

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

September 2013

Vol.28, No.9 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.27 No.9 ISSN 954-5891

Egypt And Syria:

the sins of democracy?

Democracy must be reaching the end of its shelf-life as a manipulable illusion. It has served Western Imperialism well. But can it survive its Egyptian fiasco?

Possibly it can. But if it does it will not be as an illusion sincerely believed in, but as a deception deliberately practised.

Ten years ago Iraq was reduced to a shambles in the name of Democracy. Some of the vociferous supporters of that invasion, which was followed by the destruction of the liberal Iraqi State, appeared to believe that Democracy is what happens when "tyranny" is overthrown. As we go to print, it seems likely that the Syrian State, which has resisted the Western-backed Islamist insurrection for two years, is about to be destroyed by direct Western intervention. If, after the example of Iraq, Libya and Egypt, Syria is reduced to a total shambles, any use of the word 'Democracy' in justification of the act will be calculated deception.

Of course, powerful States engage in exception as a matter of routine. In an era when Democracy has been made the official ideology of the world by the United Nations, the Governments of powerful states could not operate without deception. But what we are talking about is the people. When Iraq was pulverised in the name of Democracy, the action had extensive popular support on the ground of belief that the purpose of the action was to enable the people of Iraq to establish a democratic State for themselves. One might accept that this was grounded on credulity. But credibility is no longer possible in these matters. Support for a Western war on Syria can only be based on a cynical calculation of interest, and a cynical dressing up of interest in the verbiage of democratic principle.

As we go to print, the British Government, seeking to drum up popular enthusiasm for war, assures the public that its military action will not be an interference in the Syrian "civil war", and will not be directed towards regime change. It will just kill some people

continued on page 2

Budget Choices

Under the Stability and Growth Pact, every EU Member State is required to submit its budget to the European Commission for scrutiny in October to ensure that it complies with the rules of the Pact. Minister for Finance Michael Noonan has decided this means that Ireland will move its Budget from December to October this year.

The broad shape of the Budget is already outlined: The underlying general Government deficit should not exceed 5.1 per cent of GDP in 2014. In order to achieve this, the Department of Finance has estimated a monetary value of €3.1bn as the amount required to meet the target. Of this €3.1bn, a reduction in State expenditure of €1.9bn is to be achieved, with the remainder to be raised through the tax system. However, a difference of opinion has emerged between the coalition partners, with the Labour leader Eamon Gilmore suggesting that the final Budget package may not need to include the full €3.1bn of cuts and increased taxes mooted.

This puts him at odds with Enda Kenny, the Fiscal Advisory Council of the Cabinet, and the Central Bank, all of whom have

continued on page 3

Victims of the Peace

So Peter Robinson has pulled down the Long Kesh Peace Centre project because the victims are revolting. According to the *Belfast Newsletter*:

"In April he joined deputy First Minister Martin McGuinness at the Maze site as detailed plans for its development were unveiled... Then Mr Robinson said 'scaremongering garbage' from some unionist politicians opposed to the Maze project could agitate the suffering of thousands of victims of the 30-year

conflict. 'There will be no shrine to terrorism, no glorification of terrorism at Maze/Long Kesh', he said. Proposals for a 'script' telling the story of Northern Ireland's troubled history at the Maze had not yet been agreed by the two ministers. The First Minister said: 'We will do it with all sensitivity to the victims of terrorism, there is no intention on anybody's part to try and increase the anguish that people have had over the years' ... 'No one has asked for a shrine to terrorism to be constructed at the

Maze, Martin has made it very clear that he does not want a shrine to terrorism' ... 'It will be, I hope, a beacon of hope to the rest of the world that people can climb out of conflict and move towards a peaceful and stable society' ..." (16.8.13)

But now Robinson in a letter from America has kicked the project into the long grass

In an article in *The Belfast Telegraph* entitled 'Are the cracks starting to emerge in Peter Robinson's iron grip?' Liam Clark gave some of the reasons for Robinson's U-turn:

continued on page 4

CONTENTS

	Page
Egypt And Syria. <i>The Sins Of Democracy?</i> Editorial	1
Budget Choices. Editorial	1
Victims Of The Peace. Pat Walsh	1
What The Minister Said, Reply To A Vile Accusation, (<i>or, Why Didn't He Just Pick Up A Phone?</i>). Philip O'Connor	5
Straw Says Nuclear Deal With Iran Scuppered By The US In 2005. David Morrison	7
Shorts from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (Kenny's Betrayal; The Quinn Family; Reasons To Be Miserable?; Political Nerves?; Stimulus Package)	8
Don't Mention The War. Pat Walsh	9
Another Day At Béalnabláth. Manus O'Riordan	11
Fred May And Dev—a very odd couple. Seán McGouran	12
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (Micheál Martin & his 'evolutionary politics'; Micheál Martin & Merriman Summer School; UCC & Populism; Canon Sheehan)	13
Corrections, 3. Brendan Clifford (Part 3 of <i>The Irish Bulletin & The Academy</i>)	15
The Omagh Bomb—15 Years On. Pat Walsh	18
A Jolly Good Fellow. Fergal Patrick Keane, OBE. Donal Kennedy	20
Biteback: Budget Options On Cuts And Taxes. Philip O'Connor	
Kilmichael Statement. Peter Beresford Ellis	21
Bradley Manning. Willson John Haire (Poem)	21
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (The Irish Holocaust, Not a Famine; Dukes Of Devonshire; Taxes=Charity)	22

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

The Apprentice Boys

Mondragon, Part 22

(back page)

Trade Union Notes

(page 24)

in Syria as punishment for the regime being suspected of using poison gas, but it will leave the regime in place and allow the civil war to continue.

Hitherto what has been going on in Syria has been described as a conflict between "*the Syrian people*" and an entirely unrepresentative regime based purely on a capacity for terrorising the populace. Recognition of the legitimacy of the Damascus Government was withdrawn long ago, and the Opposition, though altogether lacking in political or military coherence, was recognised as the legitimate authority in Syria. But now, in order to garner support for war, recognition of the Opposition as the legitimate authority is tacitly withdrawn, and "*the Syrian people*" is dissolved into an internally-divided body engaged in civil war.

This is done, of course, in the certainty that, if a war of intervention can be started, all that was said in order to get it started will become litter in the rubbish-bin of history. War always brings its own dynamic, its own logic, its own state of mind, its own imperatives, and the pre-

war chatter required to bring it about loses all its force.

The chatter at this particular instant is about whether an act of war against Syria would be illegal under international law. It is a fantasy debate. An act of war by the US, the UK and France could not be illegal because those States placed themselves beyond the law of the United Nations when they created the United Nations. The legality of acts of war is decided by the Security Council. For the Security Council to be able to decide that the contemplated act of war against Syria was illegal, the three states that seem determined to commit that act of war would have to give judgment against themselves, and brand themselves as criminals. That is the meaning of the Veto which each of them has on Security Council decisions.

Unless a distinction is made between being legal, and not being illegal—and we have never seen such a distinction made—discussion of the possibility that war on Syria might not be legal is the empty

chatter of facade politics.

Meanwhile Assad's decision to provide the West with the means of working up a warmongering campaign against him by using poison gas in Damascus, after Washington said that poison gas would be a reason for war, conveniently takes attention away from the embarrassing situation in Egypt.

And so, on the 50th anniversary of Martin Luther King's famous speech, a black President is on the brink of demonstrating that the dream has been realised. The descendants of the slaves have become equal citizens, to the extent that a black man has the power to commit the State to an act of war. It is a remarkable achievement of American democracy. But it is a thing of no consequence to the rest of the world. It just means that able people amongst the descendants of the slaves are trusted to be warmongering Imperialists in the highest Offices of the State. The "*content of their character*" has become suitable.

Meanwhile in Egypt the liberal secularists, hatched under the wing of the military dictatorship, who came out on the streets demanding Democracy last year, having had an experience of democracy, demanded a restoration of military dictatorship and have scurried back under its wings.

Did they really not understand that they were not "*the Egyptian people*"?

Their complaint, when they were demonstrating on the streets against Morsi—with military aircraft dropping leaflets supporting them—was that "*the Revolution*" had been "*stolen*" from them—stolen by the populace.

In the immediate aftermath of the military *coup*, the Al Jazeera television channel engaged in the severe mental cruelty of giving them lots of air time to explain themselves. They tied themselves up in ideological knots explaining—or thinking aloud in a groping for explanation—of how it was they who were the democrats, though supported by the military backed by Saudi Arabia, while the winners of the election were fascists, or something like it.

There was much generalised chatter, with no detail, about the awful things that Morsi had done. But then somebody said that the awful thing was nothing he had actually done, but was what he would do if allowed to serve out his four years.

What would he have done if he had not been overthrown? No diabolical plans

were discovered in his office. It began to emerge that the awful thing was that Egypt would have become accustomed to Islamic democracy, and the authority of the military hegemony of the State would have withered.

New notions of Democracy were tossed off in an attempt to make it synonymous with elitist liberalism. The elected Government, in order to be authentically democratic, should have empowered the Opposition, which had proved to be entirely incapable of empowering itself in electoral politics. Democracy suddenly ceased to be an adversarial political system, and became a system of consensus in which the majority does what the minority wants.

In the midst of this nonsense, an Israeli "Middle East expert", Yoram Ettinger, said that the normal and effective mode of Arab Government was military government and that Democracy should not be attempted in Arab States.

In the days when Arab countries were governed by more or less stable military regimes backed by the United States, criticism of Arab countries for not being democracies was regularly made as a debating point by Israel. But Israeli authorities knew all the time that the Jewish State was a colonial implantation whose projects could only be realised if the surrounding Arab countries were prevented from becoming democracies and were ruled in the last resort by dictatorship regimes subject to American influence. Now that this has been said outright, there can be no going back to spurious Zionist debating points about Democracy.

The undistinguished RTE coverage of the restoration of dictatorship included, around the time Mubarak was released from prison, an interview in which it was said that Morsi was guilty of trying to "appropriate" the State apparatus of the Mubarak regime instead of getting rid of it. The interviewer made no attempt to draw out the meaning of this.

The only practical sense it makes is that the Brotherhood should not have contested the elections, but should have come to power through physical force conflict with the apparatus of the dictatorship.

But the Brotherhood was committed to peaceful methods. And, when it won the election, it did not have the means to break up the apparatus of State constructed by the dictatorship—essentially the Army, with its control of a large segment of the economy, and the Judiciary.

Morsi governed in conjunction with the apparatus of the dictatorship. That apparatus was committed to subverting him. But, if the apparatus had allowed the elected Government to continue for four years, and become a familiar fixture in the political scene, its capacity for arbitrary action would have suffered erosion.

Morsi wanted to hold Parliamentary elections to confirm his mandate. The election which he won in January 2012 was declared illegitimate by the Mubarak Court six months later, in June. Morsi issued a Presidential decree ordering a Parliamentary election this April, but the Decree was over-ruled by the Court.

Morsi was President by direct election, but the representative body on which his Government was based was the Senate, or Shura Council. The powers of the Senate were slight compared with the powers of the Parliament, so there was only a 10% turnout in its election. With Parliamentary elections forbidden by the Courts, a case could therefore be made that Morsi's electoral mandate was weak.

Ninety seats in the Senate were made by appointment. The Army appointed a large chunk of these. Morsi ended those military appointments. This June the Court ruled that Government based on the Senate was unconstitutional.

Morsi tried to form a broadly-based Government but met with refusals from people who then complained that it was not broadly based.

El Baradei, who was out of favour with Saudi Arabia because he had been insufficiently anti-Iranian as head of the Atomic Energy Commission, refused a position under Morsi. He supported the *coup* and accepted a position in the restored dictatorship—but resigned when the dictatorship began "*murdering its own people*"—as the saying used to go when somebody was killed in the conflict that is now called the Syrian civil war.

Just before Egypt was taken off the news by somebody conveniently showering a poison gas attack on Damascus, a BBC political correspondent reported on a detailed briefing he had received from a senior figure in the restored dictatorship. The policy was to decapitate the Brotherhood, whose leadership was Nazi. There was a second layer of leadership which was heavily tainted, and that would have to be got rid of too. But the third layer, the body of the Brotherhood, though infected to some extent, was capable of being redeemed. This layer was to be brainwashed and made usable by the dictatorship.

Some time later Amr Mussa, head of the Arab League and a member of the dictatorship, said much the same thing in a long interview.

Are we mistaken in remembering that that is the kind of thing that was said and done following the Soviet intervention in Hungary and Czechoslovakia during the Cold War, and condemned as outrages on human integrity by the Western media?

Editorial Note

On 29th January 2013 the *Mail Online* carried a story entitled,

"U.S. 'Backed plan to launch chemical weapon attack on Syria and blame it on Assad's regime'.

This was pulled shortly afterwards but can be found at the following address:

<http://globalresearch.ca/us-backed-plan-to-launch-chemical-weapon-attack-on-syria-and-blame-it-on=assad-government/5346907>

Budget

continued

said that Ireland must stick to the figure of €3.1 billion. Kenny has also said that any flexibility the Government has in the Budget should be used for investment in job creation, rather than easing up on cuts in areas like welfare as suggested by Social Protection Minister Joan Burton. If the full cuts go ahead, it is estimated that Burton will be required to produce savings in her Department of the order of €440 million as her contribution to the overall €1.9bn reduction.

This disagreement may not come to anything by the time the Budget hits the presses, but with Labour at a low ebb in the polls, perhaps Gilmore feels he has to be seen to deliver something to his back benchers and dwindling band of prospective voters. The deal on the Anglo Promissory Notes is being touted as providing the scope to avoid the full package of cuts going through, although the counter argument to this is that the €1 billion or so that the promissory note deal will deliver was already factored in when the Department of Finance came up with the €3.1 billion figure.

Should the expected growth in the economy, upon which the deficit reduction targets are predicated, not materialise, then easing up on austerity at this stage could be a fatal error. A further complication is the demand by Jobs and Enterprise Minister Richard Bruton that, rather than ease up on cuts, any flexibility which

might be available in meeting the targets should be used to reduce income taxes. He makes the argument that current tax rates are hindering job creation. It would be hard not to see such a move as being simply a sop to middle class voters to produce a feel good effect.

The general consensus regarding cuts is that all the low-hanging fruit—meaning the less painful cuts—has already been picked in previous budgets. However, it is hard to see how a saving of €440 million can be achieved in the welfare budget without hitting headline rates and/or undermining services to such an extent that they become unviable. The same can be said for the health system.

It is almost unimaginable that Ministers, while talking the talk on the need to hang tough on austerity, will be able to resist the temptation to argue for softening the pain in their own particular Departments. One thing can be said for certain however. If the something like a full package of cuts goes through in the budget for areas like Welfare and Health, while at the same time we see, for instance, a tax cut in the form of the reduction in the Universal Social Charge, then Labour will be participating in a Government which will have no credibility as a protector of the most vulnerable.

Reducing social spending, while at the same time also reducing income taxes, would resonate more of Thatcherism or Reaganomics than Social Democracy.

Victims of the Peace continued

"The Orange Order is increasingly influential in DUP circles. This year it called for the halting of the Maze project from nearly all its Twelfth platforms. The party has backed the Order on every marching dispute. In North Belfast Nigel Dodds, its MP, as well as Nelson McCausland and William Humphrey, are Orangemen who have been prominent in the protests at Woodvale.

"There will be elections every year for the next three years and members of the Order have a reputation for voting in a higher proportion than the rest of the population. Mr Robinson also says that victims groups have been hurt by Sinn Fein decisions like the one to proceed with a republican parade in Castleberg.

"Smaller unionist parties, both the TUV and UUP, saw the Maze issue as one on which the DUP was vulnerable and an area in which they could make inroads into the DUP support base.

"So the DUP leader tacked and changed course in response to all this. Hardliners within the party will now lose their fear of him, and push for a further toughening in the DUP position. Rival unionist parties

have seen cracks appearing in his leadership and want to drive wedges into them. Sinn Fein denounces his decision as 'weak' and 'cowardly' and is starting to wonder whether it can trust his word."

The important sentence in this is the one about Robinson's vulnerability over the Victims issue. It is here that the rejectionist Unionists (i.e. most Unionists) scented blood and the opportunity to 'Get Robinson' and thereby undermine the functional coalition with Sinn Fein and pull down the Good Friday arrangement completely.

It is said that Republican "*insensitivity*" pushed Robinson into this change of course but the issues that Loyalists had found "*insensitive*" had all occurred previous to June 2013, when Robinson continued his support of the Long Kesh Peace against Unionist detractors. And the Castleberg march occurred after Robinson had written his 13 page letter from America.

So the pivotal event in the U-turn must have been the Unionist victory over 'Anne's Law' that occurred in June. From then Robinson maintained an ominous silence.

The scent of blood leads back to 'Anne's Law' and the non-sensical behaviour in the South, aimed at undermining Gerry Adams and Sinn Fein through the use of Victims (e.g. the Miriam O'Callaghan interview etc.), which sent out a message to those wishing to bring down the 1998 settlement that this was acceptable and mainstream politics across the island.

What we have seen lately is a shattering of the continuum painstakingly built up in order to transfer War into Peace. 'Anne's Law' signalled to rejectionist Unionism that they were onto a winner with the Victims. And the fundamentalists have scurried like rats leaving a sinking ship away from Robinson.

Unionists will be Unionists and sensing there is an alternative to the hated peace deal with Sinn Fein the DUP rank and file are now looking for it.

The Balance of Power shifted with 'Anne's Law', as we predicted a couple of months ago in this publication. Up to that point a functional agreement and relationship had been constructed between the DUP and Sinn Fein under Paisley and Robinson. Then the Victims issue made a significant in-road into the Nationalist Bloc, scattering the SDLP. The Unionist Bloc achieved its first significant victory in years, the Peace Process was breached and the fundamentalists went streaming through.

After Robinson's U-turn the SDLP leader who supported 'Anne's Law', Alasdair McDonnell, said:

"This U-turn on the Maze is very obviously influenced by a decision to play to the gallery of unionist extremism. It is evident that from America, Peter Robinson saw the loyalist mob violence in Belfast city centre at the weekend and decided that he would use the Maze site as a means of appeasing this minority. It is clear that Peter Robinson also felt the pressure of the TUV leader Jim Allister and needed to appease him also. We are walking ourselves into a political crisis" (Newsletter 16.8.13).

McDonnell did not give any credit to Allister's victory or 'Anne's Law' which he facilitated, of course. But it was all thanks to the success of the TUV—the one-man opposition at Stormont Jim Allister—in using Anne Travers to lever the SDLP away from the Nationalist Bloc that the flood-gates were opened.

After Robinson's U-turn Allister welcomed the change describing it as "*a monumental climbdown*" and "*seismic*": He is cited in the *Newsletter* as follows:

"The logic of Mr Robinson's analysis of how Sinn Fein is still wedded to justifying terror leads to the obvious question of why he still sustains them in Government?" he asked. Patently, OFMDFM [Office of First Minister and Deputy First Minister] is and will be in disarray over the Maze, which, of course, typifies the paralysis and dysfunctionality at the heart and top of this failed Government" (Newsletter 16.8.13).

That makes it pretty clear what the ultimate objective of the promoters of Victims are about.

There are indications that Peter Robinson wrote another letter to the members of his party, describing what they had agreed with Sinn Fein on Long Kesh. Some journalists have suggested that this was on the lines of a "*back me or sack a letter*". It seems that the DUP fundamentalists were of a mind to call his bluff.

There are strong rumours going about that Robinson is about to step down and go the way of all the Protestant middle class—off to their businesses. Unionism is being left to a rag-bag of 'fleg protesters', Orange sectarians, Willie Frazer's wild men, and Racialist blow-ins from the 'mainland'.

Obviously, this has the potential to fundamentally alter the relationship between the DUP and Sinn Fein and to sharpen the conflict which Robinson managed to blunt.

On BBC Radio Ulster Jeffrey Donaldson, the UUP blow-in and 'Victim's Spokesperson', said that the DUP had listened to those who matter, whom he defined as "*relatives of the security forces and innocent victims*"—emphasising whom he thought was a Victim and who wasn't, who was Special enough.

Perhaps Donaldson felt that this all too obviously meant Protestant victims, so he then mentioned Anne Travers (of Anne's Law) had emailed the DUP to congratulate them on bringing down the Long Kesh Deal with Sinn Fein. He said it in such a way that it was clear he was thanking the Taig that helped them get one over on the Fenians as an Honorary Victim (The Taig was very important in breaching the Nationalist Bloc because the SDLP felt they could not ignore her as they could ignore Prod Victims.)

But which Victim should determine politics? Alan McBride, whose wife and father-in-law were killed in the IRA's Shankill bomb said:

"I have always felt the story of the Maze prison should be told, it is right that it is told—it happened... For me the question wasn't about should a peace centre be built at the Maze/Long Kesh or not, it's how it was going to be done and how the story was going to be told. I think the story can be told with sensitivity. People could visit and they could make their own minds up about what went on here. I don't think it needs to be the coat-trailing triumphalist sort of shrine that people are talking about. I think the scaremongers have won the day".

Is Alan McBride a lesser Victim than Anne Travers—it seems he is!

Donaldson said that a number of events had hardened the DUP against the Long Kesh project, including the taking away of their flag from City Hall and the "*insensitive*" Tyrone Volunteers march in Castledearg. But what is clear is that a momentum has built up over Special Victims that has shaken the functional coalition between the DUP and Sinn Fein.

In relation to the Castledearg march when asked by Stephen Nolan how Republicans could commemorate their War dead Donaldson refused to answer. The ex-UUP man probably had to think how the DUP would expect him to answer this tricky question and he stumbled. Nolan continued to press him asking him if they should do it "*privately, within the privacy of their own homes*". Donaldson replied that that would be a good idea. Nolan then asked him if there was any way in which it would be acceptable for Republicans to

commemorate their War dead in public. Donaldson refused to answer.

One pertinent question from all of this is whether the Victims will have the power to re-start the War? In other words will their new prominence in political decision-making result in the creation of new victims? Will the Victims be used to victimise the survivors of the War?

Dissident Republicanism has proved itself incapable of substantial activity as yet but the course of events may give it another innings yet. In the recent march to commemorate the anniversary of Internment, that was blocked by Loyalists from going along its lawful route, substantial numbers of people along the Falls came

out and cheered the marchers. A band stopped outside the Felons Club in Andersonstown to play the tune '*Take it Down from the Mast Irish Traitors*' to the ex-prisoners within. And Anti-Internment bonfires went up for the first time in 25 years, since the Feile an Phobail was instituted as part of the winding down of the War to end the annual conflicts on 9th August.

Unionists seem to be happier with War and Victims than with peace—a peace that they were losing.

But what will Dublin and the SDLP do if it all starts to fall apart now after all the years of trying to put it together?

Pat Walsh

What The Minister Said: *reply to a vile accusation*

(Or, why didn't he just pick up a phone?)

The August *Irish Political Review* contains a "*Letter to the Editor*" from Joe Keenan that consists of a possibly libellous accusation that, in an article in a previous issue, I ascribed statements to a Minister for which there is not alone no evidence but which are actually contradictory of the very speech to which I claim to be referring. In other words, that I was lying.

At the end of my article, '*Merkel and the export of Industrial Democracy*' (*Irish Political Review*, April 2013), I had written:

"And another good listener [to Merkel's proposal that other countries adopt the German dual system of apprenticeship training—POC] seems to be our own Minister for Social Protection, Joan Burton TD. At the biennial "Social Inclusion Forum" on 26th March she laid out her perspective on the Youth Guarantee programme she intends to launch. She said that an essential tool in combating youth unemployment was a properly developed vocational education system, and for this she would not be looking to Britain but to the dual system that had proven so successful in Germany and Austria." [emphasis added—POC].

Keenan in his '*Letter*' insinuates that this is a fabrication on my part. He says:

"... it turns out that nothing in the official Labour Party report of its Coalition Minister's speech on March 26th bears any resemblance to Philip's report of it ... Not a word about the need for '*a properly developed vocational education system*', nothing at all about

that system having to be developed along German and Austrian as against British lines. Nothing at all in fact about '*her perspective on the Youth Guarantee programme she intends to launch*'. Just the usual old Joan Burton using her fifteen minutes at the Croke Park Conference Centre to deliver herself of the usual old platitudes about '*workfare*'."

In a resounding conclusion Joe mellows somewhat, stating: "*I'm sure there is some simple explanation of all these discrepancies, which I will be very happy to hear.*"

* * *

For starters, I must assure readers who to date have trusted in the integrity and honesty of what I write of the following:

1. Minister Burton's remarks as reported by me were indeed said by her in front of an audience I believe of around 100 people;
2. While I did not attend the meeting myself, several people who did attend it and with whom I work closely in a campaigning social policy organisation, reported back her comments exactly as I describe them;
3. Well before I read Keenan's letter, I had been positively surprised at the Minister's comments myself, and had had her office contacted to seek elaboration of her "*remarks about the German apprenticeship system, which*

is not covered in the short summary speech on her website."

4. In ensuing email exchanges—which I can only marginally cite here so as not to breach any confidences—it was stated that:

a. The Minister did indeed speak along the lines I reported, and while "we didn't provide that part of the script" an effort would be made to see if "a fuller version" of the speech might be available;

b. The Minister, as in this case, I was told, often departs in her speeches from official scripts, and formal scripts are anyway briefer than what she actually says;

c. "This is a theme on which she spoke on a few occasions."

d. The Minister's views would be forthcoming and would be forwarded to me.

Unfortunately that is where the matter rested. I imagine that this has something to do with the political no-no of one Minister trespassing on the turf of another, pronouncing on important policy matters that are the preserve of other Departments or Ministers. Joan Burton is *Minister for Social Protection* while apprenticeship policy is very strictly the responsibility of the *Minister for Education and Skills*, currently Ruairi Quinn, also of Labour.

But I can now verify that, as indicated to me by the Department official, Minister Burton has indeed spoken on other occasions on the issue in question in a way that is totally consistent with her later remarks to the Social Inclusion Forum as reported by me.

For example, in the "official script" of a speech entitled '*An Active Approach to Tackling Youth Unemployment*' to a prestigious international OECD Conference in Dublin on 13th October 2011, she both identifies the unacceptable weaknesses of the British system of apprenticeship training and states her belief that Ireland had "much to learn" from the German, Dutch and Austrian systems, but particularly the German one :

"With the transfer of the training functions of FAS to the new Solas agency under the Department of Education we must ensure that our training initiatives are as closely aligned to the needs of the labour market as possible. In particular, we should pay heed to the findings of the recent Wolf review of vocational education in the UK (*'Review of Vocational Education—The Wolf Report'*—POC), which concluded that the wrong kind of training can actually damage employment prospects. It found that almost a third of 16- to 19- year-olds in

Britain are enrolled in low-level vocational courses that have little or no labour-market value. Research indicates that taking a year or two to complete schemes of this sort reduces lifetime earnings unless the schemes are combined with employer-based apprenticeships.

"In this context, there may be much to learn from the German system of apprenticeships, where a quarter of employers provide formal apprenticeship schemes and nearly two-thirds of schoolchildren undertake some form of apprenticeship. In addition vocational students at second-level can spend up to three days a week as part-time salaried apprentices of companies for two to four years, with the cost shared between the company and government. It is common for apprenticeships to turn into jobs at the end of the training, with the result that the youth-unemployment rate in Germany, at 9.5%, is one of the lowest in the EU. Apprenticeship schemes in the Netherlands and Austria have borne similar results. (www.welfare.ie/en/pressoffice/Pages/An-Active-Approach-to-Tackling-Youth-Unemployment-Speech-b.aspx.)

As Joe would say, "there you have it".

There would seem to be support for the Minister's views elsewhere in the Labour Party. Here is the opinion of Emer Costello, Labour MEP for Dublin, as expressed in a press release dated 31st May 2013:

"We also need to strengthen the role of the European Investment Bank such as linking its loans to the creation of jobs and training places, and the development of 'dual-education' systems which combine studies with practical skills, as in Germany and Austria" (www.labour.ie/press/2013/05/31/latest-eu-unemployment-stats-confirm-positive-iris/) .

Views from industry advocating the introduction of a German style system have been heard frequently in recent days too. A former Assistant Director General of FÁS wrote in an opinion piece recently for *The Irish Times* that "there should be a major expansion in Ireland of the apprenticeship approach of learning while earning to other job roles, similar to that in Germany and to the recent initiatives in the UK" (*Irish Times*, online ed., 31.07.2013). Glen Dimplex is one of the most successful Irish manufacturing firms exporting worldwide. Amongst its many subsidiaries abroad (including China) is one in Bavaria which employs 900 workers and trains 44 apprentices each year from the factory floor to the back office:

"... [its] apprentices work for up to 3.5 years and earn up to €1,000 a month. At the end they have a recognised qualification and a good chance of being taken

on by the company ... Sean O'Driscoll, chief executive of Glen Dimplex, is 'impressed by what he sees at his Bavarian subsidiary' and 'would love to see the dual training system as one of the reforms in the [Irish] action plan for 2014'..." (*Irish Times* online, 01.07.2013).

The German-Irish Chamber of Industry and Commerce (AHK)—in a dual role as a voice of both German industry in Ireland and Irish industry involved in Germany—has been trying to promote the dual system with Irish employers and the Department of Education:

"AHK chairman Ralf Lissek says Irish companies have difficulty understanding the dual system's core principle: for companies to get the workers, they have to design the training course themselves, not buy it off the peg. *'In Government there is talk that the dual system is a priority* but, a year after we made our submissions, nothing has yet materialised,' he said." (ibid.—emphasis added—POC).

Similar ideas have also been impressing themselves on Mr. Eoghan Harris, whose *Sunday Independent* column of 18th August was titled 'German-style apprenticeship system is what our youth need' and in which he praised the German apprenticeship model.

I can also confirm that the Minister actually responsible for the Irish apprenticeship system, Ruairi Quinn (Labour), is currently indeed carrying out a thorough review of the Irish apprenticeship system with a view to its substantial reform. According to the AHK the Government regarded "the dual system is a priority". Whether the outcome of the review will reflect this "priority" and accord with the stated preferences of Joan Burton and Emer Costello remains to be seen, although it must be said that the Labour Party has a good record on VET reforms over the years. But this is what Quinn is reported to have stated:

"the market-driven approach to apprenticeship recruitment should be retained. The State should only financially support the off-the-job training/education of apprentices up to a certain recruitment cap, and beyond that the industry or individual firm should be responsible" (*Irish Times* online, 31.07.2013).

I would also point out to Joe, who in his time made an outstanding contribution to British trade union politics, that the ICTU has expressed opinions on this issue too. In early 2012 it published a document arguing that the Irish apprenticeship system, under European influence, had

already developed in a far more progressive direction than the British one, and proposing its further reform along the lines of "best practice in the smaller member states of the EU such as the Netherlands or the Scandinavian countries". It also states:

"These examples show a continuum of practice ranging from the Austrian system, which is very similar to general practice, through two Scandinavian models with their greater involvement of the state to the Dutch model with a greater emphasis on a market driven approach. What all these models have in common is a strong involvement of employers and unions in VET institutions. There is a danger lest our Anglophone habits of looking first at UK institutions would lead us to place an excessive reliance on an approach which is seen as problematic by most UK commentators and which would be seen as having led to the UK being described as being in a low skilled equilibrium." (ICTU, *A New Skills Policy for a New Economy*, p. 23, emphasis added—PO'C).

Now, as regards Joe's rejection of my view that Germany has been showing an interest in exporting its dual system, *The Irish Times* reported on 1st July (online ed.): "Chancellor Angela Merkel has invited EU leaders, including Taoiseach Enda Kenny, for a meeting aimed at regaining control of the losing battle against youth unemployment." At the meeting in Berlin that followed:

"German chancellor Angela Merkel said ... that youth unemployment was the biggest crisis facing Europe and urged other governments to do more to copy the German system—concentrating on apprenticeships and not simply academic study—to prevent the emergence of a "lost generation". She said her country's tried-and-tested dual system—a mix of classroom learning and on-the-job work experience—was the best way forward at a time when almost six million under-25s in Europe are out of work" (*The Irish Times*, 11th July, emphasis added—PO'C).

In fact the German Government has made funding available to develop trial dual system apprenticeship systems in Italy, Spain and Greece. I will leave the reader to trace suitable quotes to prove this and in the meantime hope that s/he will trust the integrity of this assertion by the current writer that this is in fact the case.

A final word: Joe hoped that there was a "simple explanation for all these discrepancies" in my original article. What mystifies me is that, when I was informed that he had found certain alleged "dis-

crepancies" and was preparing a refutation of my claims, I let him know, through the editor of the IPR, that there certainly was a "simple explanation" for his misconceptions. I described briefly for his information what had occurred at the Social Inclusion Forum and this information, I believe, was passed on to him. Surely if he had had any remaining doubts he could have picked up a phone!

I think from all the above that it can fairly be said:

1. That Joan Burton certainly holds the views I ascribed to her;
2. That I have confirmed that she did indeed say the comments I reported her as having said at the Social Inclusion Forum;
3. That she also has expressed similar views on other occasions;
4. That positive views of the German dual system are increasingly to be heard from progressive manufacturing employers and commentators in Ireland;
5. That the ICTU has proposed reforms of the Irish system, admittedly not specifically along the lines of the German system, but certainly along those of "the

Netherlands or the Scandinavian countries", which are essentially similar;

6. That a full review and restructuring of the Irish apprenticeship system is actually currently underway, and that this review is considering proposals and apparently even giving "priority" to reforming the system more towards a German/Austrian model;
7. That Angela Merkel and Minister van der Leyen have called for a European initiative to expand the dual system to other countries of the EU, have put resources into doing so and have expressed their views in this respect to Irish Government leaders, all of which would seem to me to be clear evidence of a German interest in exporting its apprenticeship model.
8. That Joe should make more use of the telephone when he thinks the author of an article might be fabricating evidence rather than gushing into print in a most inadvisable way.

I hope that this statement, for the record, dispels the accusations against the integrity of my writing contained in Joe Keenan's rather nasty "letter".

Philip O'Connor

Straw says nuclear deal with Iran was scuppered by the US in 2005

"I'm absolutely convinced that we can do business with Dr Rouhani, because we did do business with Dr Rouhani, and had it not been for major problems within the US administration under President Bush, we could have actually settled the whole Iran nuclear dossier back in 2005, and we probably wouldn't have had President Ahmadinejad as a consequence of the failure as well."

Those are the words of Jack Straw, speaking on the BBC Radio 4 Today programme on 3rd August 2013, the day that Hassan Rouhani was inaugurated as president of Iran.

Straw was UK Foreign Secretary from 2001 to 2006 and took part in negotiations with Rouhani in the period 2003-5, when he was the head of Iran's nuclear negotiating team.

In this period, Iran was actively engaged in negotiations with Britain, France and Germany (aka EU3) about a range of issues including its nuclear programme.

According to Straw today, these talks could have been successful "had it not been for major problems within the US administration under President Bush", that is, the inflexibility which stood in the way of an agreement in 2005 lay in Washington and not in Tehran.

This isn't news to anybody who has a passing familiarity with these negotiations—the blunt truth is that they foundered because the US insisted that Iran must not have uranium enrichment facilities on its own soil in any circumstances, and the EU3 bowed to this diktat from Washington.

What is news is that the leading British player in these negotiations, Jack Straw, has now acknowledged publicly that the intransigence that caused the negotiations to founder lay in Washington and not in Tehran. The message we have continually heard from the US and its allies—including Britain—is that Iran was intransigent then on the nuclear issue and continues to be intransigent today—and that is what is standing in the way of a settlement. What Jack Straw is saying is that this message pumped out from Washington and London

To page 8, column 1

Shorts

from
the Long Fellow

KENNY'S BETRAYAL

The revelations in the *Sunday Independent* (21.7.13) of Enda Kenny's contact with senior executives of Anglo-Irish Bank do not reflect well on the Taoiseach. They come just two months after he denounced the "axis of collusion between Fianna Fáil and Anglo bankers".

In all the tapes and documents revealed by the *Sunday Independent* there is no evidence of any inappropriate contacts between senior Fianna Fáil politicians (unless Beverley Flynn can be considered "senior") and Anglo bankers.

But can the same be said of Fine Gael?

Kenny made contact with the bank in the months following the Bank Guarantee. The country was in the midst of an economic crisis. The FF-led Government decided that the Opposition should be briefed. The crisis was so grave that party politics were to be suspended.

The emails of Anglo's Chief Financial Officer Matt Moran show that, at a time when statesmanship was called for, Kenny could not rise above the parish pump. Moran, who is from Castlebar, the same town as Kenny, was briefed by Kenny on Fianna Fáil led Government strategy on two occasions in November 2008.

How did Kenny respond to the implication that he was briefing Anglo Irish bank against the Government at a key period in the financial crisis? The sole response from Kenny was:

IRAN continued

for the past decade is essentially untrue.

This is a staggering assertion coming from the leading British player in these negotiations. The failure to take advantage of Iran's flexibility in 2005 and reach a settlement on the nuclear issue (and perhaps a great deal more besides) has had enormous consequences, ending up with ferocious economic sanctions being imposed on Iran by the US and Iranians dying for want of lifesaving drugs. All this despite the fact that Iran doesn't possess any nuclear weapons and, according to US Intelligence, hasn't got an active nuclear weapons programme and hasn't had one for a decade.

"Any contacts between Fine Gael and the banks during the banking crisis were aimed at highlighting the impact that the continuing uncertainty about the banking system and its impact on credit availability was having on businesses and jobs" (*Sunday Independent*, 21.7.13).

In fact he was revealing to Anglo-Irish Bank the Government's strategy as it unfolded. This information was not available to the public. It does not appear that he was making any attempt to ascertain Anglo-Irish Bank's strategy. The information flow was all one way.

Kenny told the *Sunday Independent* that he would not be adding to that statement. How pathetic!

THE QUINN FAMILY

The Long Fellow cannot claim to know who leaked the Anglo documents and tapes to the *Independent* Group of newspapers, but it has been suggested that the Quinn family had access to the information as a result of its legal dispute with the IBRC.

It is also noteworthy that on the Miriam O'Callaghan show the *Irish Independent* journalist Paul Williams expressed the view that the Quinn family was somehow hard done by. It is difficult to see how.

It could be said that Anglo lent 2.34 billion euro to Quinn to enable him to support the Anglo share price, but if such an arrangement existed he was complicit in it. However, it is unclear when Anglo's Board became aware of the extent of Quinn's investment in the bank because he had concealed his ownership of shares by means of 'Contracts for Difference'.

Once Anglo became aware of Quinn's involvement, it was anxious to reduce its exposure to Quinn and facilitated the offloading of his shares to the so-called Maple 10 group of investors, which had the effect of reducing Quinn's losses.

REASONS TO BE MISERABLE?

In an interesting article Dan O'Brien apologized in advance for the depressing economic data he was about to discuss (*The Irish Times*, 1.8.13). But it was difficult to know why such an apology was necessary.

The numbers receiving Unemployment Benefit have reduced from almost 450,000 in mid 2011 to less than 420,000 in July of this year. This reduction cannot be explained by emigration. The numbers in employment have increased. Also, the numbers in full-time education are at record levels (is that such a bad thing).

The cause of O'Brien's depression seems to be the level of retail sales which remains

low. But in trying to explain this he comes up with some remarkable statistics. According to the Central Bank, households have collectively paid off a massive (net) 40 billion euro (about a quarter of national income) in debt over the past half decade, while adding around 8 billion to the aggregate amount they have sitting in bank accounts over the same five-year period.

Since the onset of the crisis we have been told that this is a balance sheet recession; that economic activity has been constrained by the accumulation of private and public debt. It appears that the problem of excessive private debt has been addressed. In the years to come economic growth will be on a sustainable basis.

O'Brien rounds off his article by decrying the "ongoing and still marked fall in lending to companies". However, there are numerous ways of looking at this and not all of them bad. The banks claim that the demand for credit has decreased. Could it be that companies like households are paying back excessive debt?

In the past few years there has undoubtedly been a shortage of credit. It has not been simply that the banks don't want to lend, they have not had the capital to do so as a result of the losses incurred following the bursting of the property bubble. However, the Irish banks look like they will return to profitability in 2014. The increase in savings is another reason to believe that more credit will be available.

Cheer up, Dan!

POLITICAL NERVES?

The State has made significant progress in reducing the budget deficit. Three-quarters of the fiscal adjustment achieved since 2008 was as a result of the budgets of the previous Government. The current Government, notwithstanding its electoral promises, has continued those policies. Up until now it has been able to blame the previous Government and the Troika, but after two years it finds it has some room to manoeuvre. The planned adjustment of 3.1 billion euro will bring the deficit down to 4.3% in 2014. This is below the Troika target of 5.1% of GDP. The Labour Party has suggested that all the Government need to do is achieve 5.1%.

We have been here before! In the mid 1980s Labour and Fine Gael policies cancelled each other out and as a result the recession of that decade lasted longer than was necessary.

From 2008 the Fianna Fáil-led Government tackled the budget deficit in a decisive manner and thus averted a catastrophe of Greek proportions. Is the current Government now going to repeat the mistakes of

the 1980s?

It looks like the Government, in particular the Labour component, is suffering a failure of political nerve. In political terms, as well as economic, it would make sense to front-load the fiscal adjustment so that the budget before the next election can be relatively benign. The only effect of postponing tough decisions is to drag out the pain. The experience of the 1980s was that a failure to tackle the budget deficit did not give a "boost to the economy". It had the opposite effect. Investment decisions were postponed because people could see that the crisis had not been addressed and therefore they lacked confidence in the future—an essential requirement for investment under capitalism.

STIMULUS PACKAGE

A deficit of 5.1% means that, unless the nominal GDP rises by more than that percentage (an extremely unlikely scenario) the ratio of the Government debt

to GDP will continue to rise. It is now at over 120% of GDP. As the GDP-debt ratio climbs, an increasing proportion of Government spending is taken up with interest costs. That is not sustainable. If there is an opportunity to decrease the current budget deficit sooner rather than later, it should not be spurned.

Any stimulus will have one of two effects. The first possible effect will be that the private sector will use the extra money in the economy to pay down debt. What is the benefit of this? The effect will be an increase in public debt while private debt will reduce. But as has been shown earlier, private debt has already been reducing, while public debt continues to escalate. What purpose will be served by accentuating this trend?

A second possible effect is that private consumption will increase. The proponents of a stimulus package believe (apparently) that an increase in consumption will

somehow call forth an increase in economic activity. This might be the case in a relatively closed economy like the United States, but in a small open economy the most likely effect is an increase in imports and a reversal of the impressive fiscal adjustment that has been achieved.

Up until now there has been a grudging consensus on the necessity of correcting the public finances. The Labour Party is in danger of breaking that consensus. The momentum generated by the previous Government could be dissipated. We may be heading for a period of political and economic stagnation in which concessions to Labour on public expenditure are matched by the Fine Gael preference of tax relief for the so-called 'coping classes'.

If that happens, the current Government cannot blame either Fianna Fáil or the Troika for the damaging consequences. It will only have itself to blame.

Don't Mention the War

Don't mention the War—the Twenty Eight Year one, that is. That is the message coming from the British Secretary of State, Theresa Villiers, who made an unprecedented intervention in trying to halt an "insensitive" march in 'Northern Ireland'.

There are hundreds of "insensitive" marches held across the Six Counties every year. The vast majority of them are organised by the Orange institutions. They are dealt with by the Parades Commission and do not attract the attention of the British Secretary of State who does not ordinarily have powers in the matter. As the Secretary of State said herself:

"On the issue of legal powers to ban the parade, these are restricted and narrowly defined. The criteria set out in legislation that would enable me to intervene are not satisfied in this case. I realise that will disappoint many but I am bound by the law."

But she still insisted on singling out one march, to commemorate The Tyrone Volunteers of the Republican Army, held in Castlederg this year, as "insensitive", despite its abiding by all the rules laid down by the Parades Commission and being very sensitive toward the feelings of local Protestants.

It subsequently passed off entirely peacefully.

It seems that it is "insensitive" for Cath-

olics to commemorate those who gave their lives to transform the position of their community for the better.

It might be said that this is not the point—that there are many Castlederg Protestants who lost friends and families at the hands of the Republican Army. Castlederg is very much a frontier town in which a high proportion of Protestants took it to be their duty to defend the frontier within their local militias (Specials/UDR) and Police (RUC) and resist the transformation of the Catholic community.

A reading of *Lost Lives* gives an indication of fatalities in the Castlederg area from 1971-94: The IRA killed 13 members of the UDR; 4 RUC and 1 UFF. 5 members of the IRA were killed. Loyalists killed 2 members of Sinn Féin and 2 Catholic civilians. 2 Protestant civilians died; 1 worked for a building company rebuilding military installations who was regarded as a 'legitimate target' by Republicans; and a Protestant woman died of a heart attack after a nearby explosion. The IRA apologised for killing 2 members of the security forces who had recently left the UDR and RUC.

That seems to have been a clean war on all accounts—much cleaner than the type of wars that are engaged in by the UK and

US across the world, where high levels of civilians are killed without a thought.

Professor Henry Patterson has recently had published a very expensive, grant-aided book, book called *Ireland's Violent Frontier*. At the launch of this book Prof. Patterson said:

"I wanted to write about the Border, the problems of North-South security co-operation and the terrible price which Border Protestant communities paid for it because it's a crucial but largely ignored story... It's very common in literature on Northern Ireland and the Troubles to see it largely in terms of a dominant Protestant majority and a Catholic minority, but in the Border areas it was the Protestants who were in the minority and who suffered for it. It has been ignored in large part because it does not fit into the 'oppressive Protestants/oppressed Catholics' dichotomy.

"It is also one where a brutal sectarian dimension of the Provisionals is undeniable: the relentless bombing of Protestant businesses, the burning of farms, the shooting up of farmhouses to force the occupants out and the relentless campaign to kill Protestants in and out of uniform. The Provos said and still say that they were killed for the uniform they wore and not for their religion but a good number of Protestants were killed who had left the UDR and others were killed who had never been in the security forces" (Sunday Independent, 23.3.13).

The Border was, of course, a revolutionary British imposition on Ireland made in 1920/1. From the start the British

required the local Protestant inhabitants of the area to maintain it and police the Catholic inhabitants that found themselves trapped on the wrong side of it. In many Border areas Catholics were in the majority—but Catholic West and South Tyrone, Fermanagh and South Armagh were still required to submit to it.

Professor Patterson seems to think that being a minority in itself is a cause for sympathy—so we can sympathise with a local minority ruling over the majority through force and repression and develop a guilt complex about what happened to them in performing this function, when the majority had had enough.

The local Protestant casualties of the War came about through two factors: The British Government establishing a Border close to Castleberg and handed over the task of patrolling that Border and policing the Catholics within it to local Protestants. That was to be their job in perpetuity. And some others engaged in voluntary "*vermin extermination*" as part of an active UVF unit in the Castleberg area (as a note published in *The Irish News*, 22.1.77, to a local Catholic victim of loyalists put it).

Secondly, after the intervention of the British Army to curb the Catholic insurrection of August 1969, Whitehall decided to pursue a policy of 'Ulsterisation' or Re-Ulsterisation, as it should be more accurately called, to place local Protestants back in the front line against the Republican War that the Republican Army was attempting to fight against the British State.

It was a cunning Whitehall plan to deprive the IRA of British targets and set the Ulster Protestants up between the Republican struggle and the British State. And its major consequence was to create local Protestant victims who could be used to elicit guilt complexes during and after the War.

Secretary of State Theresa Villiers wanted the Castleberg event to be cancelled:

"I know the deep pain this parade will cause the families of victims in West Tyrone area and the rest of Northern Ireland... This parade is damaging to community relations and even at this late stage I would call upon the organisers to think again and call it off..."

But perhaps if British Secretaries of State had been more concerned with preventing local pain and poor community relations in 'Northern Ireland' they would have used their own army to sustain casualties so that when the War was over it could leave without the prolongation of these issues.

But the good of the people of 'Northern Ireland' never was a consideration of the British Government. We have the existence of 'Northern Ireland' to show that.

Britain has fought many wars, for many reasons, against many enemies, right across the world. Very few of these wars were necessary. But it is not permitted to be "*sensitive*" about commemorating them or those who fought in them.

Northern Catholics engaged in two Wars of great significance—one that they are given every encouragement to commemorate these days and the other that they are told to forget.

But it is the one that they are given great encouragement in commemorating that they would be better off forgetting and the one that they have been told to forget that they have every right to commemorate.

Even though they took place a half a century apart they are inextricably linked for Northern Catholics. The first, The Great War, resulted in a catastrophe for them. After being encouraged to support a war for small nations and self-determination by Joe Devlin and their other leaders and volunteering in their thousands for it they found themselves cheated, cut off from the rest of their Nation and subordinated in perpetuity to those who had prevented the small measure of devolution, Irish Home Rule, they had requested.

The rapid disillusionment of the Northern Catholics with the Great War they fought is expressed in the *Irish News*, the paper with Joe Devlin on the Board, which had war-mongered with the best of them, but which could see that it had all been a con a year after it finished.

It was evident in the *Irish News*' reaction to the first ever Armistice Day. The heading of its editorial was *NO ARMISTICE HERE!* :

"Tuesday next, November 11th, being the first anniversary of the Armistice between Germany and the Allied Powers, we are all royally requested to stand stock still as Lots wife in the desert... and devote 'the brief space of two minutes' to pious meditation on the end of the Great War. But how can a man, woman and, or child in Ireland fulfil the royal behest without self-conscious hypocrisy. The war on the French and Belgian front was ended at 'the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month', 1918. Hostilities on the Irish front are conducted by the Government with more virulence than ever a year after the date of the Continental Armistice. 'I believe' wrote the King in the document published yesterday, 'that my people in every part of the Empire fervently wish to perpetuate the memory of that Great Deliverance and of those

who laid down their lives to achieve it'. Amongst those who died to defeat the Germans were scores of thousands of Irish Nationalists. But many Nationalist soldiers, who fought as gallantly as their comrades who died, have returned; and we doubt whether there is one amongst the survivors to whom the appeal from Buckingham Palace will not come as a mockery and taunt. Those Irish soldiers went out to the fields of slaughter freely, not as conscripts but as enthusiastic volunteers, to fight and shed their blood for the 'rights and liberties of small nations'. Thousands of the bravest of them fell. The thousands who escaped came home to find their own small nation betrayed, crushed under a juggernaut of Coercion, denied the slightest gleam of the rights and liberties secured by their valour and self-sacrifice for the Poles and Estonians, Croats, Czecho-Slovaks and Jugo-Slavs, overridden by an Ascendancy whose rampant intolerance has increased rather than diminished since the 17th century, and not only debarred from political freedom but threatened with economic destruction.

"We know from the reports of their meetings published in our columns how the Veterans of the Great War feel in Belfast and the North of Ireland; we have seen it stated recently on the authority of an English correspondent that the men who fought the Germans to the last gasp and who returned to the South and West of Ireland are now members of the Sinn Fein organisation and active drill-masters amongst the Irish Volunteers. This statement may be misleading, or exaggerated, or accurate: in any case it is certain that not an Irish Nationalist ex-soldier in this country or Great Britain thinks of his experiences and the net result of his work on Europe's battlefields with any other feeling than bitterness deep and enduring.

"We are asked to stand still 'so that the thoughts of everyone may be concentrated on reverent remembrance of the Glorious Dead'. The two minutes of profound stillness will be given to thoughts of what William H. Redmond and Thomas M. Kettle would say had they lived to see the Ireland of their love in the position to which British statesmanship has brought it a year after the last shots were exchanged between Germany and the Allies..."

"No matter how the anniversary of the Armistice in Europe may be celebrated in free countries, the battle on the Irish front proceeds without suggestion of Armistice from Whitehall or Dublin Castle..." (IN 8.11.19)

Elsewhere, in the same edition, the *Irish News* published the thoughts of "*an Irish ex-soldier*" who "*pictures the thoughts of all Nationalists*" regarding the Armistice commemorations of the Great War in Britain and Ireland. The former soldier wrote:

"There is no armistice or no peace for Ireland. Thousands of Irish Nationalists who fought through the Great War will breathe a prayer for their comrades dead today; they will also mutter a curse that they ever left the home shores...."

"Death might have been easier... but they lived, and came home—to suffer more. One thousand of them walk their native Belfast streets to-day—turned from the workshops and the foundries—told to 'go elsewhere' out of 'loyal' Belfast if they want to exercise the right to work.

"That is their reward; and mighty England doesn't care, for England's hour of need has passed. And what of Willie Redmond and Tom Kettle and all the rest?... They died for Ireland... we will give them all a thought to-day. Perhaps it is better that they did not live to see the evil which British treachery has wrought."

The Great War was a totally unnecessary war for Northern Catholics. They killed Germans, Turks and others for nothing and they died for nothing. The Twenty Eight Year War raised their position immeasurably, turning them from a sullen and bitter people to a self-confident achieving community. And it was a necessary war.

It was necessary because it proved to be the only means of addressing their political predicament, which had all kinds of implications for other aspects of their lives—social and economic.

Many other ways were attempted before Northern Catholics were provoked into insurrection and then supported a Twenty Eight Year War until it transformed their position.

After Irish devolution was defeated by Unionism and they found themselves trapped within the Six County entity they put their faith in Michael Collins. But Collins, after taking the Northern Catholics in hand and turning the North into a battleground, was ground down by the Treaty he signed and he left them in the lurch to fight his 'Civil War'. His much promised Border Commission, which should have placed Tyrone in the Free State, turned into a fiasco.

Then De Valera insisted in keeping Northerners at arm's length, out of his party when they wished to join it, and out of all influence within the Southern State, in order to prevent them being used as a lever against independence.

And in August 1969 Lynch let them down in the vital hour after promising not to 'stand idly by'.

At the same time the British State

prevented them from breaking out of their predicament through the party politics of the State. It denied them the politics open to the Irish everywhere else in the State and insisted they engage in the local communal conflict instead. And Westminster denied their representatives a say through its use of parliamentary 'convention' and refused to address their moderate demands for Civil Rights in order to retain the detachment that had been put in place in 1920-1.

So after the insurrection of August 1969 there had to be War to get out of the predicament. And the War had to be kept up until there was some chance of it addressing the predicament. And so it was supported through thick and thin.

There can be little doubt now that the Northern Catholics knew what they were doing when they stood by the new Republican Army that formed itself in their midst. And things were never the same again, just as they hope.

I recently came across a reference to a Stormont Green Paper of October 1971, from the Faulkner term of office. It suggested something revolutionary after 50 years of Stormont and one year of Republican War:

"It may be argued by some that a permanent majority/minority situation creates problems for the smooth operation of the democratic process. In many ways the British democratic system, with its virtual assurance that those who control

the executive will also control the legislature, represents a much greater concentration of power than say the American system, based as it is on a deliberate diffusion and separation of powers. Between general elections the power of the British government is, in some respects, as absolute as democratic power can be, but this exercise of power is accepted by a Parliamentary minority who would know that sooner or later their turn to exercise it will come. When this expectation does not exist, there is clearly a risk of disenchantment with the democratic, parliamentary process. Because of this, it has been argued in some quarters that means must be found to give 'the minority' in Northern Ireland a share in the effective exercise of power. The Government believes that this important issue should be openly and dispassionately considered by Parliament and public..." (Stormont in Crisis, p. 152)

On the day after the publication of the Green Paper the first and only Catholic, G.B. Newe, joined a Stormont Cabinet, under Faulkner.

Four months earlier the Stormont Parliament celebrated its 50th Anniversary. In 50 years of 'constitutional' politics the Nationalists failed to alter the Unionist position one inch. Within just over a year of Catholic insurrection and Provo War the Unionists were thinking unimaginable thoughts.

And it is said that those who died in that War should not be commemorated?

Pat Walsh

Another Day At Béalnabláth

The fact that Michael Collins was a Clonakilty man did not mean he had a good knowledge of the terrain in every nook and cranny of West Cork. When he first came through Béalnabláth Cross on the morning of 22nd August 1922, he proved to be of no assistance to the driver of his touring car as to what direction to take for Bandon, after they had lost sight of dispatch motorcycle rider and the Crossley tender, accompanied by a guide from Macroom, that had proceeded on ahead of them. As Meda Ryan recounted:

"When the touring car reached the crossroads (it had been some distance behind), Quinn, the driver, discovered that there were four roads radiating from this point; he had lost sight of the vehicles in front, and as any of his passengers weren't exactly sure which of the roads to the right the leading vehicles had taken, he drove across to where a man stood and

asked him the best road to Bandon. Denny Long... was a Republican scout... posted as a sentry at the crossroads because of the large number of Republican leaders who were gathered in the area for that day's meeting in Béalnabláth... Instantly he recognised Collins... (and) he quickly sent the 'intruders' on their way. 'The other lorry is gone straight ahead, and take the second cross to the right in the Newcestown direction', he said. But what Long didn't know was that further on, Kelleher (the guide) had directed Smith (the motorcyclist) to take the straight road to Bandon, not a right at the cross. When Kelleher discovered that the convoy wasn't following, he immediately sensed what had happened, so the motorcyclist and tender made an about turn at a gap in a field and headed towards Newcestown where they found... Collins reading an inscription over the door (of the Church) ... Collins raised his hand and returned to the touring car" (*The Day Michael Collins Was Shot*, 1989, pp 68-69).

Later that evening, as T. Ryle Dwyer has related:

"The convoy moved on... back by the same route through Béalnabláth, where the republicans had been waiting to ambush him throughout the day... The Free State convoy approached the ambush site. It was surrounded by hills and when the first shot was fired Dalton realised it was an ideal spot for an ambush. 'Drive like hell!' Dalton shouted, but Collins put his hand on the driver's shoulder. 'Stop!' he ordered. 'We'll fight them.'..." (*Michael Collins and the Civil War*, 2012, pp 278-9).

But, seven years previously, there had already been an assessment of Béalnabláth as a potentially treacherous ambush site. The 385 page Witness Statement delivered to the Bureau of Military History by Liam De Róiste in 1957 is particularly invaluable in being, in the main, not a 1957 retrospective at all. In fact, the bulk of it consists of a verbatim reproduction of De Róiste's own contemporary diary entries from the period under review. Liam De Róiste was a member of Dáil Éireann for Cork City from 1918 to 1923 who was to take the pro-Treaty side. Although a founding treasurer of the Irish Volunteers in Cork city, his role in the War of Independence would be political, not military. And yet, in taking part in one particular Irish Volunteers training manoeuvre, while at heart a civilian, he had enough common sense to draw a particular military conclusion. The following is the diary entry by Liam De Róiste for 25th October 1915, with Bealnablah being his spelling, but the emphases added by myself:

"Had a strenuous day yesterday with the Óglaigh at Bealnablah, near Crookstown. It was a fine, dry day with a bracing north-east wind. Part of the operations of the company to which I am attached was charging up a steep hill from the road through a furze brake, over rocky, rough, uneven ground. We were exposed to view from the top. If an 'enemy' had been there, not one of us would have escaped! But all of us reached the top. It was a fine exercise. There were men from various corps around the district taking part and a new corps for Crookstown centre itself was formed—some 80 men being put through preliminary drill, after short addresses to them by Tomás MacCurtain and Terence Mac Swiney."

Would history have been changed seven years later, if Collins had ever engaged in conversation with his Free State confederate De Róiste about the latter's Volunteer activities in 1915-16? Hardly. Collins proved to be far too headstrong and reckless even to defer to the superior military judgement of Emmet Dalton, a decision which cost him his life. Tragic, no doubt, but far more tragic had been Collins's decision to launch the Civil War in the first place, at the behest of Churchill and Lloyd George.

Manus O'Riordan

Music Review

Fred May and Dev —a very odd couple

The *Irish Times* (*Weekend Review*, 11.06.11) Radio Review (by Mick Heaney) mentioned an RTÉ Lyric FM Feature: *Sunlight And Shadow*,

"...this portrait of the composer Frederick May was a reminder... Amid the pious austerity of de Valera's Ireland, May was a marginal figure... "one, he was a composer; two, he was gay; three he was an alcoholic; and four he was deaf", recalled Garech Browne... "none of which got you very far in the Ireland of the day"."

Were deaf people the objects of particular discrimination prior to 'Celtic Tiger' Ireland? Alcoholism wasn't and, unfortunately, still isn't rare in Ireland. So far as May's sexuality is concerned, he lived in a place where an unapologetic homosexual couple, Hilton Edwards and Michael MacLiammóir, became honoured (literally —by Dublin City) citizens. As for composers, Aloys Fleishmann circumvented the alleged lack of facilities for composers in the 1930s in Cork, by the simple expedient of forming an orchestra. Fleishmann was involved in Joan Denise Moriarty's ballet company in Cork. The Cork-born Quaker Havelock Nelson set up Belfast's Studio Opera. Its orchestra still flourishes as a purely amateur group. Studio Opera experienced the tender mercies of ACNI (pron: 'acne'?) the Arts Council {of NornIrl}, and is now defunct. The Naples-born Michele Esposito set up the (semi-professional) Dublin Orchestral Players in the 1880s. The band was disbanded when the Great War 'broke out' (as the UK's Establishment likes to put it) in 1914. The Players re-formed in the 1920s. They would probably have re-formed earlier if the same UK, which had persuaded tens of thousands of Irish men to go and fight (and die) 'that small nations might be free' thought the proper response to a freely elected native Irish Government was years of terror.

An English musician (Dr.) David C.F. Wright runs www.wrightmusic.net. He is very complimentary about Irish (and Scottish and Welsh) composers (and positively libellous about his fellow Anglos). His item on May has been taken down, even though it is still billed. Dr. Wright seems to have been the only person at May's interment. He wrote that May was a victim of tinnitus and was politically an unreconstructed Unionist. He hated everything about 'de Valera's Ireland' with a venomous passion.

May's father worked for the Guinness Brewery, Dublin. As Fred lived on a private income for many years, presumably it wasn't as a draysman. May received financial help from his fellow musicians, and his and their, professional and welfare organisations. He

was a founder member of Aósdana, set up by Éire, the Irish State, to provide funding and a nexus for cross-fertilisation, for creative artists. This is not to attack Frederick May. He lived in a democracy and was entitled to any political views he chose to hold. (Assuming Dr. Wright got them right.) But his fellow citizens did not reciprocate his alienation from his surroundings. He was very kindly treated and honoured for his great talent.

Mick Heaney (or his RTÉ producers) make much of the fact that May was trained, in part, in England by Vaughan Williams. May, like Benjamin Britten, wanted to be taught by Alban Berg, in Vienna. Berg died in 1935. May was taught by his pupil Egon Wellesz. Wellesz had to leave (for, eventually, Edinburgh) after the 1938 *Anschluss*.

May would have fitted into the cosy anti-'modern' 1930s musical life of London much less comfortably than that of Dublin. (Britten's Royal College of Music tutors convinced his parents that Berg, being a Foreign Chap, would be implicitly, a 'moral' as much as musical, 'bad influence' on their son). A stream of UK composers left for the USA from the 1930s. Some, James Wilson and Archie Potter (born in Belfast raised in Bromley, educated Bristol, lived, worked, and died in Dublin), for example, left for Éire. Long before the generous tax-breaks for creative artists introduced by Haughey in the 1970s.

Seán Ó Riada has been perceived (possibly inaccurately) as the template Irish composer for some decades. His 'Eurocentric' (as he would have described it) music has been attacked as not being up to scratch by academics who admit that they have nether heard nor studied it! His scores are available in Cork University's library and there are some recordings of what he called *Nomos / Nomoi*. Ó Riada is famous for the music he put to Gael Linn's three documentary films about the lead-up to the 1916 Easter Rising, the War of Independence and the 'Civil War' (*Mise Éire*, *Saoirse*, and *An Tine Bheo*). The titles alone probably give 'Dublin 4' fits of the vapours. He set up Ceóltoiri Chualann, most of whose personnel became The Chieftains. They proceeded to bring this bog-music to, among many, many other places, the White House—and the Great Hall of the People in Beijing.

Replacing such a person with a hyper-alienated British-Loyalist is nonsensical. A problem is that there is not much of May's music. Tinnitus, alcoholism and self-criticism (he was quite as ferocious with himself as with the outside world) put paid to that. Though, just as Ó Riada's scores are lying unread in an archive, so may be many of Fred May's.

Incidentally, RTÉ Lyric FM has issued Seán Ó Riada: *Orchestral Works* (CD 136), Frederick May: *Sunlight and Shadow* and other works (CD 135), and John Kinsella: *Orchestral Works* (is CD 134). All available from www.rte.ie/shop, or www.discovery-records.com

Seán McGouran

es ahora *

MICHEÁL MARTÍN AND HIS 'EVOLUTIONARY POLITICS'

Historically it was British politicians who were accused of playing the Orange Card but with the present leader of Fianna Fail—it seems from his pronouncements for some time now that he too seems intent on following the same kind of particular bent. He does not seem to care that his comments are likely to produce some kind of backlash in the North from the Unionist community yet his constant harassment (with the backing of the usual suspects in the media) of Sinn Féin in general and Gerry Adams in particular displays what amounts ultimately to a *contempt* for democratic principles and fair play. This was brilliantly exemplified in the June edition of the *Irish Political Review* (IPR) article 'Get Adams' by Pat Walsh.

In the *Irish Daily Mail*, 10th July 2013, it was reported that Adams was "put on the spot over the murder of Jean McConville" by Martín reading from the book by "journalist Ed Maloney's 'Voices from the Grave'. The paper went on to detail how Martín brought the book into the Dail and stated: "*The investigation into Jean McConville's death is happening now*", referring to the PSNI last week securing audio recordings from Boston College oral history project, the contents of which were intended to be kept confidential until all former paramilitary participants were dead—as the *Mail* stated. Martín then went on to ask the leader of Sinn Féin "to make a statement to the House on this matter, given the gravity of what occurred and the gravity and scale of the allegations".

Gerry Adams, TD responded by stating:

"I have consistently rejected claims that I had any knowledge or any part in the abduction or killing Jean McConville. I do so again today. Will that be the end of the matter? Of course not because this party (Fianna Fail) under its current leader is fighting a battle for its survival and that is it's only concern in raising this issue."

Adams—a brilliant strategist and statesman—spots immediately the *weakness* in Martín's position and that is that he is the *leader* of a party that was thrown into the political wilderness by a raging electorate in the last elections. It is not Fianna Fail *per se* who are trying to smear the Sinn Féin leader but the man who led the former into the last election. The media

tries to obfuscate the issue, but Micheál Martín was the outgoing Taoiseach who led his troops into—not just the wilderness but the outer wilderness at that and many in the party know that.

Martín got an awful kick in the pants recently when he ambulated into a protest outside Leinster House over Government cuts and thought he could score a cute-hoor-goal over his rivals by aligning himself with the protesters—who quickly turned on him and he had to sprint back to the safe surroundings of the House while recriminatory cries followed him all the way. That's why Martín tries to impotently kick Adams. This plays very effectively in the media which *heroises* anyone who 'sticks it' to the Northern boyos, but anyone with real *nous* knows that that's a busted flush except for the fools and gombeens who know no better.

Many in Fianna Fail pragmatically accept that Martín is *in situ* for the time being but nearer the next General Election very few want him to lead them into it, given the sure fact that the political carnage that will be the resultant mash-up will need someone who can do business with whoever the numbers toss up and will not have the political baggage that the present leader has.

MICHEÁL MARTÍN AND MERRIMAN SUMMER SCHOOL

Micheál Martín was in Co. Clare, where he gave the opening address of the 2013 Brian Merriman Summer School on the theme of the Good Friday Agreement. The *Irish Daily Mail*, 15th August 2013, featured his proposal that the curriculum North and South contain a range of common topics in Irish history. According to Martín:

"It's very difficult to build an understanding of different historical traditions if there is no shared historical literacy".

He said that the sharing of common Irish history topics

"would not impose a single interpretation on the past. What it would do is at least ensure that pupils North and South can comprehend each other because they have considered the same themes".

Mr. Martín said such initiatives could stop what he called the "*drift*" apart of people on either side of the border.

Now I don't know where/how such a supposed "*drift*" is happening. Can Micheál substantiate his allegations of so-called "*drift*" in any sphere whether cultural/political? If anyone watched the GAA games recently—they would know that such *raméis* is only in the minds of the

most restricted Dublin 4 set and even that is pushing it. Micheál also wants a "*border development zone*" because he says that it remains "*the most disadvantaged area in the country*". Well Micheál if you want to talk about a disadvantaged area—why not mention Cork city? With shop closures, derelict buildings, run-down streets, and no-go areas, to name but some of the many blights on the second capital city. Everyone accepts—especially in this Heritage Week—that Cork needs special attention and it is right on your own doorstep Micheál, so why not refocus your attention on it rather than this blather on shared historical traditions?

And by the way, we all know now that the one tradition that is to be dropped is our own national narrative. For sure the Unionists are not for turning on this point and I doubt that Michael Gove, the Secretary for the UK's education has heard of your proposals—otherwise he'd have openly scorned them. After all he is on record as describing the Irish insurgents of 1916 as "*squalid gangs who betrayed Ireland*". But alas that view is now shared by our academic community with one leading historian calling the 1916 Rising nothing more than a "*street-brawl*". And, if truth be known Micheál, you too share such *revisionist* thinking, even if you can't come right out and say so publicly: but here in Cork it is widely known that your hatred for republicanism rivals that of your old mentor—one John A. Murphy.

And what a turn up for the books that Anne Harris, Editor of the *Sunday Independent*, of all people on 18th August 2013 took you to book for that same Merriman speech where you apparently, in singling out the architects of the Good Friday Agreement mentioned Albert Reynolds, John Major, John Hume, Seamus Mallon, Brian Cowen, the Queen's visit but altogether absent from your account was one Bertie Ahern. Anne Harris went on to state:

"Bertie Ahern has few fans nowadays, but nobody has ever attempted to take away his work on the Peace Process. Until now. He is a former Taoiseach and leader of his party. He showed exceptional leadership and without him arguably there would be no Good Friday Agreement and no cross-border structures. ... But he is not a non-person: he worked day and night for the peace we now have on this island... If ever there was an obvious opportunity to be generous to Bertie Ahern for his contribution to a peaceful end to 30 years of strife, this was it. The creation of the "non-person" is a dangerous precedent, where do you stop? You can't be selective in your demands for transparency about the past, Martín

remonstrates with Sinn Féin. Precisely. The rest is propaganda."

And from what I have heard about the Editors of the *Sunday Independent*—there are no better people to know what "propaganda" is. And when their likes lecture like this it is time for Mr. Martín to take a good look at who he has become and stop behaving like the village eejit and act more like a politician with some wit about him. Having to take sharp history lessons from a paper like the *Sunday Independent* is a very telling development in itself.

Mr. Martín meanwhile continues to concern himself with media-driven-tinkering tasks about reforming Fianna Fail with the appointment of Local Area Representatives (LAR's), though these will not derive their power from the democratic set-up of the local *cumanns* but from *his* centralised headquarters in Mount Street, Dublin. He also has announced (to much ordinary membership amusement) that he intends to appoint an Equality Officer, but the latter's remit is all about the preferment of women over those that the *demos* selects.

Under the EU Electoral (Amendment) (Political Funding) Act 2012 women have to have a specific gender quota of at least 30% of the candidates from each party nationally or else the latter face heavy fines. Senator Ivana Bacik, Labour is all for this restriction because that is what it is, and of course you can see her point of view. After all, she has stood for Labour in two General Elections and never got elected by the people. So now she has her seat in the Seanad from the fact that she is a Trinity College special electee. And maybe she sees the writing on the wall and wants her career in politics to be protected just because of her gender. As *Village*, August-September 2013 stated:

"A male hegemony in finance and politics caused the crises that devastated this country. They were cheered on by a media that was largely male. The need for female voices is clear; the reason against, spurious."

Really—but really? What kind of *gom* writes such utterly risible raméis and what kind of bigger *gom* actually allows it to be published?

UCC AND POPULISM

In the May edition of the *Irish Political Review*, Michael Stack outlined the remit of the National Commemorations Programme as set up by this Government and named the so-called "eminent historians" who were to help the State for the duration of the commemorative programme 2012-

2016. The former as anyone could have predicted were the usual suspects of revisionist academics, with the surprise addition of the local UCC historian Gabriel Doherty as quoted from the *Evening Echo*, 16th April 2013. The talk in town and college is that it was quite a shock for the invitation—so late in the day—to be made to Doherty who after all has not even a doctorate and there was much muttering amongst those who were so much better qualified—but being UCC it was all *sotto voce* of course.

But I must confess I was surprised at the degree of bitterness about Doherty's appointment—even given the unparalleled degree of bitchiness in the academic world—because he is a classic work-horse as exemplified by his hard slog setting up the history road-shows both in Cork county and Cork city in the last year or so. Now of course being Cork it didn't take the local wags long before they started calling them the travelling circuses but this rather misses the point. UCC's School of History are chasing—or as the Americans would put it—ambulance chasing anyone interested in studying history and as the take from secondary schools is falling and with history now no longer a mandatory subject in Leaving Certificate and about to fall from Inter Certificate studies too—there is certainly evidence of a crisis emerging. No wonder the college chases after the local History Societies who have a proven track record in collating, archiving and writing about their history.

I have been told that the thinking in UCC's administration is that here is a catch that is just waiting for harvesting—even if *certain historians* are having to pinch their nostrils and partake of smelling salts on account of who they have to deal with. And who quite is the worst of them all? Well apparently having to rub shoulders with the Aubane Historical Society is having an awful affect on the more *refined* academics and there is much hue and cry about it—all of this it hardly needs to be said is taking place in private *tete a tetes*.

Recently at one dinner party I roared with laughter on being told about a few approaches being made to various people as to who actually were involved with Aubane. Such intelligence is apparently at a premium but I was left wondering why they just cannot contact Jack Lane whose name and contact number appears on all Aubane publications? Maybe it is the *bold Lane* who has them in such a pickle.

But to get back to Doherty and why he was chosen latterly for the National

Commemorations Programme Committee of "eminent historians", I have it on good authority that a certain British Ambassador—Sir Dominic Chilcott—no less—who, having heard of the successful history road-shows, had a quiet word in the ear of the people who count and hey presto Doherty without a doctorate was deemed sufficiently "eminent" to have on board.

What those road-shows also made clear was that UCC is intent on getting adult students who are members of local History Societies in to study for MA's without the usual necessary qualifications of Leaving Certificates or even primary degrees. (See the attendant brochures available to all at these gatherings!) Such back-door Master qualifications however may have future negative impact on those who go through the full route and there is great disquiet—rightly I might add—about these methods, which some see as an attempt to nobble what Brendan Clifford termed 'Aubaneism' in a very witty review of *'Stalin, His Time and Ours* by Geoffrey Roberts (ed) Irish Slavonic Studies Yearbook in the July edition of the *Irish Political Review*. Of course Geoffrey Roberts is the Professor who is "Head of School" (of History) as outlined in the extensive brochures available to those seeking his guidance in all matters pertaining to history at UCC.

The latter institution also showed how in touch it is by bestowing on the BBC light entertainment chat show host Graham Norton an Honorary Doctorate on 7th June 2013. Alongside him was the BBC broadcaster Fergal Keane who was also bestowed with the same degree. Norton had formerly said he had studied for two years in UCC before sprinting across to London where he began his career in acting in the sitcom 'Father Ted' and later did stand up comedy before finally landing on his feet by becoming a chat-show host in Channel Four. He later moved to the BBC where he now fronts the very successful *'Graham Norton Show'*, which attracts actors, singers and other celebrities who delight in the light, fun aspect of the programme and which, according to the UCC publicity bump which accompanied the announcement of his honorary doctorate, has won—gasp—six Bafta Awards (?). The announcement also stated that Graham studied French and English but they didn't state—understandably—that he left after only two years without a degree.

CANON SHEEHAN.

In the good news department is the publication this year of *'The Collected Letters of Canon Sheehan of Doneraile*

1883-1913. Ed. by James O'Brien. Smenos Publications. It is a handsome book and ably edited by Monsignor O'Brien, Congregation for Divine Worship, Vatican city—and I was genuinely taken aback at how extensive was the reach of this sickly priest through the letters he wrote to such a wide and varied audience.

At a big international gathering as reported in 'Alive' July/August 2013 in the Australian Embassy to the Holy See, Cardinal George Pell, Archbishop of Sydney presented the book *The Collected Letters of Canon Sheehan of Doneraile*. Present were representatives from the American, Australian, Czech and other diplomatic missions, as well as several cardinals and officials of the Roman Curia. Notable by his absence was the Irish Ambassador to the Holy See or indeed anyone from the Irish diplomatic community. Cardinal Pell described 'The Collected Letters' "*as a valuable contribution to the rediscovery of an important Catholic writer and a significant contributor to Irish Catholic literature*". The Australian Ambassador, John Mc Carthy recalled how the priest's novels

"circulated in practically every English speaking country. Most of them were also translated into various European languages. Copies of 'My New Curate' were printed in Boston and retailed in London, Calcutta, Melbourne and Sydney".

The Ambassador congratulated Monsignor James O'Brien, Editor of the book, "*on having shown the wide range of Canon Sheehan's interests and contacts*".

Monsignor O'Brien spoke about the Canon's literary world and the development of the Catholic novel in 19th century Europe. A reaction to hostile political and cultural forces, Catholic novels, he explained, "*helped clarify Catholic identity and consolidate the Catholic community in a hostile cultural environment*". The book's Editor expressed his "*gratitude to Ambassador McCarthy for having generously provided accommodation to the Irish community for the occasion*".

It was the first significant Irish cultural event to take place in Rome since the closure of the Irish Embassy to the Holy See.

There was a conference in UCC back in 26th—27th April 2013 by the School of History organised by—well guess who—Gabriel Doherty and it was called: '*A different discipline: revisiting Canon Sheehan of Doneraile (1852-1913)—author, activist, priest.*'

The School of History acknowledged in its brochure at the very bottom in

extremely small print "*its wishes to acknowledge the financial assistance provided by the parishes of Mallow and Doneraile in support of this event*".

The line-up of speakers was impressive and usually the format is that after such a conference—there is a book published with all the talks—which I am looking

forward to getting as soon as it is available. There was very little publicity about the event or otherwise I would have attended and so would others I have spoken to.

Julianne Herlihy ©

Next month's article will cover the two Summer Schools I attended this year.

Corrections

3.

I find I am mistaken (*Irish Political Review*, June, *The Irish Bulletin And The Academy*) in saying I have no acquaintance with Patrick Maume beyond observing him at Brian Murphy's talk about Peter Hart's methods. I had a brief encounter with him about fifteen years ago in Belfast when he was attached to Paul Bew. I had known Bew very well from 1970 until 1972-3. I was notorious for having refused to support the Civil Rights agitation, and publishing the Two Nations view in September 1969, immediately after BICO had been active in defence of the Falls against the pogrom. He was a bit shocked from having contributed as an ideologically confused radical subversive to what he later described as the destruction of the state: he had been a member of the People's Democracy group. His girlfriend at the time was Anne Devlin, Paddy Devlin's daughter, who went on to become a well-known writer of plays and stories. Bew used to be around at Athol St. most days for a couple of years, often accompanied by Henry Patterson, who is now a very fierce Unionist Professor. Both were ultra-Marxists. Neither became a member of BICO. Len Callender set up a little magazine for them to edit: *The Two Nations*. Len and myself were more interested in what Soviet revisionism was doing to Political Economy and philosophy and would have been happy to see the Northern Ireland diversion hived off.

Bew and Patterson produced a few issues of the magazine. Then they began to complain that the Two-Nations theory as it stood was not sufficiently "*nuanced*". They attended a BICO meeting to discuss reservations they had about the way the issue was argued in the paper. (Perhaps it was really about something else, but formally that is what it was.) My attitude was: So nuance the argument! But what they wanted was that I should nuance it. I was fed up with the term "*nuance*" at the time because of its use by Gramscians about

other things and wouldn't play. And I thought the theory was adequate to the situation. But they were the intellectuals, so let them nuance if they wanted to.

As far as I recall the magazine lapsed at that point.

Shortly before that, Bew had come up with a criticism of Ulster Custom (agricultural tenure before the Land Purchase Acts) as a contributory element to the uneven development of capitalism in Ireland—a case I had made in *The Economics Of Partition*. An American economist, Solow, had written about it and I should take account of it. I read the book. I could make no sense of it—and I was pretty hot on Political Economy at the time. And Bew could not make it intelligible to me. So I treated it as gibberish.

He also urged me to become acquainted with Althusserianism, which was the latest thing in Marxism-Leninism. He told me something about it, and I read Althusser, and I thought it was even greater gibberish, and that it would tend to destroy any mind which formed itself on it.

I gradually became aware that Bew wasn't calling to Athol St. any more. And that I wasn't running into him in the street any more. And that, when there was a danger of running into him in the street, he took evasive action. I was later told by another academic that the University authorities had put Athol St. out of bounds for their staff. I don't know if there was anything of that involved with Bew. But he had a career to make in academia and, to say the least, BICO would have been of no use to him in it.

Besides that, Marxism-Leninism in its terminal Althusserian form had become the dominant ideology in the 'social sciences' in the Universities.

Anyway, I took it that Bew and Patterson, having careers to make, had seen it as necessary to sever all connection. I thought I had seen the last of them. And so I had,

CONTINUED

with Patterson.

They published an academic book on Northern Ireland in the late 70s, taking it to be a state, and attributing a dynamic political system to it, driven by the dialectic between Populism and something else that has slipped my mind.

Meanwhile BICO, having pushed the Two Nations theory with a view to making intelligible dialogue possible between North and South, established that the South absolutely would not have it. No progress being possible there, it changed tack and advocated democratisation within the party-politics of the state as the only way of establishing a common ground of politics for Protestants and Catholics. We waited to see what would come of William Whitelaw's attempt to bring about a power-sharing form of devolution. When that collapsed in the hands of a British Labour Government and a Dublin Coalition in May 1974, we launched a Campaign for Labour Representation, to pressure the Labour Party into extending its organisation and activity to the North. The CLR was started by BICO, but quickly took on a life of its own. It invited a wide range of people to come to meetings and say what they thought of the project. Bew and Patterson were invited after their book was published. They came, and spent the time denouncing BICO for having gone wildly astray since the time they were associated with it.

(There are many ex-BICOs, true BICOs, around the world. Though Bew and Patterson were never members, they were in effect condemning actual BICO from the viewpoint of their true BICO at that meeting. Most of their audience was bewildered.)

When they had got all of that off their chests they were asked if they would say a word about the CLR project. They said that it proposed a solution and was therefore ideological. In Althusserian language that meant that it was delusory and they wouldn't bother their heads with it. And I was described as an arse-licker of Unionism.

Well, that's that, I thought. But fast-forward a few years and I find Bew running into me again on the street or in the libraries and being anxious to talk. I don't think I've ever refused to talk to anyone, and wasting time is my favourite occupation. So I talked while being treated to cups of coffee and pastries in fancy coffee-shops in various nooks and crannies. By this time I knew that Bew had become a Stickie.

Because of that, and all the rest of it, I couldn't take him seriously, and didn't pretend to.

I had let an early pamphlet drop out of print—*The Home Rule Crisis*, or *The Road To Partition*, I think. I thought it must be inadequate but didn't have time to go over it again. Bew urged me to reprint it, because he was having to photocopy his own copy for his students. The lack of *nuance* had been entirely forgotten.

Another time he had found out that Connolly had made a point of going through the form of being a Catholic before they killed him, and what did I think of that. I thought it made good political sense in the circumstances. Then he discovered Annie M.P. Smithson, and wasn't she awful! And so it went on.

One day he told me he had two brilliant students who would soon be going out in the world and making an impression on it, and that would prove that my disdainful attitude to the University was unwarranted. He wished he could show them to me. Some time later he ran into me again. He said they were nearby and could he whistle them up for me? I said OK. We went to the fashionable coffee shop and waited for them. That day, as far as I recall, his discovery was Arthur Lynch, the interesting Home Ruler. The students turned up. One of them was Maume. Then they had to put up with being shown off by their Professor to me. It was very peculiar. The following morning I happened to run into Maume on the street near Shaftsbury Square, Belfast. I stopped to pass the time of day with him, as one does. He made it clear on the instant that he had better things to do.

Whether his animus towards me predated his being exhibited to me by his Professor, or was caused by it, I don't know. But the *animus* was clearly there, in highly subjective form, and it confuses the critical faculty.

The last time I exchanged a word with Bew I asked him if he believed it possible that the Provos switched off the cameras at Castlereagh high-security barracks, walked in in broad daylight, went straight to the files they wanted, and walked out with them, leaving not a trace behind, not even a good memory of a face. He believed. I gathered from the depth of feeling in his reply that he believed there was nothing the Provos couldn't do.

I'm afraid I treated Bew as a bit of a joke in those days. I took him to be only a kind of hanger-on of the Stickies and was surprised when it came out that he was in the

Stickie IRA. If I had known he was in the IRA I would probably have avoided him. The only direct threats we ever received came from the Stickie IRA, which remained operative as an assassination force after it called off its misconceived and bungled war.

In Belfast in those years you needed a nose that told you who you were talking to. I often had useful discussions with Stickie Sinn Feiners, or fellow-travellers, who had been gripped by the general ideological case presented at the time of the split and continued trying to make sense of developments within it. One knew that there was nothing more to their conduct than an earnest, naive attempt to understand. With others one knew that was not the case.

Bew was not a working class or lower middle class traditional Belfast Republican trying to understand how it could be that theoretically advanced social-Republicanism had been marginalised in the great post-1969 Republican upsurge. He was an upper class Protestant intellectual with an Ascendancy fringe in his family background, and he was successfully making a career in academia under the purposeful patronage system that was established when the Northern Ireland Office took over from Stormont.

Athol Street was shut out from patronage, even though the Secretary of State subscribed to the *Workers' Weekly* out of an idle curiosity to know what was really going on. Academia and the broadcast media were engaged in purposeful indoctrination—brainwashing intended to create a mentality in the populace that would cause it to settle down and be happy. But the brainwashing, supported by material incentives—bribery—met with a stubborn reality which went its own way, no matter how often it was dismissed as "*atavism*" by the indoctrinators.

British patronage was enormous. Belfast was deluged with patronage money. Athol St. never got a penny of it—beyond the normal subscription to *Workers' Weekly*. We knew we would not get it, so we did not apply for it. We were told this was paranoia so we applied for assistance with a number of projects in order to demonstrate that it wasn't. One refusal told us that, since we were publishing without a public subsidy, that proved that we were commercial and were therefore not entitled to a subsidy.

So there you have the scene. Paul Bew has become a Professor within the carefully-monitored British patronage system in Northern Ireland, and he is

showing off a couple of prize students to people from outcast Athol Street who could be of no earthly use to them. (This was explained in *The Irish Bulletin And The Academy*, in the May issue of *Irish Political Review*.)

I don't recall that I gave much thought to why he was doing it. Odd things happen in wartime.

I had stopped reading his books by then. I saw the way he was going. I knew what was going to be in them. And the style was turgid—an inheritance from his Althusserian phase, I thought.

I did not hear that he ever explained what had happened to his Althusserianism, or to the Marxism-Leninism of which it was said to be culmination. If I heard he had explained it, I would have read it. I did not ask him about it. I asked him nothing. I did not engage with him. I just let him talk. I took it for granted that the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the associated collapse of Marxist dominance in the University system, rather than any rigorous train of thought such as Althusser demanded, caused Marxism to evaporate.

Very much later I happened to strike an acquaintance with an intellectual, who worked in the interface between journalism and academia, who wanted to find out what the hell Northern Ireland was. I told him what I thought and suggested others he might read. He came back to me saying he could not understand why I was so dismissive of Bew, as Bew had mentioned me in one of his books. I said, So what? He was a close fellow-traveller of BICO for a number of years and had picked up a lot of ideas from it, and the Althusserian nonsense he left it for had collapsed. Yes, that's all very well, but he *mentioned* me. This was like being mentioned in a scientific paper and I shouldn't be dismissive of it. But Political Science was pseudo-science: a mimicry of science! Yes, but it took itself in earnest, and it was important and influential in the power structure, and I shouldn't be so light-hearted about it.

So I looked up the book and found that I was indeed *mentioned* for saying that 1916 was an independent source of state formation in Ireland. That was so self-evident that I thought it was rather like somebody being mentioned for saying that two plus two equals four.

However the point did not seem to be that you were mentioned for something original and worthwhile, but the mere fact that one was mentioned, in an Oxford publication. I kept an eye out for such

things after that, and saw that people were indeed mentioned in confirmation of banalities, and that therefore what was important was the *mention*. And I was made to understand that the *mention* must have been important to Bew. And my acquaintance thought I should have responded to it. But by then it much too late.

There is however the question of the capacity in which he *mentioned* me. Was it as a Stickie or as a conscientious intellectual who had acquired a degree of autonomy in his profession and wanted to broaden out? A number of oblique approaches were made to me by the Stickies in that period in an attempt to get me writing for their publications.

Fortunately I did not have to deal with Bew's *mention* of me as I was blissfully unaware of it until after I had ceased to have any contact with him. (I should say, however, that I found this book more interesting than I expected.)

Some years after Maume's presentation to me by his Professor, somebody sent me a print-out of a comment he made about me on the computers. (Being computer-illiterate I never get to see such things if I am not given a print-out.) The comment, as far as I recall, was that I had changed from being a Unionist to being a Nationalist—maybe even a Provo: I don't remember.

One of the things I have noticed about modern academics is their inability to give an accurate summary of a position they are taking issue with. I would have thought that this was a basic academic skill—indeed a skill that should have been acquired long before one entered the academic profession. I understood that it was called *precis* and was taught as part of elementary education. But if so it doesn't seem to survive the process of further education.

My view of Northern Ireland, expressed *ad nauseam*, was that it was an undemocratic variant of the British state which ensured the continuation and aggravation of what is usually called sectarianism, and that its incorporation into the democratic system of the state offered the only prospect of unsectarian political life. That was not the position of any brand of Unionism. A movement for the incorporation of the Six Counties into the democracy of the state which held them was brought to nothing by Unionist subversion. Actual Unionism on the ground—as distinct from intellectuals snatching at pedantic meanings which were in conflict with words as used—was against participation in the democratic

political life of the state to which it declared allegiance. It preferred to be top-dog in the Six County communal conflict outside the democratic system of the state. And it destroyed the Campaign for Labour Representation and the Campaign for Equal Citizenship into which I and others had put many years of effort.

I knew the horse was dead so I stopped flogging it. That the Nationalist position was strengthened by that turn of events is certain. But it wasn't me that killed the horse. It was the Unionists. After that I merely commented on the course of events on the ground of conflict chosen by the Unionists under the delusion that it gave them the advantage because they were still the majority.

In the late 1980s, when the movement for democratic integration was going strong, and had established a base within the Tory Party, making it necessary for Nicholas Scott (a Junior Minister who became Secretary of State shortly after) to try to rebut it in the *Daily Telegraph*, Cornelius O'Leary took issue with me in the Belfast Unionist press. He was from Cork City and was Professor of Politics at the Queen's University. He had nothing to say that was relevant to the case I had made, which was to be read in pamphlets in the bookshops and to be heard every day on Radio Ulster.

In order to be able to make any semblance of a case against me he misrepresented the case I had made in the best modern Irish academic fashion. I wondered why he bothered. He had a cosy well-paid job up there in the Ivory Tower. Did the Secretary of State ask why he had to do the barking himself when he was paying good money to a politics Professor?

Anyway Cornelius entered the fray using his authority as Professor to ridicule what I said. And what was I to do in that live situation other than ridicule him for the nonsense he talked, and ridicule the academic establishment of which he was master for its silence. I took apart the particular argument he made against the CLR and CEC—which was easily done. And I surveyed the international academic literature on the subject of party organisation and democratic politics and showed that none of it supported him. The pamphlet—*Queen's: A Comment On A University And A Reply To Its Politics Professor*—sold out quickly in the shops around the University and had to be reprinted a number of times. Thousands of it circulated in the immediate vicinity of Cornelius. He was hurt. But he had no comeback. He had chanced his arm on an

issue about which he seemed to know nothing, being familiar with neither the academic literature nor British political practice since the democratisation of 1918.

He was an official, authoritative expert on electoral politics but was capable of dealing with only the political routines of Britain and the Republic. But it was in Belfast that he was Politics Professor. And he could not apply his mind to the probable consequence of the exclusion of the Six Counties from the political system of the state which held them—the most durable democratic system in the world outside the United States, and the most seductive of minorities. He could not even admit that the Six Counties were excluded from the functional democracy of the state by being excluded from the system of politics. That is understandable. The State would not long have tolerated such an admission from one of its servants. But he could have stayed quiet. However he chose to intervene polemically in a live political situation, authoritatively making the absurd statement that absence from the Six Counties of the parties which contested every other constituency in the state, regardless of the chances of winning, did not constitute an essential anomaly.

He was hurt by my reply, and by the eagerness with which it was read within his own sphere. He made no attempt to dispute my reply.

Soon after he returned to Cork. In Cork he co-authored a book with Patrick Maume. So I suppose that is a further ground for the animosity which puzzled me.

And beyond that there is the fact—which I did not notice at first—that an imaginary chapter at the end of Lord Bew's book on Parnell is by Maume.

History seems to have increasingly become what did not happen for Lord Bew. And the great thing that did not happen, but might have happened, is that Parnell might not have been overcome by a despotic rage against his Party and tried to destroy it when it refused to obey his orders. He might have compromised, bided his time, and nursed the Party into a more conciliatory attitude towards the Ulster Unionists and the Southern gentry. I don't think that is probable, but he might have. What he might have done has priority over what he actually did in Lord Bew's outlook. And in order that the "lovely world of might-have-been" should have speculative priority, what he actually did must not be described.

A movement to conciliate the Ulster

Unionists and the Protestant gentry of the South, so that Ireland might be united, within a broader national culture, developed amongst the native population under the influence of William O'Brien and Canon Sheehan. Forty years ago Bew

took some interest in that movement. He later became a Redmondite. And his protégé, Maume, is strongly antipathetic to O'Brien and Sheehan. I assume this is connected with imaginary Parnellism.

Brendan Clifford

The Omagh Bomb – 15 Years on

I noticed the following piece on Anthony McIntyre's website, *The Pensive Quill*, under the heading 'From Civil Rights to Republican Wrongs'. McIntyre, is a former IRA Volunteer who served 18 years in Long Kesh is, with Ed Moloney, the organiser of the Boston College Tapes:

"15 years ago today physical force republicanism devastated Omagh with a horrendous atrocity. The Real IRA took responsibility for the action and has been vilified ever since. As much as we might blame it alone, a more disconcerting truth is that those of us who privileged the physical force tradition to the exclusion of all else, have our moral fingerprints all over that bomb. The bombers on the day only delivered what the rest of us had for long enough primed with legitimacy. Wax philosophical if we wish about us and them, but the difference between our La Mon bomb and their Omagh bomb amounts to little more than a date.

"In terms of casualties inflicted it was easily the worst republican assault on civilian life in the course of the Northern conflict. Even though the attack was not as malign as the Provisional IRA massacre of people gathering for a remembrance ceremony in Enniskillen 11 years previously, in so far as the intention was not to kill civilians but to blast the commercial heart of the town, it was no more palatable because of that. Republicans had no right to launch the attack and the civilians of Omagh had every right not to be bombed. Even when we can be certain that the hand of British spooks played some part on that darkest of days, it does nothing to absolve armed republicanism of its gross infidelity towards civilian life.

"I met with the father of one of the children killed a number of years ago in Derry. He contacted me and asked if we could speak. I agreed, travelled up and found it an experience that I am not sure how to describe. Words like humbling sound trite. If he was uncomfortable, he overcame it with stoical forbearing, and spoke at some length with me over coffee. He showed great dignity and displayed no anger when I told him that there was nothing I could do to help him.

"His son was twelve when his life was snatched away from him. Another child

was 8, the same age as my own son is now—a sobering thought. Innocents callously exposed to tradition induced devastation.

"I took a call shortly after the explosion from a republican friend on holiday in Donegal with his children. We had served time in prison together and he was not given to shallow thinking. His despair was palpable. If it was the event that heralded the end of physical force republicanism, it seemed far too high a price...

"While I had for some years, by that point, abandoned the notion of armed campaigning as a means to realising republican objectives, the bombing of Omagh deadened within me any residual, lingering consideration that it was only tactically, but not morally, wrong to practice physical force republicanism.

"Pacifism is not in my view a viable mechanism for displacing malignancy or overcoming aggressors. They see it as a weakness to be exploited. Moreover, coercion of some sort governs the whole range of human relations and is to politics what oxygen is to fresh air. The corollary of that truism, however, is not that physical force is the panacea to the problems of aggression. Violence if it is ever to be utilised purposefully in any conflict situation can only be driven by rational strategy and never by irrational tradition. I have seen no one yet who has made a persuasive argument for the application of republican physical force. Yet 15 years on from the worst atrocity yet unleashed from the republican armoury, Omagh remains the turning point at which physical force republicanism failed to turn."

The Omagh bomb, along with the earlier killing of the Quinn children in Ballymoney had important ramifications for the Peace Process. The killing of the Quinn children disabled Protestant support for the Drumcree Orangemen after incessant political and media pressure was mounted to hold the Orangemen at Drumcree directly responsible for the separate event at Ballymoney. After that, Orange protests at Drumcree were never the same again and an important destabilising element was removed from the scene.

The other potential destabilising element that emerged was the Real IRA. The Real IRA were the splitting off, during late 1997, of a group of senior and experienced Provos who had had enough of the unarmed strategy and decided to return to the tried and trusted methods of former days.

The Real IRA quickly revealed itself to be a force in the devastating bomb attacks it made on a number of town centres including Portadown and Banbridge. The sheer scale and success of these attacks put in doubt the Republican peace strategy. But then a similar attack on Omagh resulted in the deaths of 29 people—Catholics and Protestants as well as visitors to the province amongst them.

The Omagh bombing was a deliberate attack on a non-military target. The Omagh killings, on the other hand, were accidental in the sense of being unintentional. The other town centres had been blown apart by the Real IRA without killing anybody and that was obviously the intention in Omagh. However, in the bombing of towns there is a high risk of killing substantial numbers of people who in the view of those carrying out the bombing are not legitimate targets.

In the same week as the Omagh bombing a US missile destroyed a pharmaceutical factory in the Sudan with the result that thousands in the area lost their lives by being deprived of essential medicines. Britain publicly backed the attack whilst working up a moral storm about Omagh. Britain itself, of course, killed hundreds of thousands of innocent people in blockading and aerial bombing in its wars and continues to do so in alliance with the US, e.g. in drone strikes that have killed large numbers of civilians in countries not even at war with the UK/US.

But the victims of British and Allied bombing are not put on the television screens and most of the time they are only ever heard about in reports outside of the mainstream media. They are explained as 'collateral damage' in military parlance, seen as an unfortunate result of wars taken to be in the natural run of things, and have had no moral or political significance in Britain.

An interesting incident occurred in the wake of the Omagh bombing when Eamon Malley, the investigative reporter, was interviewed by Channel 4 News on 18th August. He had sought to find out the details behind the botched warnings that had resulted in the deaths of the people in

Omagh. He began to explain that there had been a series of three warnings, of increasing accuracy, but the interviewer, Sheena Macdonald suddenly interrupted him with the statement, 'But a bomb is a bomb' and prevented any further details of knowledge leading to the truth from being broadcast to the general public.

Knowledge and truth were things not sought over the Omagh bomb. The media acted instinctively as a propaganda organ of State in creating an atmosphere around the bombing of unquestionable evil that defied any thought about why it had resulted in so many deaths. The objective was to finish off physical force Republicanism at this opportune moment by not letting any facts get in the way of a higher moral and political purpose.

The relatives of those killed in Omagh were understandably unsatisfied with this approach, particularly after it subsequently emerged that security force agents had had prominent roles in the bombing operation.

Some of this was given the light of day in the report of Nuala O'Loan, while she was Police Ombudsman. After she had given the relatives a briefing on what she had discovered about the Omagh bombing one of the relatives, Laurence Rushe, told the *Sunday Business Post*:

"The work of British dirty tricks and the security services underworld makes me sick... It is obvious to everyone that the so-called Real IRA are infiltrated with informers and cowards. The Real IRA is controlled by the state and the state knows more about the Omagh bombing than they are telling us." (9.12.01)

Following this the *Irish News* carried a Real IRA statement admitting that "*M15 had handled two agent provocateurs whose identity was known*" to them and "*who were instrumental in the planning and implementation of the bombing*" (14.12.01).

O'Loan's effort at uncovering the truth about Omagh was given little support from the Secretary of State and she ran into a great storm of hostility from Unionists. (Finding herself persona non grata she ultimately took herself out of affairs in 'Northern Ireland' and into the House of Lords, with the result that investigations into these things, conducted by second-raters, have been tightly managed and repressed ever since.)

However, despite the obstructions placed in her way by the police and other agencies of the State, O'Loan did not go

the same way as Stalker, Stevens *et al*, because the Omagh relatives had been given such a large media profile that it would have been impossible to have buried the Omagh report as other State investigations had been buried in the past.

Subsequently, the British State did an unprecedented thing in relation to the Omagh bombing. In breach of the normal practice of criminal law, established about a thousand years previously, the British Government instigated the families of the Omagh victims to take the law into their own hands, treating murder as a mere civil offence, and to seek a money settlement with the people whom they held to be responsible (with the State providing the names of those it held responsible, minus its agents, presumably).

This begged the question of why the State did not conduct a prosecution itself when it had changed the criminal law to make prosecution easier than it had been before. It was, of course, a possibility that such prosecutions would fail—but that is an eventuality that has to be reckoned with in all criminal prosecutions.

The State gave every impression that it was uncharacteristically paralysed by the fear of failure in relation to Omagh. The only explanation for this seems to be that it was not really the fear of failure that paralysed the arm of the State in this respect but fear of the prosecution itself, or what might emerge in any prosecution taken against those that it chose to put on trial.

It must therefore have been calculated by the Government that, knowing it had agents at the heart of things in relation to the bombing, the Defence might have made a credible case in court that the State itself was responsible for the casualties at Omagh.

That, of course, would have been disastrous for the British. So they decided to overturn the normal rule of law that says the criminal law acts to vindicate the victims and these must make do with whatever satisfaction that that gives them. In the instance of Omagh the victims were encouraged to act in place of the State, at the instigation of the State, and with the support of the finance and propaganda operation of the State, in order to achieve 'justice' in financial form, in an unprecedented civil case that would not expose the hidden behaviour of the State to the wider public.

To this day there remain many unanswered questions about the Omagh bombing and how it resulted in such a

high death toll. Information was made available in the civil inquiry that suggested the following: the car containing the bomb was stolen by a Garda agent; an FBI agent video-taped the town for intelligence purposes before the bombing; the bomb was apparently made by a British agent; the car had a tracking device planted in it pin-pointing it through a live satellite receiver; those driving the car to the target were being tracked by GCHQ in Cheltenham via their mobiles; pedestrians were herded away from safety toward the car without any police supervision of them in the area; the car was the only vehicle illegally and suspiciously parked in the street.

The event served its purpose in a political way by cultivating a great popular reaction against the physical force men that suited the purposes of the British and Irish Governments, Sinn Fein, the SDLP and all shades of Unionism—without the awkward questions that might have, in the past, emerged and persisted when such a political consensus did not exist.

One thing that is significant here is a comparison between the reactions to the Omagh bombing of 1998 and the Dublin/Monaghan bombings of 1974. Both these bombings had British involvement in some way or other but the reactions of Republicans and Loyalists were entirely different. Omagh really had a shattering moral effect on armed Republicanism—something it really never recovered from, even though it was clearly unintentional in its killing. However, Dublin/Monaghan, the deliberate mass murder of innocent civilians, was taken by Loyalism in its stride. The more the better was its attitude and only the lack of bomb-making capability, prevented it from more (see Colonel Morgan, *'The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings 1974, A military Analysis'*, Athol Books).

Gerry Adams said after the Omagh bomb on September 1st: *"the violence we have seen must be for all of us a thing of the past, over, done with and gone"* (IN 02.08.98) This statement prompted Trimble to agree to meet Adams for the first time.

Pat Walsh

On-line sales of books, pamphlets
and magazines:
https://
www.atholbooks-
sales.org

A Jolly Good Fellow?

Fergal Patrick Keane OBE

Fergal Keane had been garlanded with so many honours one might imagine he'd need a battalion of porters to carry them all but I saw a photograph of him recently taken at Liverpool University where he has been made a Professorial Fellow, flanked by Dame Professor Marianne Elliott OBE who is the Director of Irish Studies there.

Some years ago a piece of Keane's in *The Independent* (of London) was headlined *"Ireland has paid a high price for its dishonest myth-making"*. He called for a truth commission for the North of Ireland on the lines of South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

I've read, heard and seen Keane's works in print and on radio and television for many years, and for the life of me would find them difficult to reconcile with the truth.

For example he has claimed that Michael Collins had attempted to sell Partition to the Irish people; that British television began to be received in Dublin in the late 1960s, and that a Eucharistic Congress was held in Dublin in 1936.

All these statements are false.

On the death of Collins in 1922 his most recent speeches and articles were published by The Talbot Press, Dublin, under the title *The Path To Freedom*. I have that original edition and a seven page section is headed *"Partition Act's Failure"*.

A classmate of my own stayed home in Blackbanks, Raheny, Dublin, in June 1953 to watch the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth, and my mother watched the 1955 Monaco wedding of Grace Kelly in the house next door on Howth Hill, courtesy of the BBC.

I can clearly remember having a quiet pint in the old Royal Hotel in Howth in 1960 when there was a virtual stampede of women into the lounge to watch a recording of Princess Margaret's Wedding to Anthony Armstrong Jones. I particularly relished the fact that they had come from a Fianna Fail Cumann in an adjacent room and included veterans of the Anglo-Irish and Civil Wars. By that time BBC TV was coming to us from Wales and the North of Ireland, and ITV was clearly received from Britain and UTV from the North of

Ireland. Half of Dublin watched *Sunday Night at the London Palladium* and its catch phrases had gone *"viral"* as today's expression has it. It was the impact of British Television in Ireland that prompted the Government to set up a Commission to inquire into the desirability of establishing an Irish TV service (in 1958 or 1959) before actually establishing one in December 1961.

The Eucharistic Congress was held, not in 1936, but in 1932, for fifteen hundred good reasons, once known to every schoolboy and schoolgirl in Ireland, if not every Professorial Fellow. For Ireland's National Apostle, and Patron Saint, (commemorated in Fergal Keane's second name) started his Irish Mission in 432 AD.

If Mr Keane is economical with the truth, he can also be a Begrudger of Epic proportions. Again in *"The Independent"* (of London) in 2001 he expressed displeasure at the public ceremony and Christian burial of Kevin Barry and nine other patriot soldiers who had been hanged by the British and buried in quicklime in 1920 and 1921. He seemed to call for public ceremonies to honour Royal Irish Constabulary killed by the IRA between 1919 and 1921. In fact the RIC and other anti-democratic forces were given public and Christian burial shortly after their deaths, and woe betide any man who didn't remove his hat, or any shopkeeper who didn't shutter his premises when the funerals of these gentlemen passed by.

The British funeral of the "Auxiliary Police Cadets" killed at Kilmichael can be viewed by Googling British Pathe and entering the word Macroom. The captions tell us that those attending are from the various units of the British Army's Aldershot Command from which the "Police Cadets" were drawn, and there's not a Bona-Fide Bobby, Kosher Kopper nor Pukkha Plod to be seen.

His Economy with the Truth and Begrudgery are trumped by Keane's astounding arrogance as he surveys the rest of us Irish from an Olympian height.

In *"The Independent"* (of London), in another piece, he quotes the Belfast-born poet Louis MacNeice, who, in the 1930s, chided his fellow-Irishmen for deluding themselves that the world cared

who was king of their castle.

The context was the rise of Hitler. MacNeice, said Keane, "*from the vantage point of London*" gazed "*scornfully on Ireland*". In fact at least two of the three Kings who reigned in London in the 1930s were very jealous of their Irish holdings, and law made in London proclaimed their supremacy over "*every person matter and thing in Northern Ireland*". And those Kings' military, paramilitary police and specials were there to keep those holdings for them, helped by draconian Special Powers Acts and gerrymandered local elections. To this day in Britain the Treason Felony Act of 1848 is still in force and it provides for life imprisonment for anyone advocating the abolition of the Monarchy, even by peaceful means. A High Court Action by *The Guardian* a few years ago did not succeed in having that provision removed.

When Cork Harbour, Bantry Bay and Lough Swilly were ceded to Irish control in 1938 Winston Churchill, in the House of Commons on May 5th, launched an attack on the Government and on the impertinence and ingratitude of the Irish for wanting their ports back. Say what you like about Churchill, but he knew more about kings, castles and the deployment of power than MacNeice or Fergal Keane.

The concern for these things didn't expire with the defeat of Hitler, nor Attlee's defeat of Churchill in 1945. They remained in 1949 when Attlee was co-founding NATO and after John A Costello declared an Irish Republic. The British Cabinet Secretary, Sir Norman Brooke, prepared a memorandum outlining Ulster Unionist arguments which he regarded as not really weighty, but declared that "*for strategic reasons*" "*some part of Ireland should remain within His Majesty's Dominions*". Attlee marked the Memo "*noted*" and a new *Ireland Act* was passed by Westminster that year. It purported to cede the determination of Northern Ireland's status to the Parliament at Stormont, but when push came to shove removed that Parliament with less ceremony than it later abolished The Greater London Council.

It is no mere coincidence that Britain first declared no further strategic interest in Northern Ireland after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact and that the Western Powers withdrew support for the Apartheid regime in South Africa at the same time. Nor that US missiles were withdrawn from Greenham

Budget Options on cuts and taxes

The Labour TDs who wrote to your newspaper (August 2nd) that they were not "austerity junkies", and the many supportive responses this statement has provoked, raises an interesting question for opponents of "austerity".

The Government strategy to date has been aimed at not increasing an already catastrophic budget deficit but managing it downwards, preferably with as little damage to social cohesion as possible. Opponents of what is called "austerity" rarely spell out a realistic alternative.

If we discount fantasies of pots of untapped revenue gold out there, the only alternative is increasing the national debt and the budget deficit. There is the much repeated refrain: "Austerity doesn't work". But it now seems that the opponents of "austerity" actually don't believe this themselves. As the Labour TDs put it, they were not "austerity junkies", but would "do as much austerity as is needed to secure recovery". Is this an admission that "austerity" – if admittedly only a certain amount of it – does work after all?

Philip O'Connor
[*Irish Times*, 12.8.12]

Kilmichael Statement

Presume you are all up to speed from Cristóir de Baróid about the proposal to erect a memorial at Kilmichael to the Auxiliaries killed in the engagement together with a replica Crossley Tender. I sent in my two pennyworth of comment in August 17 Southern Starletters. Cork County Council seems to be putting up ≈100,000 for this piece of revisionist nonsense. Pádraig Óg Ó Ruairc wrote an excellent piece on www.theirishhistory.com website 'Opinion: Commemorating Kilmichael'. Even by revisionist standards this is astound. As I said, does this mean we will be seeing memorials set up in Poland, France etc. to members of the Waffen SS killed there?

I hope there is going to be a strong campaign against this. Commemorating the Auxies and in Cork of all place!

Peter Berresford Ellis, 22.8.13

Common at that time. From 1841 until 1957 Britain had a naval base in Simons-town, South Africa, and was thereafter guaranteed access to it by the apartheid regime. The *Wall Street Journal* in the 1970s revealed that the USA had secure communications nearby, to Ballykelly in Northern Ireland, as part of a global military communications system.

Great powers and their satellites have interests, not sentiments, and ordinary humans whatever their religion or colour don't weigh much in their calculations. "*Some part of Ireland*", North or South, Orange or Green, could equally serve their strategic interest. When Ireland had an independent-minded Government in Dublin, the North served Imperialist strategy.

But since Dublin lost its Moral Compass and settled for a Moral Shat-Nav, Shannon Airport serves that strategy quite nicely.

But journalists don't get OBEs for telling such truths.

Donal Kennedy

BRADLEY MANNING

We tend to see flaws in our enemies:
his head is too big, her face scares the
crows,
in vindictiveness the vitriol flows.
Our enemy has enemies, they see
Bradley Manning as gay, small, feminine,
treacherous, treasonable, not a patriot,
but in our land he's a compatriot,
he strides this war-torn world in ermine,
lord of conscience, of humanity,
bursting the small packet of his being,
to war criminals he's profanity
but a mighty heart beats in this wee'un,
makes a superpower doubt its sanity,
a nightmare he could no longer feign.

Wilson John Haire
22nd August, 2013

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

THE IRISH HOLOCAUST, NOT A FAMINE.

That a great quantity of food was being exported out of Ireland is evidenced by some entries in the *'Handbook for Youghal'* published in 1896 by G. Field who acknowledged that *"the greater portion of the Chronicles is a reprint of a publication ably compiled by that distinguished archaeologist and most kindly of men—the late Samuel Hayman"*.

The entry for 1843 is:

"The salmon fishing of the Blackwater was very productive this year. One house alone, that of Messrs Keyes and Ronayne, exported 9,823 fish, weighing 24 tons and 27 cwt" and a footnote to this entry tells us: "Salmon was so plentiful in Youghal within the memory of persons still alive, that it was commonly sold for three half pence per lb. and so was customarily laid-in for the use of servants, by the resident gentry and shopkeepers."

There is no reference in these chronicles to starvation during the years of the Holocaust until the entry for 24th September 1846 which reads:

"In the morning of this day (Thursday) a mob of some thousands marched down to Mr. Fisher's mill, at Pilltown, just opposite Youghal on the Co. Waterford side, vowing vengeance if Indian Meal was not sold for 1s per stone (21 pounds weight) from the mill, and corn ground for 1d per stone. They then proceeded, armed with sticks, stones, spades, hammers (such as are used in repairing roads) and other weapons to the Ferry Point, opposite the centre of the town; and considerable apprehension was felt that they should attack Youghal. The magistrates had the military in readiness immediately to repel them, but the country people contented themselves with threats of vengeance against the ferrymen and boatmen, should they carry corn or provisions over to the Youghal merchants. The house of a farmer Wynne was plundered; and several other farmers were sworn not to carry their corn over to Youghal; after which the mob again marched down to the Ferry Point to shew themselves. An express having been sent to the Admiral at Cove from the magistrates, informing him of obstruction of the river by the infuriated peasantry, and requiring the assistance of a steam ship, the "Myrmidon" was immediately dispatched, and with a fair-wind she arrived off the harbour at half-tide (3 o'clock p.m.) The commander got out all his boats filled with artillery and marines, and pulled into the harbour, the launch carrying a

nine pounder in her bow coming in last; the steamer dropping anchor about half-past four. This seasonable arrival seemed to deter the country people, who returned soon after to their homes.

"At an early hour on Friday, Sir Richard Musgrave, Bart. proceeded up the river with the marines, artillery and small-arms men from the "Myrmidon" in their boats, a twelve pounder in the bow of the launch; and taking a lighter of corn the mob had seized above Ballynatray, towed her into Youghal without difficulty. The country people were deterred by the strength of the force, and came to no collision with them, venting their wrath in shouting and yells. Sir Richard Musgrave and Lord Stuart De Decies returned to Youghal with the boats, and had an immediate conference with the magistrates. An attack on the town was, at one time, seriously apprehended; for the Waterford peasants, maddened by hunger, cared not to throw away their lives in quest of food. The military and constabulary were ordered out, and were stationed at Cork Lane, the magistrates having fully made up their minds to repel force with force. In the town there was universal excitement. The doors of the banks were closed and porters stationed at them, as a report was abroad that they were to be attacked. The merchants held a meeting, at which a strong memorial to the Government was adopted, calling on the Executive to make the town a Commissariat depot, and to send-in-food, or the consequences would be fearful. A resolution to import some thousand barrels of Indian Corn was immediately come to, and a deputation left for the purpose of purchasing the corn, while a subscription list of between £2000-£3000 was signed, to guarantee any loss arising from a fall in the markets."

Thus ends the only reference I can trace in Field's Chronicles to the Irish Holocaust which was raging throughout Ireland in 1845, 1846, 1847 and up to 1852.

There is an entry for 7th May 1849 with regard to a fever outbreak in Youghal which reads:

"The Asiatic Cholera visited Youghal after an interval of eleven years. It prevailed during the months of May and June; and recurred with augmented virulence in August, but was providentially withdrawn at the end of that month. There were about forty fatal cases."

Youghal was, and still is, a walled town and the wall, together with the supply of salmon and onions (which thrived on the sandy soil to the SW of the town) may have saved it from the Holocaust. But it is clear from the above reference that the "country people" of west-Waterford were starving with hunger. Was the purchase of Indian Corn for the townspeople or was it to be sold on to the west-Waterford people? The *Chronicles* are silent on this. It is

quite clear that Youghal town was a colonial outpost—a garrison town, having British navy protection to guard the exports from the wealthy estates upriver on the Blackwater of which the wealthiest was the Duke of Devonshire based at Lismore Castle.

The castle is still held by the Duke of Devonshire. In 1882, the then Duke was so influential that the House of Lords in London decided in his favour and confirmed his ownership of the salmon fishing of the Blackwater not only down to Youghal but out to sea into Youghal Bay and two miles out offshore to Capel Island. Every local Irish fisherman had to obtain and pay for a fishing-licence from the Duke—even when fishing out at sea in Youghal Bay. Also the Duke is the owner of fishing-weirs to catch salmon on the Blackwater River in Munster.

It is said by pro-British history propagandists that the mere Irish were too lazy or too lacking in initiative to catch fish. The truth is the fish were owned by the landlords and the mere Irish were prohibited from owning ships or boats. The Irish have always had a great maritime tradition. The Irish traded with Spain, caught fish on the Newfoundland Banks then known as Talamh na hÉisc, Brian Boru had a fleet of ships, Niall of the Nine Hostages was sailing the coast of France when he captured St. Patrick at Patrick's father's house at Bonaventum near St. Malo, St. Brendan voyaged to what is now Newfoundland and there are numerous other evidences of Irish maritime activity throughout history. In A.D. 563 St. Columba sailed from Derry to Iona and he wrote:

"Robad mellach, a meic mo Dé,
Dignail réimenn,
ascnam tar tuinn topur ndilenn
dochum nÉirenn."

Which translates as:

"What joy to sail the crested sea and watch the waves beat white upon the Irish shore."

So there is an abundance of evidence of maritime tradition in Ireland but England put a stop to Irish-owned boats. England had to control the imports and exports and England needed to reduce the Irish to penury so that Irishmen had to join the English navy or the English army or starve. It was the *modus operandi* of the British Empire which killed two or three million in the Irish holocaust. (No one was counting at the time).

DUKES OF DEVONSHIRE

The Devonshire Estate is one of the biggest landowners in England, based at Chatsworth House in Derbyshire with a smaller estate at Lismore, Co. Waterford. It is said that when English King James

the First created the Earldom, the word "Devonshire" was a clerical error and that "Derbyshire" was the intended title. The family name has been Cavendish since Sir John of Cavendish, a village on the banks of the river Stour, acquired the manor of the same name by his marriage to Alice and he became Chief Justice of England in the reign of Edward the Third. His son also John is famous for helping the Lord Mayor of London to kill Wat Tyler in Smithfield for which deed John was knighted by King Richard.

On the other hand at about the same time, a crowd led by Jack Straw captured the father and beheaded him in Bury-St-Edmond's market place. Several generations later in 1530 we find William Cavendish is a Royal Commissioner working at dissolving the monasteries. He acquired for himself many properties and married three times and had sons by his third wife Bess of Hardwicke who herself was married four times. Her second son William later was made the first Earl of Devonshire. The fourth Earl was made a Duke after he was one of the leaders in the substitution of William 111 for James 11. Along the way the Earls and Dukes had changed religion and political sides several times and always came out on the winning side. They married women who controlled property and land and of course under the Law then a wife's property became the property of her husband.

Regarding the fishing rights on the Munster Blackwater, the Duke of Devonshire was in the Irish courts a few years ago and he could not produce a Deed to prove his title but he claimed his ownership under the *Magna Carta* and under English common law. The court decided in the Duke's favour—which is a very odd decision however you look at it. *Magna Carta* is an English agreement enforced on King John by his barons at Runnymede and he later rejected it and in any event—it never applied to Ireland. The *Magna Carta* is merely a tourist attraction in the British Library. In the British Library shop a copy of it is available for £3.

A Royal (English) Charter in 1485 purported to give the town of Youghal an Admiralty Jurisdiction over a stretch of the Blackwater from a line between Ardmore Head and Capel Island and up the Blackwater to include the River Bride. The Bishop of Lismore was given Admiralty Jurisdiction upriver. Admiralty Jurisdiction is not ownership and it is merely a policing power. But apparently the Duke traces his title to the fishing rights to these shaky pieces of history. He has not got the deeds and cannot have. There was never any deeds. One of the golden threads

TRADE UNION NOTES continued

However most other unions, including a number who had previously rejected Croke Park II, have accepted the new Agreement.

On 15th August 2013, the ASTI Central Executive Council voted to put the Haddington Road Agreement to a ballot of its 17,000 members with a recommendation to reject.

"Members of the central executive council expressed the view that teachers have given enough, including a 14% pay cut, which was imposed on all public servants.

The Executive Committee of the TUI also met and decided to put the proposals to a ballot of members without recommendation.

TRAFFIC OK! Dublin businesses have called for the reversal of Government plans to shut down one of the city's main shopping streets for a commemoration day marking the 100th anniversary of the 1913 Lockout.

The Dublin City Business Improvement District (BID) said a lockdown on O'Connell Street to allow the State and community mark the 100th anniversary of the 1913 Lockout and Bloody Sunday would see shops lose trade on one of the busiest retail days of the year.

"Richard Guiney, chief executive of BID, which represents 2,500 businesses in the city centre, urged organisers to reconsider the plans to close the thoroughfare to traffic as it is expected to affect around 65% of potential visitors to the city.

"It does not bode well for how the decade of centenary celebrations, which

are fast approaching, will be managed." (*Irish Examiner*, 16.8.2013).

PENSIONS: Allied Irish Banks' staff accepted a cost-cutting deal on 15th August 2013, which will close the bank's defined benefit pension scheme and employees will work longer and give up automatic pay hikes.

Workers at the bank were balloted on the deal, which was supported by the Labour Court as a way to avoid further staff cuts at the lender. Shares closed up 4.4% at 7.2 cents despite a fall in the benchmark ISEQ and other lenders on the exchange.

The savings recommended by the Labour Court include scrapping automatic pay hikes for staff, a phased increase in the standard working week from 36 to 38 hours for no additional pay, and closure of the bank's costly defined benefit pension scheme, which has a funding gap of €1.1 billion.

"Larry Broderick, who heads the banking union IBOA, said his members had signed off on the plan 'on the basis that the commitments contained in the proposals are honoured by both AIB management and the Government'.

"In early August, the bank said it returned to "pre-provision" profits of €162 million in the six months ended June for the first time since it was nationalised as part of a €21 billion rescue by taxpayers. Overall losses for the first half of the year were €758 million, including cash set aside to cover historic lending. First half operating income rose 19% to €916 million" (*Irish Independent*, 16.8.2013).

running through English law and Irish law is that a person cannot take good title from a person who does not hold good title. So how come the Dukes of Devonshire are allowed to claim ownership of the riverbed? It is one law for the ordinary people it seems in this case but not for a rich and powerful Duke. *Qui Bono?*

TAXES=CHARITY

We taxpayers just have no idea of the sense of entitlement and the ignorance of our electoral representatives but we get some insight into their mindsets now and again. Our tax euros are to keep public services running, right? Wrong! The TD's think it's to keep them cushioned from the realities of life. Among the many sorts of shovels they put into our taxes is that shovel known as the "*Leader's Allowances*". So as to make it look like a genuine need, there is a formula for calculating it based on the number of seats won by each

party in the most recent election or bye-election. Since the 2011 General Election the Allowance shovels out €1,800,000 to the Labour party and €2,700,000 to Fine Gael each year. Once it is shovelled out there is no vouching for it. It is in addition to a Leader's salary and expenses as a TD and in addition also to a Leader's salary as Taoiseach or Tánaiste and in addition to the allowances each TD gets to maintain his or her office. Both Labour and Fine Gael have lost or expelled TDs, but that makes no difference to the Leader's Allowances and so €200,000 a year is being drawn for the number of TDs not now in these parties. Minister Brendan Howlin says he does not propose to change the system. Colm Keaveney—a former Labour TD—says the system is unfair and that the (taxpayer's) money should be given to charity! Think about it! Charity? It doesn't stack up.

Michael Stack ©

APPRENTICES continued

The new regulations weakened the statutory controls e.g. practising a trade by not being apprenticed was legal and removed the requirement for a minimum of seven year apprenticeships. Despite this, apprenticeships remained relatively popular with many occupations that involved practical skills and with a number of the professions. Towards to end of the 19th century approximately 340,000 apprentices were involved each year in preparing to enter building, engineering, shipbuilding, printing and woodworking occupations.

(To be continued)

NOTE: A Court of Assistants is a council of members belonging to professional, trade, craft or livery organisations. The term originated among the London Livery Companies. The Court of Assistants is usually the governing body of these organisations and may include the officials, as in the case of the Worshipful Company of Clockmakers founded in 1631: *"The governing body of the Company is the Court of Assistants, comprising the Master, three Wardens and not less than ten Assistants"*.

TRADE UNION NOTES

Domino's Pizza has confirmed that it is using controversial zero-hours contracts in Ireland.

A spokesperson for the pizza chain said its Irish outlets follow the same model as in the UK where junior positions are all staffed on zero-hours contracts.

A zero-hours contract of employment means the employee is available for work but does not have any specified hours of work.

The contracts are widely used in the services sector, according to Siptu.

In Ireland, employees on zero-hours contracts have to be compensated if they do not work at least 15 hours, according to the Organisation of Working Time Act 1997.

If the hours worked by an employee doesn't meet this quota then the company must compensate workers to the equivalent of 15 hours' work.

McDonald's Ireland confirmed it is not using the practice as Irish law prohibits it.

In the UK, however, the company has been widely using it.

"Siptu's services sector organiser, John King, said that in parts of the industry that have not been unionised there are a lot of companies using zero-hour contracts.

"Mr King said that the employment market was now ruthless since the removal of the Joint Labour Committee.

"Since the removal of the Joint Labour Committees, the employment market has become a jungle," he said. (*Irish Examiner*, 13.8.2013)

DUBLIN BUS faces the prospect of further strike action after 900 staff balloted on August 16.

Both SIPTU and NBRU drivers voted overwhelmingly to reject the latest proposals aimed at saving the company €11.7 million.

Discussions took place at the Labour Court following a three-day strike over the August Public Holiday weekend (4.8.2013).

SIPTU organiser Willie Noone said that, while his members don't want another strike, they have *"had enough"*.

"They can't afford a strike, that's why they're taking such a stand in relation to these cost-cutting measures.

"They cannot afford any more cuts ... but if the company comes along and tries to force through these changes, there will be a strike."

Over 70% of SIPTU drivers rejected the proposals, and NBRU drivers voted against the deal with a 67% majority.

DEFINED BENEFIT: than 100 such pension schemes still have not submitted funding proposals to the Pensions board.

According to figures provided by the Board to Fianna Fail Finance spokesman, Michael McGrath, 120 firms are yet to offer a formal plan to deal with deficits in their scheme.

The trustees of Defined Benefit schemes are required by law to submit proposals on how they will address deficits.

The deadline for the submission of the proposals was June 30, 2013, at which point over 200 schemes had not submitted their proposals.

An estimated 200,000 workers are members of Defined Benefit pension schemes.

They are more favourable to the worker as essentially the employer undertakes to guarantee a fixed portion of final salary on reaching retirement.

Unlike the **Defined Benefit scheme,**

the **Defined Contribution scheme** promises only that a certain level of contribution will be paid and the pensions to come from the scheme are not defined or promised.

Over 400 Defined benefit schemes have shut down since 2008.

SIPTU Trade Union members in the G4S security company have voted to accept company restructuring proposals which will cost 30 jobs.

"A SIPTU organiser Brendan Carr said the agreement means 'approximately 30 voluntary job losses and changes to workers' terms and conditions of employment'..." (*Irish Independent*, 10.8.2013).

AER ARANN: Threatened industrial action at the airline has been suspended after talks between management and representations of the Aer Arann pilot group which took place on 16th August 2013.

The planned strike was postponed to allow for a negotiated agreement on pay to be put to a ballot.

The IMPACT Trade Union said they will put *"a strong recommendation for acceptance"* of the proposed deal to the pilots.

A spokesperson from Aer Arann said:

"We are pleased to confirm to our customers that it is business as usual at the airline. The strike has been averted. All services will operate fully, across all routes, at all airports.

Aer Lingus pilots were also considering strike action in solidarity with the workers at Aer Arann.

TEACHERS' BALLOT: Two teaching Unions, whose leaderships rejected the Haddington Road Agreement without putting it to a vote are to give their members the chance to ballot on its contents in September.

The Association of Secondary Teachers Ireland and the Teachers' Union of Ireland remain the only large public service Unions opposed to the deal.

They had balloted their members on the predecessor to the agreement, Croke Park II, and there had been an overwhelming rejection. When Haddington Road was then formulated the executive committees of the two Unions decided not enough had changed to warrant a re-ballot.

continued on page 23

APPRENTICES continued

clockmakers about a quarter of a century after their incorporation, at which time the freemen proclaimed their condition to be worse than 'ever before they were given their charter'. For then they said 'such as were agrieved sought their remedy by the law of the land and ye customs of this city, but since the power hath bin in the Courte of Assistants all manner of evils have flowed in upon us, as may appear by theis particulars.'

"Foremost in the list of particulars, appears the charge that the governing body abetted strangers and foreigners 'whereas the charter was in especiall manner procured for ye restraint' of all such. Next they denounced the court's method of binding apprentices to freemen for foreigners, thereby enabling apprentices to become freemen as if they had served their whole time with freemen. Finally, they accused the court of disregarding the 'Order which hath bin often renewed for restraining the multiplicity of Apprentices', and permitting apprentices to multiply until 'the trade is almost ruined'..." (Ibid.p.189-90).

Although the cutlers of Hallamshire received parliamentary incorporation in 1624, largely to regulate the taking of apprentices, by 1711 the company had cause to complain of freemen taking unto themselves so very many apprentices and turning out vast quantities of wares of all sorts which had to be sold for scarce half the rate at which they were formerly sold, to the ruin of the company (see Hunter, *Hallamshire*, p.219). In 1598 the coopers of Hull were admonished to keep no more than two apprentices at once (see Lambert, *Two Thousand Years of Guild Life*, p.287).

In 1683 the Court of the Wheelwrights' company of London forbade any member not of the Court of Assistants to have or keep more than one apprentice at any one time. Only during the last year of the service of such apprentice could his master take another (see Scott, *History of the Wheelwrights' Company*, p.58) (Felkin., p.186, note 5).

"Toward the end of the 16th century influence was brought to bear upon parliament to prevent the guilds admitting persons who followed different callings apparently with little result" (see Strype, *Stow's Survey of London*, Book v, p.252, cited in Felkin, p. 188, note 16).

RUIN OF THE GUILD SYSTEM

"In admitting men, apparently at a very early period, by redemption and by patri-

mony, gild procedure itself furnished a way by which members could evade serving an apprenticeship. This procedure contributed in the end to the causes which brought about the ruin of the system as a whole, by opening up the offices as well as the ranks to men who, not having themselves served an apprenticeship to a calling, naturally had no particular concern in employing only those who filled the requirements in that regard" (ibid. p. 188).

"The cleavage was scarcely less pronounced between masters and men than between the different master classes. There seemed little chance of reconciling free journeymen of the 17th century to the fact that masters refused them work while they gave it to unfree journeymen, or to those from the country, or extracted from them a pledge not to set up for themselves, or denied them membership in their guilds or took more apprentices than gild law allowed" (ibid. p.190-91).

"Apprentices, in their turn, could scarcely be expected longer to sympathise with the policy of masters who broke faith with them by neglecting to enroll them in gild, and even in borough records, or who refused them their freedom after they had faithfully served their term, or charged them such exorbitant fees for entry as to make gild mastership practically impossible for them forever after" (ibid. p.191).

"RIOTING APPRENTICES"

"Masters, of course could prefer charges equally grave against journeymen and apprentices. Journeymen, they averred, combined to raise wages, or to shorten their working hours, or took service with men of rival corporations when their own needed workmen, or refused to pay their gild quarterage, or to take up their freedom, preferring to work secretly in chambers; indeed, they often went so far as to dictate to masters in the taking of apprentices. Apprentices, in effect, they accused of wasting their masters' time in rioting; of demanding unreasonable wages; of deserting during times of war, or even peace; of refusing to serve them after coming 'out of their terms' and taking upon themselves rather 'a mansion or shop' of their own; or of setting up in business before they took up their freedom, of failing thereby to 'unite and conform themselves' to their respective trade companies" (ibid. p. 191-93, note 41).

STATUTES IGNORED

"If a contemporary writer can be credited, by 1656 'not any of the relations to clothing... doth observe this rule of apprenticeship notwithstanding it is enjoined in very strict and penall manner by the Statute Lawes'..." (Dunlop,

English Apprenticeship, pp. 105-6. Quoted from *The Golden Fleece*, 1656, by W.S). By the end of the following century, the non-observance of the Elizabethan act had become so universal in the cloth trade in Leeds that masters who had served no apprenticeship were apparently in as good standing as those who had... From the time of King James I {1603-25} the judges had ruled against the statute and in favour of the common law, according to which a man might exercise any trade whether he had been trained to it or not" (ibid. p.160-61).

"In 1669 we find the act being set aside to enable a certain draper to use his trade in a Suffolk town, on the ground that 'though not repealed' yet the 'Statue... has been by most of the judges looked upon as inconvenient to Trade and to the Encrease of Inventions'. Fifteen years later it had become a matter of legal knowledge that such 'By-laws mett with no favour in Westminster Hall'. In 1709 the attorney consulted by the mercers of Derby concerning their power to enforce the apprenticeship service under by-laws which dated from 1675, advised them that in his opinion 'Ye Crown cannot originally grant any such privilege to a corporation because ye same tends to yet restraint of trade and traffic', wherefore 'any below founded thereupon will not be good'. How this opinion, which denied to crown, borough and guilds the right to enforce the apprenticeship service, was received in Derby does not appear.

"But during the first half of the 18th century in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, actions to restrain men from using trades to which they had not been apprenticed were brought in the quarter-sessions courts as being contrary not to borough or gild laws, but to the Elizabethan statute of apprenticeship. It is only after the third quarter of the 17th century, that the records of the Newcastle quarter sessions fail to register further proceedings taken under the statute. So it appears that as a means of restraining trade or industry, the apprenticeship system was doomed long before 1814, the years in which the English government swept from the statute-book the clauses of the statute which, for over two centuries, had made apprenticeship a legal requirement. (*The English Craft Guilds, Studies in their Progress and Decline*, Stella Kramer, Columbia University Press, 1927, p.161).

Hibbert in his book *Influence And Development of English Guilds*, p.134 pointed out that there were still Guilds which kept on enrolling apprentices after the passage of this act. The Shrewsbury mercers recorded their enrolment up to 1835. (*ibid. p.161 Note 155*).

continued on page 24

APPRENTICES contin-

of the 18th century London pewterers could no longer keep their members from employing workmen who had failed to serve a proper apprenticeship. By that time guilds took apprentices without apprising their organisations of the taking. In 1719 the Dublin merchants filed a protest against the many members who 'contrary to their oaths and in contempt of the by-laws of this house do take apprentices without causing them to be enrolled in this hall'. By 1732 master carpenters of Bristol took apprentices without leave of the court of the company" (ibid. p.156-58).

"In 1653 the goldsmiths of London found it expedient to limit the number of apprentices members might lawfully take. Three years later city clockmakers protested against the 'undue multiplication' of apprentices whereby they said their industry was almost ruined. By 1711 disaster is said to have overtaken the cutlery business in Hallamshire because members of the cutlers' company 'do take unto themselves so very many apprentices'..." (ibid. p.158).

"To be sure, there had always been masters of this type both within and just without the English boroughs but their numbers had steadily increased with the passing of the years. For example, at Chester, in 1629, steps were taken to apprehend feltmakers who kept apprentices although they had served no apprenticeship themselves to their art. Nine years later the glovers of London told of the hardship they suffered from the invasion of men and women from different parts of the kingdom, who had served little or not time to the trade yet who worked privately in chambers and took many apprentices. During this time, too, the cordwainers and curriers of Lichfield protested against the numbers of persons 'which have shifted abroad in the country and have not orderly served an apprenticeship' in any one place before coming to their city and using one or both industries. In 1698 at Nottingham 'Specyall care' was being taken to see that neither a 'Burgess' nor a 'Freeman of the said Towne' should by any chance use a trade 'vnto which they haue not served as an apprentice'..." (ibid. p.160).

FAILURE TO ENFORCE GUILD RULES

It is evident that Guild supervision proved effective in so far as it enforced apprenticeship, and failure to enforce it, led to the breakdown of the Guild system as a whole. Of course the Norwich 'taillour' who, in 1524, refused to 'suffre' the wardens of his craft 'to search in his shoppe in

causes concernyng the occupation of taillours' was not alone in defying Guild authority. But the records tell of the many 17th century craftsmen who denied the right of Guild officials not only in Norwich but in other places to search their premises for defective goods.

"During the first quarter of the 17th century, obstructions of one sort or another were frequently put in the way of the wardens of the London goldsmiths as they made their accustomed rounds in search of defective wares. In 1642, the master and wardens of city apothecaries were assailed in a very ill manner when they attempted to search the shop of one of their members. In 1676, at Bristol, the feltmakers' official supervisors were prevented from inspecting certain parcels of felt stored in a member's shop. In 1700 any number of Pontefract merchants either refused outright to permit guild officers to search their shops or interrupted them in the discharge of that office. A year later, a certain member of the London saddlers 'did deny the search' threatening to strike the searchers with a hammer, besides 'giving very abusive words'..." (Stella Kramer, p.163-64).

"Seemingly guilds of the period suffered no offender to be a law unto himself. In 1701 by order of the court of the London gold and silver wyre-drawers' company, members who resisted the search were to be prosecuted. It was one thing to issue an order of the sort, but another to enforce it, for a few months later this company was consulting the attorney-general to learn whether it could legally prosecute members for transgressing the by-laws under which their search had been conducted" (p.164).

"In 1613 it was agreed by the searchers and the company of silk-weavers of York that thereafter no brother should taken an apprentice 'uppon sett purpose to turne' him over to another or by any means to defraud the trade'..." (*Account of the Company of Silk Weavers*, MS., B.M., fol. 21. Ibid. p.163; note 8).

According to Professor Brentano (*History & Development Of Guilds* (cited in Toulmin Smith's *English Guilds*, p.31), in 1796 the trustees of the cloth halls at Leeds admitted masters who had served no apprenticeship. With the adoption of modern machinery the art of weaving no longer required a seven years' apprenticeship and Parliament in the act of 43 George III, {1760-1820} c. 136 suspended the Elizabethan law so that clothiers might employ weavers who had served no apprenticeship (ibid. p.160, note 148).

"In 1631, among the clockmakers of

London, searchers were authorised to seize the goods made by men who had not served full time and to close their shops as well" (Overall, *History of the Clockmakers*, p.15).

It is interesting to note, that chief among such 'defaults' they evidently reckoned that of masters taking an apprentice for "*less that the term of seven years*". Manifestly to keep control over their occupation, these 15th century barbers established a system of inspection, the basis of which they held to be the enforcing of a rigid apprenticeship.

Moreover, that 17th century organisations deemed equally essential to their welfare, the enforcement of the service, is evident from appeals for leave to incorporate it as an integral part of their regime.

LEGAL ROUTE

"Appeals of the sort were issued not only by a group like the London clockmakers, in establishing a new organisation for the purpose of fulfilling their destiny as arbiters of the art of clockmaking but also, by the cutlers of Hallamshire, a company of established standing, when they asked for parliamentary incorporation in order to prevent their workmen from taking as many apprentices as they considered themselves free to take and for as long a term of years as they pleased. *Apparently, no matter what the source of their authority, guilds of the later period could not inculcate in their own members a proper regard for this fundamental requirement of gild economy and consequently failed to impress it upon outsiders...*" (ibid. p.185-86).

Overall, *History of the Clockmakers' Company*, p.59: "...When the powers conferred by their crown charter proved ineffectual in preventing unskillful and unscrupulous practice, the company endeavoured to have its members finance parliamentary incorporation, but failed in the endeavour. After the framework knitters had obtained an act of parliament regulating framework knitting—an art not in vogue at the time the Elizabethan act made the seven-years' service a prerequisite to the practice of a trade or industry—the company inserted in its by-laws a provision making apprenticeship a requirement to membership in the craft"..." (Felkin, *History of Machine, Wrought Hosiery and Lace Manufactures*, p.68).

In the 1620s, the Clockmakers' Company voiced their discontent at their Court of Assistants:

"This, at least, seems to have been the burden of the complaint voiced by the
continued on page 25

APPRENTICES continued

to freemen yt were inhabitants'. A practice thus begun at Hertford against the wishes of the freemen (who begged the mayor 'to make noe more Strangers freemen by redempcon', because the borough's trade was already impoverished), seems to have been continued in different years of the 18th century when batches of non-freemen were admitted, as it would appear, for political purposes rather than for economic" (ibid. p.155-56).

POLITICS

"The political exigencies of the times had in all probability interfered considerably with the normal working of the apprenticeship laws. Just as the boroughs had to relax the severity of their rules governing the admission of freemen, in order to make room for soldiers who in times of stress had given their services to their country, so in like manner it was felt in 1642 that something should be done to encourage apprentices who already 'have or shall voluntarily list themselves to go in this present expedition for the defence of Religion, the preservation... of the King and the Kingdome'.

"The following year it was decreed by both the 'Lords and Commons in Parliament' that 'apprentices unto watermen plying and rowing upon the river of Thames as have been or shall be listed to serve as soldiers... shall be secured against their masters... from all loss and inconvenience by forfeiture of bonds' and that after this public service 'be ended the master of such apprentices shall be commanded... to receive them again into their service without imposing any punishment, loss or prejudice for their absence in the defence of the Commonwealth.' Later, when invoked, the courts declared that the time spent as a soldier in the Parliament's service must be allowed an apprentice 'as if he had continued with his master'. Apprentices to other handicrafts, apparently quick to avail themselves of the opportunities thus open to them, took the law into their own hands and eluded gild service. The weavers of Westbury told how in these disordered times apprentices forsook parents and masters under colour of following the wars, and refusing afterwards to serve out their time, set themselves up as weavers, thereby depriving the 'ancient weavers' of their accustomed work" (ibid. p.155-56).

In 1728, not only were unfree persons found using their trades within the liberties of Durham, but apprentices as well were gaining their freedom by improper Guild practice. This objectional procedure the borough authorities tried to stop by imposing a weekly fine of twenty shilling on

all intruders, payable so long as they continued to ply their trades within corporate limits. Seven years earlier, in 1721, the Mayor of Wells in Somersetshire charged local Guilds with clandestinely admitting into their ranks men who had never properly qualified by serving an apprenticeship within the borough. In places like Norwich as early as 1622, the authorities had cause to complain that local Guilds were not properly enrolling their apprentices or paying a proportionate share of the fees into borough coffers. In 1672 the 'tylers' and 'playsterers' of Bristol were binding apprentices to themselves and then turning them over to non-freemen, a procedure forbidden because detrimental to the interests of the city.

"Three years later the Derby mercers were taking apprentices fraudulently to the displeasure of the borough. Because the fraudulent binding of apprentices enabled them to secure their freedom without serving an apprenticeship. At Northampton, in 1702, the assembly forbade freemen thereafter to bind apprentices save in the presence of the mayor, recorder or one of the borough justices. As a further precaution the indentures were to be made out by the town clerk only, and for a term not less than seven years, while gild masters were to forfeit twenty pounds each time they failed to comply with the rules. At Bedford, too, 'improper apprenticeship' became so serious a menace as to force the authorities of the period to consider the practicability of disfranchising freemen for the offence. (Stella Kramer, p.155).

APPRENTICES UNDERMINE OWN SYSTEM

"At Somerset, the attention of the executive authorities was called to instances where apprentices refused outright to carry out the terms of their 'agreement to be bound apprentice' or deliberately ran away from their masters. During these days too, the guilds found themselves obliged to overlook breaches of their rules governing apprenticeship. In 1646 the merchants of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, taking into consideration 'these distracted times' during which an apprentice living in Rotterdam had neglected to acquire his freedom in the company prior to his marriage, condoned the offense and admitted the offender to membership, although there still remained to his account, thirteen months of service.

"This same company is known of its own 'favour and grace' to have admitted an apprentice still 'wanting' eighteen months service. However, even before the tempestuous days of the civil war {English Civil War 1642-1651} the guilds had grown lax about enforcing rules

governing apprenticeship. In 1629 we find an artisan girdler of London accusing the court of his company of not putting into execution ordinances touching those who 'set on worke such as had not served seven years at the art'..." (ibid. p.156-58).

1563-1954, XVI,

1. The number of apprentices in each recognised office shall be regulated...

2. No boy intended as an apprentice to the printing trade shall be allowed to remain on trial for a longer period than three months...

4. The choice of apprentices shall be in the ratio of two selections by the Society to one by the employer...

7. To discountenance the pernicious effects of runaway apprentices, the Branch Secretary must immediately inform the General Secretary when a turnover is introduced into an office...

8. The Secretary shall notify apprentices and turnovers seeking or being offered employment when a dispute is pending in the Branch; he shall also inform the parents or guardians of such apprentices of the nature of the dispute and explain to them the evil results of such a step on their future prospects as workmen.

(Rules of the *Cork Typographical Society*, Established 1806, a Branch of the Typographical Association, Manchester. Amended in 1954.)

In 1649 the merchant tailors of Bristol denounced the practice then prevalent in their company of admitting persons who had failed to serve a seven years' apprenticeship. Their company, they said, had, of late years, been exceedingly enlarged by the taking in of strangers by way of redemption and composition, there having been during the past year a 'continual adding of such unto this numerous Company'. In London during this epoch poor '*Working Taylors*' besought their company to protect them from the competition of foreigners, who, they asserted, were being allowed to work under a nominal apprenticeship and in some instances without qualification of any sort.

"LUCRE AND GAIN"

"In 1656 the glovers of Shrewsbury attributed the impoverishment of their company to the fact that its freedom had been conferred upon many who had not served a due apprenticeship, and later in the century told of brethren among them who had sunk so low as actually to connive at intruders 'for fraudulent lucre and gain'. Ere long, too, the mercers of the borough had transgressed by taking sons of intruders as apprentices. By the opening

continued on page 26



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 31 No. 9

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

MONDRAGON 22

The Apprentice Boys!

The loss of Guild power to enforce the laws governing apprenticeship was a fundamental blow to the future of the Guild System. Guild supervisors passed judgement upon the fitness of apprentices to be taken into service, say "whatt apprentices" masters "kepe" so that only the stipulated numbers were taken at any one time, ensured that they were properly enrolled in Guild records and that none were taken merely to be turned over to other masters. The searchers had likewise to testify to borough officials as to the fitness of an apprentice who had served the required term to set up as a master.

Apprenticeships in Britain started back in the Middle Ages and were an integral part of the mediaeval Craft Guilds. In 1563 the Statute of Artificers created a more regulated and prescribed system by setting out more precise conditions and terms. These included the duration of the apprenticeship and, very important, set out the relationship between the master and apprentice. Also it limited the master to a maximum of three apprentices.

Surprisingly apprenticeships were not necessarily voluntary and in some cases there were instances of compulsion.

Basically, apprenticeships evolved by way of a contractual agreement between the master and apprentice—initially in a few trades. The regulation was through indentures that were legally binding documents. Indentures were written and agreed, binding the servant and master and in which the master took responsibility for the apprentice's training and welfare and provided him with accommodation. Also there were conditions about how the apprentice should behave outside his workplace and these conditions were stated explicitly in the indenture.

JOURNEYMAN

Apprenticeships lasted for two to seven years, depending on the particular trade, after which the apprentice became a journey man. The term derived from the French word for day i.e. 'journee' and basically meant that the journeyman would be paid by the day for his work.

After a period of extensive experience, the journeyman could submit a piece of his best work to the appropriate Guild for assessment and approval. If this 'master piece' was accepted he could become a master craftsman and set up his own workshop and train apprentices.

APPRENTICESHIP OBLIGATIONS

"Undoubtedly, apprentices owed certain obligations to the guild in control of the occupation they used, which they were required to meet. According to a ruling adopted in the twentieth year of the reign of King Edward IV {1461-1483}, an apprentice could gain the freedom of the merchant guild of Newcastle-upon-Tyne provided that he duly 'observe and kepe all manner gud ordinances and acts maid... in the courtes', and in addition contribute to the 'comon box at his enter-

ing' as well as at the end of his 'forsaid termes' of service, the sum specifically designated for the privilege. (*The Merchant Adventurers of Newcastle-upon-Tyne*, Surtees Society Publications, vol. 93, p.1.) In Elizabethan days every bricklayer's apprentice born within the borough of Kingston-upon-Hull had 'for his parte' to pay three shillings to the bricklayers' guild, while one born elsewhere paid five shillings. (Lambert, *Two Thousand Years*, p.278.) Among 17th century clockmakers of London, an apprentice who had served his term and been admitted a freeman of the company, attained to mastership after he had served two additional years as a journeyman and produced his masterpiece. (Overall, *History of the Clockmakers' Company*, p.30"...") (*The English Craft Guilds, Studies in their Progress and Decline*, Stella Kramer, Columbia University Press, 1927, p.192-93).

ATTACK ON APPRENTICESHIP SYSTEM

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

"It seems evident that many 17th century boroughs exerted their energies, apparently in good faith, to compel townsmen within their precincts to observe the laws governing apprenticeship. Yet there were others, which as necessity or expediency prompted, so far disregarded such laws themselves as to admit to the freedom either singly or in groups, both handicraftsmen and traders 'that never were inhabitants in ye Borrough nor served their apprenticeship

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