicanism was a child sex abuse ring.

It seems that some years ago the Belfast authorities considered prosecuting Adams for withholding information but considered there were no grounds for it.

But the Republican Dissidents, who are out to get Adams because he stopped the war—whom it seems reasonable to call extremists—Anthony McIntyre etc., assisted by Ed Moloney—have devised a different case against Adams. This is based on the cross-examination of Adams at the first trial by the Defence barrister employed by his brother.

The sense of this seems to be that the cross-examination demonstrates that Adams gave perjured evidence in support of his niece and against his brother, bearing out their contention that lying is second nature to him. By deception he took control of the Provisional war effort and by deception he entangled it in the peace process. And now he has been shown under oath to be a liar.

If a plausible legal case can be made that Adams withheld information from the police in breach of law, or that he gave perjured evidence, then he would be prosecuted. Powerful interests in North and South would love to bring him down.

A full transcript of the April cross-examination of Adams has been published by Anthony McIntyre, and also by the Belfast daily, the *Belfast Telegraph*. As far as we know, that is the only part of the proceedings of either trial that has been published in full.

Liam Adams was convicted as a paedophile at the second trial without his brother's evidence. That might be taken *prima facie* as showing that the Prosecution found his evidence unsound and dropped him from the second trial. We do not know if the prosecution explained why it was dropping him. But a reading of the long transcript shows that, if he was lying, he was extremely inexperienced at it, and had made no preparation for it.

The job of Liam Adams' Defence Counsel, Eilis McDermott QC, was to discredit Gerry's testimony that his brother had admitted to him that he had abused Aine. She put it to him that, if Liam had made an admission he would have reported it to the police, as he was legally bound to do. His explanation was that the matter lay with Aine, who was an adult, and that she was trying to resolve the matter informally.

The barrister naturally tried to confine him to Yes/No answers to pointed questions, and to prevent explanations as being beside the point. It was a tricky operation, and she herself sometimes went wide of her mark with her questions. Adams protested and the Judge, Deputy Recorder Corinne Philpott, ruled in his favour a number of times.

Liam Adams got a job working with young people at the Clonard Monastery and the Blackie Centre. Gerry said he advised against it because of the allegations and he also spoke to the Clonard authorities:

Question: Of course it shouldn't be a matter, should it, of you or anyone else telling a person who is suspected of being a sexual abuser of children that you thought they shouldn't be working there? It was within your power to make sure that he wasn't working there.

Answer: ...As you know, Liam denies this allegation... And I didn't bring it to Liam's attention in a, you know, a dictate sort of way...

Q. What about the police? Did you bring it to their attention?

A. I didn't, because at that point Aine was an adult. This, insofar as we know it, was a legacy issue. I am not Aine's parent. I am an uncle and she has many uncles. And I was doing my best to resolve these matters in a way that helped Aine, but also, if I may say so, in a way which allowed Liam to get rid of these

demons.

Q. Mr. Adams, this is not about your niece Aine, it's not about your brother getting rid of his demons. This is about the protection of children and young people in your constituency, in a youth club associated with Clonard Monastery with which you had a very close connection.

A. I have answered that question, I think, and if I may say so, this is all about Aine...

Q. So you decided that you would be the arbiter of whether he posed a danger...

A. I don't know how many times, your Honour, I have to repeat the point that I brought it to the attention to the authorities in Clonard.

Q. ...The police is the civil authority and was at that time in Clonard.

Judge Philpott: Well, Ms McDermott, although it wasn't proceeded with, it is fair to say the police did have information about an allegation in 1987.

Ms McDermott: Yes, but the police—sorry

Judge: Although it was not proceeded with, they still had the information.

Ms McD: What the police didn't have, of course, Mr. Adams, if the evidence you are giving today is true, is the information that, not only was there an allegation, but the person against whom the allegation was made has admitted it to you right in the middle of the period that he's working in Clonard youth centre..."

Adams replied that the Clonard authorities and the Social Services knew of the allegation. A wrangle followed, which is ended by the Judge telling the barrister, "*Jut keep to the issues:*."

The Judge asked Adams if he ever said to Liam that he'd go to the police if Liam didn't get out of Clonard. Adams replied that he didn't, but he said to Liam that, if the matter wasn't dealt with, it would probably end up with the police.

Adams later persuaded his brother to leave Clonard:

Q: And why did you persuade him to leave if you didn't think he represented a danger.

A: Because Aine was increasingly disappointed with the fact that she had got—

Q. Mr. Adams—

A: I am giving you my answer please.

Judge: I think this will have to be, he is entitled to give the answer to that question."

Defence Counsel did not agree. The Jury was sent out, as was Adams, while the matter was argued out. The Judge concluded:

Q: "Well Ms McDermott, I don't know what he is going to say, but it may be that in the light of the fact that Aine was still exercised, to put it neutrally, over this, he knew it would be better if his brother wasn't working in this youth club,

considering her evidence has been that she reported it to begin with because she was worried about Clare [her half-sister in her father's second marriage]. So I think your question, these are difficult issues, but I think he is entitled to answer that question, so long as he doesn't stray completely out of it."

Adams was then brought back and given instructions limiting his answer, but told at the same time that it must be his own answer. He said that his answer would be that it was because of Aine that he urged his brother to leave the youth club. The jury is brought back and he gives the answer as agreed.

Defence Counsel then puts it to Adams that Liam left the youth club because of a frozen shoulder, that the conversation in which Adams claimed that Liam admitted sexual interference with Aine never happened, and that Adams invented it to save his political skin because he knew it was all going to come out.

The reasoning behind the latter assertion is unclear. Adams reply was:

"If I had been interested in saving my political skin, I would not have got involved in this process at the beginning and tried to fulfil my responsibility as an uncle for a young woman who I am very fond of and I have a large family and I would not have tried to do my best to resolve this in the way I outlined to you earlier. This is above politics and saving my political skin is no consideration whatsoever in any of these matters."

It is hardly disputable that if, a quarter of a century ago, when he had a war to run—whether politically or militarily—he had refused to have any thing to do with this mess that had arisen in his family, the paedophile mud-slinging of Micheal Martin etc. would have nothing to go on today.

And if the family had not become a suspect institution in the public mind during that period, his attempt to sort the matter out within the family would not be seen as possible grounds for a criminal prosecution. The family used to have a privileged position in law, and it was customary to describe it as the basic unit of society. Today the single individual is the social unit and the policeman is a virtual member of the family insofar as it continues to exist. That is the position in England, where the subversion of the family has been going on for a long time, and Southern Ireland is following suit to a large extent. It is very much less the case in the North. Defence Counsel did her best to reduce society to the individual and the law—it is the business of a briefed

barrister to be one-sided—but the Judge took account of the continued existence of the family as a social body.

Family life has continued in the North despite the War—or because of it—while it was undergoing a process of dissolution (at least officially) into individualism in the South.

Eilis O'Hanlon is a Northerner who has lived for a long time in the South and kept pace with its progress. She has been out of sympathy with the society she left, and she is affronted when members of that society, having achieved something at home, become active in the affairs of the South. In the South people have progressed to being "*damaged souls*" through the enlightening developments of the past generation—echoes of President Clinton's smugness about being a "*broken spirit*" after his encounters with Monica! And it is just too much for her when those Northerners with their unsophisticated, and undamaged souls, and their unembarrassed family values, follow her down to Dublin.

When Aine told her uncle that her father had interfered with her sexually:

"We never discussed the detail of her allegation... Let me say I didn't want to know the detail, and I consciously (because this is a dreadful thing that allegedly happened) didn't want to know the details..."

How backward! How incredible to the damaged souls which revel in such detail, having discarded their prudery in the great debate that preceded the abortion referendum.

Did Adams know that Aine claimed that her father had oral sex with her? They didn't discuss the details. If she had done so, he could be prosecuted for withholding information. Oral sex is rape and may not be sorted out within the family. (It will be news to President Clinton that oral sex is sex: "*I did not have sex with that woman*".)

Much of the cross-examination had to do with places and dates over a twenty year period. Adams did not have a recollection of the precise detail of many things which he had a general sense of. [There was some argument about the difference between a recollection and a sense.

Obviously Adams had not kept a detailed daily journal of all his doings during those twenty years!

He tried to introduce a sense of reality:

"If you recall, these were the years in which cessations were being arranged, in which talks were opened up, in which the Good Friday Agreement was negotiated,

and so on. I give it not as a reason but as an explanation. And I should also note that the RUC at that time had—I was advised had a statement and that the Social Services had been given an account.

Miss McD: Mr. Adams I asked you nothing about the RUC or Social Services... and the GFA wasn't being negotiated in 1987, was it?

A. The GFA wasn't but the peace process was.

Q. The peace process had begun then, had it?

A: Well the history of that is now well known, and you don't need me to take you through the dates involved.

Q. No, I'm not asking about the history of the peace process, Mr. Adams..."

But she had asked, hadn't she?

According to Anthony McIntyre and Ed Moloney, Adams was at that time, not only negotiating the peace process, but was at the same time running the war militarily and manoeuvring his Army towards peace by skilful deception. And they find it incredible that he should not have a clear recollection of times and places of discussions within the Adams family about matters which he took to be family matters.

He said he distanced himself from Liam after the allegation was made, but Defence Counsel found that he had appeared with Liam on family occasions. Did that prove that he had not distanced himself? It depends on what you understand a family to be.

Liam was mentioned, along with others, in a Foreword to Adams' first book, *Before The Dawn*. Adams said what he regretted was mentioning his father in that Preface because he was later told by one of his many brothers that he had been sexually abused by his father.

Adams was dropped by the Prosecution in the second trial. A reading of the cross-examination does not suggest that this was because of a suspicion that he gave false testimony in support of his niece. He had not wanted to go into details with his niece, and probably she had not wanted to either, and presumably the same thing went for his brother. Gerry Adams' evidence was vague. And whether he was Chief of Staff of the IRA or not, he had ample reason for not keeping a detailed account of family conversations.

At the time of going to press, following newspaper campaigns, four official agencies in Northern Ireland are investigating whether Gerry Adams has a case to answer about withholding information from the police.

A transcript of the trial in which Liam

was convicted by majority verdict has not been published as far as we know. It appears to have been a simple confrontation between father and daughter in which the daughter went to law only because the father would not make a private admission that he had done it.

If the complaint was made in the first instance out of concern for the daughters of the second family, the way things turned out was that those daughters gave evidence in support of their father. And no allegation was made against the father during the quarter century after 1987, though he had worked in youth clubs.

One can understand that the passion of those in the North who blame Adams for ending the War knows no bounds. But surely the leader of Fianna Fail might have kept his nose clean.

Report: Gerry Adams, Letter in *Irish Examiner*

Adams: "I did all I could do to help my abused niece"

"In his column (*Irish Examiner*, Oct 18), Matt Cooper seeks to rewrite the record of the events connected with a family tragedy to fit his own political opinion.

Mr Cooper's distortion of the facts of this case are highlighted by his reference to what he terms my "gross misjudgment" ... "greatly delayed reporting of his niece's allegations" ... and my ... "failures in dealing appropriately" with this situation.

For the record, there were two phases to my involvement in this tragedy.

The first, in 1987, when I learned of the abuse perpetrated against my niece Áine by her father Liam.

At that time Áine and her mother Sally had already reported it to the RUC and to the Social Services.

They gave both agencies the full detail. I never had that detail. Áine was a minor at this time.

Why did the RUC or the Social Services not investigate her complaint?

The second phase was when Áine returned to Ireland as an adult. She came to me.

I offered to go to the police with her if she wanted, but she asked me to arrange a meeting between her and her father; for him to admit to what he had done; to acknowledge that she had told the truth; and to apologise.

Of course I could have told her there was nothing I could do.

I chose to help and to try to do what Áine asked. When that process eventually failed because Liam failed to co-operate, Áine went to the PSNI.

I then also went to the PSNI. I co-operated with the police, and the Public Prosecution Service and I testified in court against my brother.

When Liam made an admission to me of abuse, he did not give any detail and minimised the extent of the abuse.

He also subsequently denied this on every occasion, including in the court.

Mr Cooper's political agenda is further underlined by his attempts to draw comparisons between this family situation and the manner in which the Catholic hierarchy dealt with the issue of abuse. There is no comparison.

The Catholic hierarchy presided over institutional abuse for decades.

They swore victims of abuse to secrecy. They set out to cover up wrongdoing, silence victims and deny them justice, whereas in this tragic case, the abuse was reported to the RUC and Social Services as far back as 1987 and I sought at all times to support the victim.

As regards Liam Adams's involvement in Sinn Féin, the party detailed this when this story became public. Sinn Féin was not aware of any allegations against Liam Adams and had no role in what part of Ireland he chose to live.

To compare Sinn Féin to the Catholic Church moving priests they knew were involved in abuse is simply ridiculous.

Finally, Matt Cooper's use of vituperative language in describing as 'whingeing' my efforts to argue for a modicum of balance in media coverage of what is a deeply distressing issue for my wider family, merely serves to highlight my point.

I find his judgemental and provocative tone both inappropriate and offensive.

It is a good thing that, to my knowledge, he has not had to deal with such issues. Those who have, and who have been in touch with me, have been more understanding than Mr Cooper of the effect abuse has on a family.

The disproportionate attention by some elements of the media on this case is obviously because of me.

At least Matt Cooper is, shamefully, clear about that.

Gerry Adams TD"
Irish Examiner
28th October 2013

Harris On Harris

Eoghan Harris presented a self diagnosis of his mental health issues and how he overcame them in a piece headed: "My way out of the dark wood" (*Sunday Independent*, 6 October 2013.) He dismisses the case that puts emphasis on social causes for such problems and chooses the purely medical/chemical argument as the main cause. But he tries to have it both ways:

"By and large, I believe that while the causes of mental illness can be buried deep in personal history or in social pressures, the actual attack itself involves a chemical malfunction of the brain. Accordingly, I broadly support the medical model of mental illness."

This surely means that an attack is the end-product of other more profound processes and is simply triggered by the explosive material that has built up and it is this that is the real issue. Harris is making the case for the non-medical approach without seeming to realise it.

He is of course forever associated with the 'Stickie' political phenomenon which he helped create and make into a political force. And he makes the point that: "Significantly, after I packed in socialism, and resigned from the Workers' Party, I never again had another severe attack."

This would seem to confirm quite conclusively that non-medical issues were the dominant factor in his case and that the Workers' Party is the actual issue that matters here.

It would follow therefore that his admission means that the Workers' Party and its particular interpretation of socialism is what he needs to analyse in some depth. But not a bit of it.

But surely another conclusion follows, in fairness to him, that the Workers' Party had a lot to answer for as regards the history of his mental state. But the Harris ego is too big to let such little things as Socialism and his quarter of a century's political activity be considered as in any way deserving of analysis to explain his mental health issues. Only Harris matters for Harris and only Harris himself could be the cause, and the cure, of his own mental health problems. What a guy!

It is quite understandable that the whole Stickie philosophy helped cause a member a mental health problem and, if Harris analysed it and explained it 'from the inside', many people could probably relate to it and find it personally useful. But very few can relate to a purely personal medical problem as Harris seeks to paint the issue.

I should explain that, from the moment I first came across him in the mid 60s, he always struck me as a 'bit touched' as they used to say where I come from about a certain type of person. But such idiosyncrasy in itself is not usually a problem for the person or those around him..

But Harris was different. For a start, he seemed to be living in a time warp, reliving War of Independence episodes and taking great pride in the annual harassing that was visited on elderly Poppy sellers in Cork city by a small group of Republicans. The sellers at that time seemed to be genuine remnants of WW I. This pathetic activity was painted by him in colours somewhat similar to the Battle of Crossbarry. And his petty victories were all declaimed by him in full military regalia (an FCA uniform) in University College, Cork.

To me that War was over and won a long time ago and the society had progressed and was progressing to other things on the basis of that victory. I knew people who had actually fought in that War and they all felt the same way. Harris was part of a quite different political culture that had not evolved with that of mainstream political developments. Politics had moved on but he and his colleagues had not—or had great difficulty in trying to do so.

Then I became aware of the grand plan to transform Harris's type of politics into Socialism. His brand of Irish Republicanism was to be the vehicle for Irish Communism. It seemed crazy to me—trying to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. The little matter of the way Irish Communists had not succeeded in doing this in nearly fifty years was glossed over. But that was the first question that needed answering if a new way had been found to do what they had failed to do.

I never recall it being an issue for the Stickies. It did not seem to even occur to them as an question that needed answering. But what qualities did Mick O' Riordan lack that Harris and company had?

The grand plan involved a new version of Irish history. A version that had to be concocted. And this was done by the industrious Desmond Greaves on behalf of the CPGB. A central feature of this concoction was turning Connolly into an Irish Lenin. It was developed from this standpoint and needed a series of dogmas to make it work. And, when it came to dogmas, there was no better man than Harris. Though he has done political somersaults, the same dogmatic approach has survived in pristine condition, un-

shaken by all actual experience. Harris does not do analysis—he does denunciation and castigation.

But reality intervened to unravel and wreck the original scheme. The crisis in the North blew apart the accepted dogmas about that situation and resulted in a crazy 'Stickie' War that was abandoned in the disaster of Aldershot. The Provos took over the real war and gave it direction, purpose and eventual success. Harris can only denounce, castigate and demonise them but cannot explain what happened. The guiding light from Moscow dimmed and extinguished itself and his response were to castigate and denounce socialism. Again, no actual analysis of why and what actually happened in the Soviet Union.

This castigating and damning became a form of self-loathing of himself for having made political choices that ended in *cul de sacs*. His formula was to now preach the opposite of what he had previously proclaimed—as that was bound to right. Just turn your views upside down and you can't go wrong! That is the real source of his mental anguish.

For example, in a contribution to a collection of articles by various political and commentators last year (*Whose Past is it Anyway?* by Jude Collins published by History Press Ireland), he specifically rejected the two nations view and then argued himself into claiming that "... *for me the Somme, despite the horror of it, represents a somewhat benign tradition, a channel to actually talk and bring the two traditions together because of the common suffering... The Somme, as I said offers the benign interpretation.*"

Any person who can put benign and the Somme in the same sentence must surely have a brain that is in some form of meltdown. There is the most obvious fact that the '*common suffering*' patently failed to bring the '*traditions*' together at the time and talking about it 100 years later is hardly likely to achieve what the original slaughtering failed to do. The mind boggles at the thought that anyone should think that a joint enterprise of killing Germans and being killed by them could be seen as a '*benign*' opportunity then or now to bring the '*two traditions*' together.

Harris thought he had found the key to political success and was in the driving seat towards a brave new world, but it all crashed and he is left amidst the wreckage. But, it must be admitted, not all was destroyed—his ego has remained intact which it must be admitted is some achievement and a wonder to behold.

Jack Lane

Letter submitted to *Irish Times*, 27.10.13

Cosgrave On Ruthlessness

Under the heading of “Great but ‘ruthless’ state-builder WT Cosgrave remembered by his Taoiseach son”, the *Irish Times* reports (October 26) that “Controversially, he ordered the execution of four irregulars in response to the murder of Cork TD Sean Hales in December 1922” and quotes Liam Cosgrave as recalling: “Of course there was an outcry against it. It was quite unusual in every respect. But it was the last time a TD was shot . . . until later, Kevin O’Higgins.” But the executions had begun prior to that. In his 2005 memoirs, another former Fine Gael Taoiseach, Garret FitzGerald, wrote of a November 1922 execution: “Erskine Childers was found guilty of what had been made a capital offence—being in possession of a small revolver that had been given to him by Collins long before this. It is difficult to acquit the government of prejudice against Childers, an Englishman who had, absurdly, been suspected by Griffith of being a British agent, engaged in fomenting a civil war in order to give the British a chance to bring their troops back to Ireland to restore peace in the country!”

The fact that his own father, Desmond, had also been a member of that same Cosgrave government did not prevent Garret FitzGerald providing a more nuanced narrative of the Civil War, but perhaps he would be considered a dissident in today’s Fine Gael. But what has the Labour Party to say when Liam Cosgrave also pronounces on labour history? Garret FitzGerald had noted another ‘ruthless’ Free State pioneer: “Joe McGrath had been appointed by Collins as director of intelligence in 1922 and was put in charge of Oriel House in Westland Row, which had a bad reputation for ill-treating prisoners.” At last year’s 85th anniversary celebrations of the ESB held at the Ardnacrusha power station, Mr Cosgrave had remarked: “When the work started, Larkin, who had come back from America, tried to disrupt it and sent down key men to instigate strength. In charge of work-force was Joe McGrath, who would take lip from nobody, and he knocked out Larkin’s men when he saw them, and the strike finished.” (*Irish Times*, July 27, 2012). It was reported that Labour Energy Minister Pat Rabbitte “smiled wryly as the former Taoiseach took a swipe at Labour icon Jim Larkin”, while you further

reported that “Mr Cosgrave received a standing ovation after his 15-minute speech.” There have, of course, been past Labour Party leaders of varying calibre, but if the Party’s Larkinite leader, the late Frank Cluskey, had been confronted with such a provocation, it would not have been in order to give an ovation that he would have risen to his feet.

Manus O’Riordan

**Some Unpublished Letters
by Donal Kennedy**

Redmond's Folly. Fallai Mhic Reamoinn?

The commemorative wall, engraved with the names of over 1,100 Waterford men who died serving with the British Forces in the First World War should be copied in other Irish cities and towns.

Many, perhaps most, of the men commemorated, shared John Redmond's delusion that killing Germans, Austrians and Turks would advance the cause of Irish self-government.

I would Christen the Waterford wall Redmond's Folly, and those yet to be erected in Limerick and other places Fallai Mhic Reamoinn.

I would also have blank walls erected dedicated to the nameless Germans, Austrians and Turks killed by my deluded compatriots in that conflict . After all, what harm did they ever inflict, or intend to inflict, on Ireland.

10.10.13, *Irish Independent*

Terence MacSwiney's Funeral

Oliver O’Hanlon (An Irishman’s Diary, Oct. 14) recalls the 1920 death and funeral of Lord Mayor of Cork, Terence MacSwiney and the role of Art O’Brian in London in keeping the world’s media informed of the course of his hunger strike in Brixton Prison.

The London stage of the funeral included Requiem Mass in Southwark Cathedral, a marching Guard of Honour of Uniformed IRA from the First Cork Brigade and numerous Mayors, Aldermen and Councillors from London Boroughs in full regalia. These included the Mayor of Stepney, Major Clement Attlee, who included a photograph of his participation in his memoirs.

Extensive British Pathe newsreel footage of the London and Cork stages of the funeral are accessible on the Internet. The final shot indicates the media interest in the event, as the grave is obscured by numerous photographers operating their hand-cranked movie cameras.

Mr O’Hanlon refers to the receipt in O

Briain’s papers for (payment) for transportation from London’s Euston Station to Cork via Kingstown (now Dunlaoghaire.)

In fact at Holyhead, MacSwiney’s brothers and sisters, who had intended to accompany the body to Dublin, were taken by force from the train, and the body taken separately direct to Cork. According to Dorothy Macardle (“The Irish Republic”) this was the result of intervention by Field Marshal Sir Henry Wilson.

14.10.13, *Irish Times*

De Valera in Context

For years lazy commentators have parroted a sneer about Eamon de Valera’s speech on St Patrick’s Day 1943, the Fiftieth Anniversary of the foundation of the Gaelic League. The League’s co-founder, Douglas Hyde was, in 1943 President of Ireland.

That was the Irish context.

The international context is just as relevant. Most of the world was involved in the most destructive conflict in history, suggesting that the Devil indeed finds work for idle hands. Families with hungry bellies and idle hands during the Great Depression would have considered “frugal comfort” an impossible dream then. And many, not only in Ireland, but in the US, Britain and continental Europe, never mind the “Third World” would so consider it today.

It should not be impossible for your readers, or you, Dear Editor, to read Dev’s message and consider whether it was really so silly.

Another context is Dev’s record. He was returned to lead ten Irish Governments following democratic elections. When the Irish electors looked into their hearts in the privacy of the voting booths, more often than not they backed Dev.

(Admirers of Winston Churchill must concede that their hero but once led his party (in 1951) to a General Election victory. Even then, the Labour Party led by Attlee secured some hundreds of thousands more votes than Churchill’s Conservative Party.)

Those with a nose for sentimental guff might read Michael Collins’s story of walking with some of his young friends in Shepherd’s Bush, when a man with a donkey and cart turned a corner. They all cheered, as it reminded them of home. Donkeys became part of the Irish scene only during the Patriot’s father’s life. In the 1830s a donkey could fetch £30 in Kilkenny. The shortage of Irish Horses following the Napoleonic Wars, created a market for donkeys. Rarely seen today on Irish farms, they appear to have found niches in politics, academia and media.

23.10.13, *Irish Examiner*

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

DEMOCRACY. WHAT DEMOCRACY?

What is called democracy in Ireland, as in other English-speaking countries, is a web of deceit woven by politicians for their own selfish purposes as a class. Democracy has nothing to do with government by the people. Yes, the people get to vote, but when they vote—and on what issues the people vote—are decided by politicians to suit themselves. The main function of the people, as far as politics is concerned, is to pay taxes. In return for paying taxes, the people are provided with an illusion of security and as little health services as is possible and a semblance of education.

In Ireland, the Local Elections are to take place next year, 2014. Or not, if the politicians so decide. Local Elections have been deferred several times in the past. An Independent candidate can go forward and enrol her/his name with the Returning Officer but such a candidate has not much chance of being elected by public vote and, even if elected, has no realistic chance of being effective as a public representative because of the "*Party System*".

The Party System is a Machiavellian English invention, which arose out of the cabals and conspiracies which governed England with or without a monarch ever since the row between the murderer King John and his barons. They purported to settle their differences at Runnymede on 15th June 1215 when *Magna Carta* was signed. Twenty-five barons were appointed (elected?) by the others to supervise the King's observance of the *Magna Carta*. The twenty-five barons were called Guardians of the Realm. However, somehow, King John got the Pope to absolve him of his oath and John repudiated *Magna Carta* and war followed.

Inevitably, John died. His son at 10 years of age was conveniently sworn in (Oaths are big in English history) under the Earl of Pembroke as Regent who continued the war against a group of barons who had nominated Louis, son of the King of France, to be the English King. Louis and the group of barons were defeated. In 1220 Hubert de Burgh, Grand Justiciar succeeded Pembroke as Regent and in 1225 (before the young King Henry had, as they say, attained 'Years of Discretion') a Parliament was called of the senior nobility.

That is how the Party System started in England. It took another five hundred years or so before the English stopped their nasty habit of prosecuting fallen Prime Ministers for Treason. To this day in England, the party not in power calls itself the "Loyal Opposition" so as to forestall any attempts to call the opposition treasonous.

And so the "Mother of Parliaments" has spawned her awful likeness in countries in the English speaking world including Ireland.

In Ireland—to be elected to Local Authorities or to Dáil Eireann—a candidate should first join one of the political parties. The next thing is to lobby within the chosen party for a nomination to the Convention which is held by each Party to elect the candidates who will be put forward to the Returning Officer as Party Candidates. Much lobbying is needed behind the scenes to get onto the ballot paper by this route. Another route is to become a public celebrity and, as a result of that, to arrange to be put on the ballot paper by Party Headquarters. Sometimes over the heads of, and in spite of, local Party Officers. This is called "*parachuting in*" a candidate. A third way to be put on the ballot paper by a Party is to be an existing member of the Local Authority or Dáil. Some go on for years by this route such as Taoiseach Enda Kenny, Fine Gael TD, who has been a member of the Dáil for 43 years.

The members of the general public, the voters, have no say in who will be on the ballot papers. It is even possible for the public to have no say in who gets elected. This is due to the English model of voting. The English do not like to think of a public expression of dissent and so there is no provision in our voting system for a NO vote against a disliked candidate. If the number of candidates on the ballot paper is equal to, or less than, the number of vacancies to be filled then the candidate will be elected, no matter how few votes they each get. (This is to assume each candidate will have at least one vote: his/her own vote.).

By not having the facility to vote NO for a candidate it does not want, the public has therefore foisted upon it a candidate which the public has an aversion to. And inevitably candidates are elected who have previously exhibited gross incompetence or even corruption in public office.

It is not democracy. The English in their Oxford Dictionary define Democracy as "*Government by the people; a form of*

government in which power resides in the people and is exercised by them either directly or by means of elected representatives".

We the people do not exercise the power to govern, nor do we elect our representatives. We are given to think we elect our representatives but quite clearly, as I have shown, we elect Party representatives. We as a people have power to change the size of Parties in Local Authorities or in the Dáil. That is the only power we have. It has nothing to do with government or ruling by the people.

Politicians themselves recognise that pre-election promises are simply a ruse to get Party representatives elected. Former Taoiseach Séan Lemass said the Election Manifesto is torn up on the day of the count. At this present time both Taoiseach Enda Kenny, Fine Gael TD, and Eamon Gilmore, Labour TD, are openly rejecting their pre-election promises, made in their respective Election Manifestos. So the people's power to elect Party representatives is shown to be just that and no more. Certainly not the power to govern themselves.

Just to be certain that the people will have no influence in their government, there is a further layer of insulation inserted by the politicians at both local level and in the national parliament. At local level the elected representatives as such have virtually no power. The power resides by law in the Manager who is responsible not to the Local Council but to the public servants in the Department of Local Government, which is normally headed by the Minister for Local Government who is a Party man.

At national level the Government consists of TDs appointed by the Taoiseach, who is himself elected by the Party TDs in Dail Eireann. This is enabled by the Constitution of Ireland which provides that the Government shall consist of not more than 15 members from Dail Eireann and Seanad Eireann. Not more than two from Seanad Eireann. (Article 28). The Taoiseach has absolute power to appoint and dismiss Ministers and so it is Party rule. The Party of the Taoiseach, that is.

It is definitely not rule by or on behalf of the people and very definitely not democracy no matter how the definition of democracy is stretched.

A further layer of government is the power of each Minister to rule by regulation. Up to one thousand regulations each year are made by Party Ministers. Thus most of what is the law of the land is made, not by the Oireachtas, but by

Ministerial Regulation. It is doubtful if this tsunami of legislation was ever envisaged by the Constitution of Ireland and it is certainly not part of any democratic process. The whole Party System, the legislative system and the executive system of government in Ireland does not stack up. It is difficult to see how it can all be rectified, given the proclivity of our existing politicians to protect their own and their Party interest.

THE BUDGET

The annual Budget day has been reduced to a farce. On ce upon a time the Minister for Finance stood up in the Dáil and read out his Budget Statement for the year. The full statement was faithfully reproduced the following day in each of the newspapers *verbatim*. And, after weeks of debate in the Dail and Seanad, the Finance Act was passed. The Finance Act was then law.

This year we had readings by in effect, two Finance Ministers. The readings were then interpreted by journalists in the print and broadcast media and on the internet. What was read out by the Ministers was, it seems, wishful thinking because, since this Government came into power, the actual outcome of incomes and expenditures in each Department bore only a vague resemblance to the budgets. The Health budget is almost meaningless in view of the hundreds of millions of Euros gone astray since last year's Budget. It is out of control. Then there was the fiction which, until a few months ago, was called the Budget Deficit. Countless hours of media comment speculated uselessly on whether the Deficit should be €3.1bn or €2.5bn. Then the "*Deficit*" was changed to "*Adjustment*". Adjustment of what was not explained by anyone. And the latest expression for the "*Deficit*" is "*fiscal consolidation measure*".

What a load of horse manure! What do they mean by the €3.1bn or €2.5bn? When we are also told the State has been overspending and borrowing at the rate of a billion a month—12bn a year.

What is clear is that the State's finances are a shambles. Accurate record-keeping is quite literally mediaeval—the State followed the UK in its methods of record-keeping because the Civil Service in Ireland knew no better. In 1490 or thereabouts Fra Luca Pacioli wrote a treatise on the State of Venice's book-keeping and it has ever since been used by businesses because of its accuracy. Five hundred years later—is it not time our State caught up?

Michael Stack ©

TRADE UNION NOTES

SIPTU Conference

The "establishment" will meet moves to legislate for workers' right to collective bargaining with "massive resistance", SIPTU Vice President, Patricia King told the union's Biennial Delegate Conference on Wednesday, 9th October, in the Mansion House, Dublin.

She said that Government moves to give effect to a promise in the joint Programme for Government to enact legalisation on collective bargaining would mark a "*turning point for workers*".

She acknowledged the legal complexities that exist around the collective bargaining issue, but said that the trade unions had to get to a place where they secure something that have been "*denied for one hundred years*".

The 2001-2004 Industrial Relations Acts, which she said had been a "*strong attempt*" to deliver collective bargaining, had been "*pulled down*" with the Supreme Court judgment in the 2007 'Ryanair' case.

King said they had to find a definition of collective bargaining that did not allow for employer dominance of workplace representative bodies. King told delegates that the Union had witnessed a return to wage bargaining in 2012, with twelve of its fifteen sectors recording wage rises last year.

She put the average wage rise in manufacturing at between 2.5% to 3% annually over three years. The Union's strategy is based on "*keeping jobs*" and on "*sustainable increases*", she said.

On the Haddington Road agreement, King said that Section 11 of the services delivery section of the Agreement, which covers outsourcing, remains critical to Union members. She described this as a "*deadly battle*" that the Union would have to fight, warning that this is an area that constantly threatens members' pay and conditions.

The Vice President said that it seems that the new Joint Labour Committees will be up and running within 6-8 weeks. But she warned delegates to "*watch the resistance*" that emerges. For many members the new set-up would be the pathway to a "*living wage*".

SIPTU and Mandate were adopting a common template in this area. King added that new legislation would also be needed for new Registered Employment Agreements. (SIPTU "*Liberty*" magazine online; vol. 5; issue 9; October, 2013).

Joint Labour Committees Saved

Following a successful legal action, Enterprise Minister Richard Bruton has restructured the Joint Labour Committee

GUILDS continued

they cannot make a monopoly for that is to take away free trade which is the birthright of every subject.

"In addition, the activity of townsmen directed towards downing local by-laws showed which way trade winds were blowing in certain boroughs, where guildsmen, in overriding gild laws, did their part to bring into disrepute laws of their own making. Finally, the many forces working to free trade and industry, forced upon the government the conviction that both trade and industry ought to be free, and the statute directed toward freeing them found its way upon the statute-book" (ibid. p.183-4).

In the early 19th century, Wells was the scene, it is said, of rioting almost nightly when numbers of persons paraded up and down the streets carrying clubs and crying, 'Down with the Bylaws.' *Parliamentary Papers*, vol. 24, p.1368.

A substantial number of these protesters were Guildsmen themselves who believed they had a future as master Guildsmen.

(To be continued)

system to make it legally sound. The Committees set pay and conditions for thousands of lower-paid workers and are legally binding wage-setting mechanisms negotiated between employers and unions in individual sectors of the economy.

Bruton will be abolishing the JLCs for Dublin hotels and law clerks. He will be narrowing the scope of JLCs governing sectors including agriculture, hairdressing, retail grocery, hotels (outside Dublin), contract cleaning and security staff. Mr Bruton will also amend the administration of the two catering JLCs. He said this restructuring would improve Ireland's competitiveness by enhancing wage flexibility, while also ensuring the protection of vulnerable workers.

Mr Bruton also published the Report of the Labour Court's Review of the Joint Labour Committee system, which recommends that the overall number of JLCs be reduced. It also recommends the scope of others be amended to factor in the changing circumstances of sectors where they apply.

SIPTU Vice President Patricia King welcomed the announcement. She said that while Unions might take issue with some points, she urged the Minister to immediately make the necessary establishment Orders to get the JLCs up and running as soon as possible.

However, the JLC proposals were strongly criticised by the Restaurants Association of Ireland, which has not ruled out taking another legal challenge to the new legislation. ■

GUILDS continued

as Grand Jurors, bear arms, take degrees at the Trinity College, Dublin, become members of the Corporations and advance to minor offices in the state service. Catholics were still barred from sitting in parliament.

FREE MARKET

"It had taken a long time for an English borough to put into practise theories current a full century and a half earlier, which advocated the freeing of local trade and industry. Only after experiencing the truth of the declaration enunciated by the courts as early as 1619, to the effect, that corporations in the towns and inferior cities were seldom of good use, but rather disturbed the good government of such communities, did Kingston-upon-Hull rid herself of those disturbers of her peace" (ibid. p.182).

Later an attempt to revive the Guilds of Kingston-upon-Hull was discouraged and her flourishing state compared with stagnant York and Beverley, where business was at a standstill, because in the interest of local Guilds, strangers were still excluded from the liberties. Hadley, *History of Kingston-upon-Hull*, p.829 (ibid. p.182).

In relation to the 1619 court case above, this was the verdict rendered in the case of the Taylors and Clothworkers of Ipswich, when a remedy was sought for the ills which had overtaken Ipswich's clothing industry, in order that so great an industry might not be concentrated in the hands of one corporation to make 'proffitt off their ill workmanship'. *Lansdowne MS., B. M.* 162, f. 195. (ibid. p.182).

"Preston evidently learned the lesson in 1772 with the prosecution of 'Merchant Baines' and his subsequent withdrawal from the borough's jurisdiction, for thereafter non-freemen were encouraged to ply their trades within the precincts of Preston, to the doubling of her population in something like two decades. Just what part the guilds of Preston played in the process which spelled their ruin does not appear" (ibid. p.182).

The Preston mercantile society seems to have paid the cost of prosecuting the Mr. Baines in question. Hardwick, op. cit. p.286. Certain other boroughs evidently failed to realise the ill effects likely to follow further restraint of trade, and in consequence lost out in the economic race. The prosperity of Ripon is said to have departed with the trades and handicrafts which settled in places offering greater opportunity to thrive because free from restrictive regulations (ibid. p.182).

GUILDS RESIST

"But the better part of a century elapsed between the time when the executive body of Bristol decided to free local trade and their action upon this decision, by eliminating the trade organisations which stood in the way. Gilds of a borough's own creation were not to be downed in a day or even in a year, or two or three" (ibid. p.182).

At Bristol, the year in which the ordinances levelled at strangers were omitted from civic records, by order of city officials, the penalty assessed upon interlopers was raised to twenty pounds upon each conviction. Latimer, *Annals of Bristol in the Eighteenth Century*, p.21. In 1727 the amalgamated mercers and linen-drapers of the city enforced their monopoly with the help of the city council. Three years later that body upheld local carpenters in prohibiting non-members, whether masters or journeymen, from using that craft within city limits under pain of paying ten shillings a day. In 1732 a committee was appointed to determine whether the fees charged for admission into city companies were exorbitant, but no action seems to have followed the appointment. *Ibid.* p.181. Apparently not until 1702 could all residents of Bristol ply their callings in the city unmolested by the authorities. Webb, *Local Government*, ii, pt. 2, p.449 (ibid. p.182).

CROWN GILDS

For Guilds which were created by the Crown or Parliament the process proved even more complicated and therefore slower of accomplishment.

On the ground that they were a corporation by prescription, dating from the earliest times, the goldsmiths of London refused the Municipal Corporations Commission the information they asked for in 1833. Prideaux, *Memorials of the Goldsmiths' Company*, vol. ii, p.319 (ibid. p.183).

"The state was less ready than the boroughs to free trade from the clutches of the 'societies of merchants and handicrafts' which as early as 1622 were suspected of working for their own 'private Gain and particular Advantage', and therefore tended rather to 'the hurt of the publique than to its profit'. It is true that by 1650 this 'suspition' had become enough of a certainty to cause forward-looking state dignitaries to ponder whether it might not be 'necessary to give way to a more open and free trade than that of Companies and Societies and in what manner it is fittest to be done'. Little, on the whole, seems actually to have been done by the state of that period to free the internal trade of the country" (ibid. p.183)

"By the passage of the act of 21 James I, [1603-1625] c. ix., according to which, any person could sell all or any Welsh cloths, cottons, 'Frizes',... to any person or persons who, by the laws or statutes of the Realm might lawfully buy such cloths, the state freed trade in Welsh cloth from the restraints which the drapers of Shrewsbury had imposed upon its sale" (ibid. p.183).

CROMWELL

"Cromwell and his successors evidently followed the example set them by their predecessors and incorporated industrial organisations in various sections of the realm" (ibid. p.183).

A charter incorporating the Needle-makers was issued by Cromwell in 1658, and confirmed by King Charles II in 1664. *Index to Remembrancia*, p.104. In 1693 William & Mary incorporated the soap-makers and chandlers of Bristol. *State Papers Domestic, William & Mary*, vol. v, No. 269 (ibid. p.183).

"Neither did early 18th century authorities free serge and worsted weaving following the finding of the parliamentary committee charged with inquiring into the deplorable conditions complained of by the men engaged in the art. The committee in question found the weavers' allegations true, yet they advised that the trade ought to be free and not restrained. However, economists of that epoch continued to advocate the freeing of trade; one in particular pointedly denounced every sort of restriction of trade as 'nought'..." (ibid. p.183).

This opinion was expressed by Sir Joshua Child in 1708. *Merchant Adventurers of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Surtees Society Publications*, vol. 93, p.xliii.

ENGLISH BIRTHRIGHT

Another went so far as to hold trade organisations up to derision by propounding a certain set of questions to a suppositious burgess of Newcastle-upon-Tyne and eliciting answers couched so as to make membership in an English trade Guild appear a hindrance rather than a help to Englishmen of the period. When invoked, the courts upheld free trade as the birthright of every English subject.

The case of the Clothworkers of Ipswich, 13 Jacobi, *Godbolt*, 2503: the Ipswich clothworkers lost out in this case—one which they had brought against a local tailor who persisted in plying his trade without having joined their company—because, in the finding of the court, the king might make corporations and grant them the right to make ordinances for the government of any trade but that thereby

continued on page 25

GUILDS continued

find members willing to hold office in the company. In other localities the decline of an industry brought to ruin the organisation invested with its control. With the passing of the clothing industry of Worcester went the city's famous clothing company. By 1711 its members confessed to being 'far in debt'. a condition they attributed to the admission of strangers to work in Worcester, for previously their company had the exclusive right in this field" (ibid. p.177-78).

"Another aspect may be found in the fact that the end of the Nottingham tanners coincided with the disappearance of bark from the neighbourhood. That company appointed its last master in 1808 and thirty years later sold in the borough's market place [that] which remained of its old hall. Still other organisations vanished leaving no trace of the end" (ibid. p.178).

"After the middle of the 18th century the guilds of Norwich seem to have ceased from troubling the economic life of the community, while after 1788 no further entries were made in the book of the coopers of Newcastle-upon-Hull. The Bristol organisations silently disappeared during the closing years of the century. The coopers' hall was offered for sale by auction in 1785, and the smiths' one year later. By that time, too, there were not enough weavers in the city to justify their maintaining a hall" (ibid. p.178).

"Attendance at the meetings of the merchant taylors dwindled rapidly. In 1787 there were only seven, while in 1815 there was only one member left to attend a meeting. In a sense, it is surprising that the guilds of Bristol maintained a footing so many years after 1703, when, in revising the city ordinances, those levelled at strangers were ordered 'left out' altogether by city officials who probably favoured a policy of non-interference with newcomers. Not that the announcement of the policy guaranteed its immediate enforcement; evidently the guilds of Bristol had to be reckoned with. However, when the civic authorities of Kingston-upon-Hull withdrew their support from local guilds the guilds had to go. The only organisations to maintain their hold in the early decades of the 19th century were those favoured by the municipalities, since at that late date those bodies only could keep non-freemen from sharing in local trade" (ibid. p.178-79).

KEEPING MR. MICKLESTON 'QUIET'

"In 1834 a certain Mr. Mickleston had the hardihood, not only to sue the borough of Shrewsbury for exacting from him an imposition, or 'Tentorshipp', as the record has it, but in addition did 'endeavour to make void their charter', whereupon the borough 'gave him his burgesship to be quiet'. However, when a borough of the standing of Shrewsbury was reduced to

such straits, it was apparently time for a higher power to intervene and end a situation which had clearly become impossible for all parties concerned" (ibid. p.179/80).

"Shortly after this Shrewsbury episode, the passing of the Municipal Reform Bill, [1835] according to which every inhabitant might keep a shop for the sale of lawful wares and merchandise within any borough, left neither to boroughs nor guilds the right to confer citizenship not to use a trade or industry within local boundaries" (ibid. p.178-79).

London was exempted from the operation of the provisions of this act; yet after its enactment, few of the city companies attempted to enforce any of their by-laws in restraint of trade. *Municipal Corporations Commission Report*, 1837, vol. 25, pp. 55, 88, 141, 201 *et passim* (ibid. p.180).

"That the mercers of Shrewsbury realized their end had come, is clear from the entry, inscribed in their records, under date of 1836, which laconically states that "By the Statute 5 & 6 William 4. cap.76, entitled 'an act to provide for the regulation of Municipal Corporations in England and Wales', the privileges of the Company came to an end." However, the property amassed through the centuries which was still at the disposal of the company was not 'distributed to the Combrethren' until about forty-two years later, when the company was dissolved for all time. Other companies wound up their affairs during the year which followed the passage of the act" (ibid. p.180).

The butchers of Newcastle-upon-Tyne were apparently divided on the expediency of selling their corporate property and dividing the proceeds. Indeed a considerable number refused outright to sanction such a proceeding. It was accordingly decided to continue to subscribe as heretofore to such charities as the company had been subscribing to, and to divide among the members any balance left in the treasury at the end of each year. *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 3rd series, vol. 14, p.10. (ibid. p.180).

~~~~~  
The Municipal Corporations Act 1835 (5 & 6 Wm. IV., c.76), sometimes known as the Municipal Reform Act, was an Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom that reformed local government in the incorporated boroughs of England and Wales. The legislation was part of the reform programme of the Whigs and followed the Reform Act 1832, which had abolished most of the rotten boroughs for parliamentary purposes.  
~~~~~

'RESTRICTIVE' PRACTICES

"In this connection it is worth noting, that while the guilds are usually credited with obstructing local trade and industry, the act, as its name implies, really holds the boroughs responsible for such tactics. 'Because of a certain custom', reads this Municipal Corporations Act, [1835] 'which prevailed in divers cities, towns and boroughs and of certain by-laws made that no person not being free of a city, town or borough or of certain guilds, mysteries or trading companies within the same... shall keep any shop or place for putting to show or sale any or certain wares thereafter, not withstanding any such custom or by-law, every person in any borough may keep any shop for the sale of all lawful wares and merchandises within any borough whatsoever'. Moreover the commission appointed to inquire into the conditions which existed in the boroughs prior to the passage of the act, found the trade of a borough like Beverley restricted to freemen when local guilds had evidently ceased from troubling" (ibid. p.181-82).

"Furthermore, non-free shopkeepers and artisans were, from certain accounts, compelled to purchase the freedom of Norwich down to 1835, years after trade organisations are mentioned in corporation records. The fact that some boroughs had done away with trade restrictions within their precincts long before they were forced by the government to do so, proves possibly that the boroughs realized their rights as well as their responsibilities in the matter. After 1782 the freemen of Maidstone possessed no economic privileges which were denied to outsiders. In the charter which was conferred upon the borough of Northampton in 1796, all enactments in restriction of trade and industry were omitted, it is said, at the request of the corporation" (Ibid. p.181-82).

YOUGHAL

In 1791 the corporation of Youghal was told that strangers would establish themselves in business in their precincts if certain tolls were abolished; whereupon for a certain period thereafter all goods bought before entering the liberties were declared free from the 'Clerk of the Market's dues'. Four years later, such by-laws as had prohibited Papists from using local trades and handicrafts were repealed and declared null and void. *Parliamentary Papers*, vol. 25, pp.1968-69—*Youghal Council Book*, p.535 (Ibid. p.181-82).

In April, 1793, Chief Secretary of Ireland, Robert Hobert introduced the Catholic Relief Act, partially dismantling Penal Laws, thereby permitting Catholics to vote as 40 shilling freeholders in the counties and in the open boroughs, to act

continued on page 26



Mondragon, Part 24

The State Deserts The Guilds

By the middle of the eighteenth century English Guilds had little or no control of trade and industry. For some Guilds, control had already been lost by the end of the Seventeenth century. Certain Guilds kept going by reducing fees and fines, relaxing Guild rules and penalties : all to no avail. Other Guilds disappeared leaving not a trace of their demise.

Those that did survive did so with the consent of the Boroughs, they alone had the right to keep non-Guildsmen from sharing trade and industry.

The Municipal Reform Bill (1835) brought to an end Guild privileges and held Boroughs responsible for obstructing trade and industry.

MERE CHARITY

"For example, a minute, dated August 18, 1687, in the court book of the London grocers refers to their organisation as being then merely a 'nursery of charities and seminary of good citizens'..." (*The English Craft Gilds, Studies in their Progress and Decline*, Stella Kramer, Columbia University Press, 1927, p.176).

"The merchant taylors seem to have lost their interest in the work-a-day world by 1689, for in that year they went so far as to order their court to 'examine of what use and benefit the yeomanry are... and what advantage they have brought or damage they have done' to the occupation. Two years later the 'Wardens of the Yeomanry' were dispensed with altogether. Again, by the early 18th century, city mercers had so far severed their connection with trade as to exclude from the company's courts, its committees and elections, and in addition had declared ineligible to the office of master or wardens, the member who should be 'appointed a workman', or be given any employment or 'place of profit' in the organisation" (ibid. p.176).

"Merchant companies in communities like Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Dublin renounced their control over local trade after they realized the futility of expending further effort to enforce it. The mercers

of Sandwich, seemingly reluctant to yield their place and power in the community, were forced to do this eventually. Their company spent its last days in contending against unscrupulous officials who were not only withholding money they had collected from members but were also 'going to contributors... and Diswading them from paying their several contributions' still due to the company. In order to attract new members, the company offered its freedom for forty shillings 'together with other customary charges', but met with little success in that direction. The last act recorded in the company's history was the choosing of officers for the "Year Ensuing". This leads to the inference that there was not even a meeting for the officers to preside over" (ibid. p.176).

"Handicraft organisations like the clothworkers of London also yielded to the inevitable and renounced their powers of control. Still others, notably the glovers of Shrewsbury, made desperate efforts to keep going, but the desperation which inspired the efforts, probably defeated the end the company sought to achieve. In prosecuting interlopers and in merry-making, the company dissipated funds which could never be recouped because gild members refused to pay the penalties

attached to the infringing of gild rules. In addition, the misappropriation, by the representatives of a deceased official, of certain sums which had been entrusted to him, helped to bring to an end an especially privileged organisation. Still, other companies were kept going a while longer by reducing the fines charged for the infraction of the rules" (ibid. p.177).

"By the time that the glovers of Chester raised the fee for admission into their company to a point where possible members were deterred from entering (*Parliamentary Papers*, vol. 26, p.2635) or the drapers of Shrewsbury refused to admit them on practically any terms (ibid., vol.25), the end of the regime of those two Guilds for economic good or ill had probably been reached. However, the drapers was the only one of the Shrewsbury Guilds to survive as late as 1898; it had contrived to retain its Hall, its old chest of books and other documents and certain property which it diverted to charitable purposes. *Trans. Shropshire Archaeological & Natural History Society*, vol. viii, 2nd series, p.175" (ibid. p.177).

"GOOD FELLOWS ONLY"

"In Ludlow, the stitchmen seem to have reduced gild fees for admission and also the penalties assessed for misdemeanours; yet they failed either to keep their hold over old members or to attract new ones. After the middle of the 18th century the quarterly meetings were discontinued for lack of attendance. Apprentices were no longer being enrolled, and the funds, instead of being used to pay the expenses incurred in regulating the trade, furnished feasts for the society, which by the early 19th century had evidently become one of good fellows only" (ibid. p.177).

"Other organisations seem to have disappeared with the demand for the product under their domination. Towards the end of the 17th century girdles ceased to be the fashion and girdlers had to find other employment for their energies. By 1760 the London girdlers could scarcely

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

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

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

33 Athol Street, Belfast BT12 4GX or

2 Newington Green Mansions, London N16 9BT

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

Subscription by Post:

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

Electronic Subscription:

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

You can also order from:

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

continued on page 27