

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

January 2014

Vol.29, No.1 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.28 No.1 ISSN 954-5891

Europe And The Ukraine

The European Union is hell-bent on expansion. It only knows what it is if it is expanding. It has lost the power to consolidate. The idea that it is a union for mutual benefit of countries with similar cultures became a lie many years ago. It has long been out of the business of bringing together nations with compatible interests. It is now in the business of nation-building, and in order to build it must first destroy.

The policy of random expansion was embarked upon under British influence. Britain, which knows what it is, was made profoundly uneasy by the fact that Western Europe was getting to know what it was. If the integrated development of the original Six in Europe had continued, the basic British foreign policy of three centuries—the balance-of-power game which kept the major European states in conflict with each other—would no longer be operative. Then Britain, which had refused to take part in the original European structure, insinuated itself into the successful EEC and initiated the policy of random expansion. And, while encouraging expansion, it resolutely opposed any developments tending towards the formation of a European state. But random expansion by a body which is not a state could only lead to incoherence.

It is no longer Britain that is driving expansion. Britain's work has been done. Expansion is now all that the EU knows. Britain can sit back and let it happen. There were no British representatives manning the barricades in Kiev. They could leave that to frenzied Germans, and to Americans. The British presence was more discreet.

The Ukraine, which has had no historic existence as a state, was given its present borders by the Soviet Union. It was functional as part of the Soviet Union.

It did not achieve separate national existence through its own efforts. Existence was thrust upon it by Communists in the Kremlin who became capitalists overnight, made a capitalist market by giving chunks of the socialised economy to each other, and created nation states by dissolving the multi-national state into its bureaucratic parts.

Ukraine had its post-Soviet period, which in some respects was not entirely different from its Soviet period. Then it had its Western-inspired Orange Revolution. And a

continued on page 2

The Smithwick Tribunal

The Smithwick Tribunal, established in 2005 under Judge Peter Smithwick, President of Dublin District Court, reported in November 2013 at a cost of €15 million. Ministers tried to hurry it along, but the Tribunal refused to be pressured. The terms of reference were to examine "*suggestions that members of An Garda Síochána or other employees of the State colluded in the fatal shootings of RUC Chief Superintendent Harry Breen and RUC Superintendent Robert Buchanan on the 20th March, 1989*".

The Tribunal was established following the Weston Park Agreement to provide 'balance'. After sustained public pressure, the British Government agreed to set up an Inquiry process with regard to British Government collusion in the killings of Pat Finucane and Billy Wright. The *quid pro quo* was an Inquiry into allegations of Garda collusion in this incident.

The conclusion of the Inquiry was that there had been collusion with the Provos from within Dundalk Garda Station.

Chief Supt. Breen was the head of H Division covering Counties Down and Armagh, while Supt. Buchanan was in

continued on page 4

Mandela Owed Gerry Adams— And Nelson Repaid The Debt!

"The ugly sound of howls of joy haunts the ANC's account of Mandela necklace killings." No, *Irish Times* Assistant Editor Fintan O'Toole cannot be accused of penning any such lines on the death of Nelson Mandela. The poison-pen 'essay' of his that was published on December 10th was entitled "*The ugly sound of a howl of joy haunts Sinn Féin's account of*

IRA killings". The *Irish Times* published O'Toole's demonising of Gerry Adams within days of his deification of Nelson Mandela in the *Irish Times* 8-page valedictory supplement published on December 6th. The very first contribution, that of O'Toole himself, consisted of a full page reprint of a sycophantic accolade that had been first published in 2003 and presented

to Mandela on his 85th birthday, containing—as might be expected from Pope Fintan in such hallowed circumstances—not a single critical note. Its closing sentence, a Brechtian spin-off, was reproduced three times in the supplement: in the text of O'Toole's own encomium, as a large-print sub-heading alongside its dramatic title of "*Prometheus Unbound*", and as quoted in the final paragraph of an article by the late Kader Asmal.

If O'Toole's panegyric to Mandela is

continued on page 11

CONTENTS

	Page
Europe And The Ukraine. Editorial	1
The Smithwick Tribunal. Angela Clifford	1
Mandela Owed Gerry Adams, And Nelston Repaid The Debt! Manus O'Riordan	1
Readers' Letters: An Independent Scotland. Wilson John Haire	3
Roy Foster In Cork. Jack Lane	17
Shorts from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (Buying Ireland; Pent-Up Demand?; Third Quarter Results; NAMA; Tom Gilmartin; Newspapers On-Line; Nelson Mandela; British Intelligence	18
That Pro-Treaty Crowd. Wilson John Haire (Review of <i>The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings, 1974</i>)	19
Amigos. John Morgan, Lt. Col. Ret'd. (Report of a function)	20
A Connolly Association Meeting. (Report)	22
The Connolly Association, As Seen From Another Perspective Brendan Clifford	23
The Chinamen And The Connolly Association. Wilson John Haire	25
John Regan's Myth. Brendan Clifford	25
Biteback: The Great War. Report of letter by Pat Maloney	26

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

The Pillars Of Society

Seán Ó Riain

(back page)

Trade Union Notes

(page 30)

McGrath Blasts Economic Sovereignty Myth

Press Release

(page 29)

Mandela: The 'Revered'

O Bradaigh: The Reviled!

(page 27)

Due to pressure of space we have been obliged to hold over a number of items, including the Index to *Irish Political Review* for 2013

Russian capitalist oligarch in exile (Berezhovsky), who had fallen out with oligarchs at home, founded a kind of Capitalist International (the Foundation for Civil Liberties, based in New York) and made the Orange Revolution the jumping off point for an assault on what remained of the Soviet state.

But the Orange Revolution came to nothing. It was a revolution led by billionaires who had got their billions by plundering the economy of the Soviet state. It was, in other words, a revolution of corruption. The corrupt oligarchs fostered an idealism for the masses and used it for their own benefit.

That was something that was done in the original development of capitalism in its land of origin, England. But the English oligarchs had clawed their way to the top and were able to handle the masses whose ideals, or illusions, they manipulated. But the Ukrainian oligarchs, who began at the top, lacked that necessary skill—besides which the masses had been accustomed to

food, shelter and cultural opportunity by the old state. And Julia Timoshenko failed to seize her moment of destiny and found herself in jail for corruption.

Eventually something like a normal election was held in the Ukraine. The EU did not declare it to be invalid. The present Government was elected. It engaged in negotiation to fit the Ukraine into some larger economy.

The illusions of the Orange Revolution were centred on the EU. The practicalities of the existing Ukrainian industrial economy directed it towards Russia.

The conflict in Russia following the abolition of socialism was between the *laissez faire* capitalism of the oligarchs, under which the Russian economy would lie open to the developed capitalism of the USA and the EU countries, and a form of Bukharinist capitalism, in which the needs of the Russian national economy was taken into account. The latter required the restoration of an effective state in place of the oligarchic anarchy, established by

Yeltsin (in which each oligarch had his own mafia and acted as a state). When Yeltsin was persuaded to retire, with a guarantee against prosecution for corruption on a mass scale, the restoration of the national state was undertaken under Putin's leadership.

Berezhovsky, in his base area in London, retained an abysmally vulgar form of Marxism from his days as a Communist big-wig—economic determinism. He declared that Putin hadn't a hope of succeeding, because the Russian economy had been made a *laissez faire* region of international capitalism and political life would be determined by that fact. His fellow-oligarch, Khodakovsky, who remained in Russia while Berezhovsky went abroad to operate on Russia from the outside, trusted to economic determinism and lost.

Putin built up a strong political movement, from the victims of oligarchic capitalism, to take the place of the Bolshevik Party. That movement was predictably described as fascist by the media of the US/EU capitalism whose predatory interests in Russia it threatened. But it was maintained, and it carried the day against economic determinism.

Far too many parties had been spawned in Russia under Yeltsin for functional representative government. Those mushroom parties—of which there were scores—came and went from one election to another. Democracy is functional only with a small number of parties which have continuous existence throughout a series of elections. That is how the electorate gets an effective choice and stable representative government is made possible. Putin's organised movement gradually overcame the anarchy of the fifty and more parties that was the heritage from Yeltsin. It had continuous existence; its stood for something definite; its programme made sense to the disrupted populace; and it won elections.

This did not suit the interest of the EU, which at the end of the Cold War committed itself to expansion eastwards, both economically and militarily. (The EU has military existence as part of NATO, which ceased to be a defensive force in 1990 and became an aggressive force. The distinction between the EU and NATO is now practically meaningless, though Irish Governments engage in Jesuitry to make out that there is a real difference.)

The EU therefore made propaganda against Russian elections, claiming that they were rigged. But, as Putin's system bedded down, evidence of rigging got

harder to find. After the last election all the EU could find to say was that the result of elections should be uncertain and that everybody knew Putin was going to win. The reason why that was so—as commentators admitted in late night radio programmes—was that there was no rival party to Putin's within the established system to which the electorate had become accustomed.

In elections within stable democracy the system is hardly ever at stake. The parties seriously contesting elections almost always stand for nothing more than marginal modification of the established system. In Ireland Fine Gael/Labour implemented the policy inaugurated by Fianna Fail, and said in the election campaign that it would do so (Michael Noonan said it, and who else mattered?) And in Britain the Tory and Labour Parties regularly steal each other's clothes. When a rival party, that is committed to upholding the system with a few modifications, emerges in Russia, the outcome of elections will presumably become uncertain, as in US/UK/EU.

In the Ukraine the Government, returned by an election which the EU recognised as being fairly conducted, bargained between the EU and Russia about its economic future. If it linked itself with Russia, its economic development could continue without basic alteration. If it went to the EU, its industrial economy would be destroyed, and it would furthermore be deprived of the favourable trading links it had already established with Russia. It put itself on offer to the EU for a sum that would compensate for the loss of industries that would not be viable in the EU and for the loss of subsidised energy from Russia. When the EU would not meet its terms, it turned to Russia—and the EU went frantic. Its representatives went to Kiev, made propaganda, and helped to build barricades at the centre of the city.

The fact that the Russian Federation would erect tariff barriers against the Ukraine and charge it world market prices for energy if it joined the EU was presented as Russian intimidation of the Ukraine. But it was simply an expression of the fact that the Russian national economy, which protects itself from EU/US, would have to extend that protection to its borders with the Ukraine if the Ukraine joined the EU—an EU which is contemplating a free trade agreement with the US, with NATO in the background.

If the Ukrainian deal with Russia firms

continued on page 4

An Independent Scotland

There is possibly another angle to an independent Scotland—the people in the North of Ireland who term themselves Ulster-Scots. This large section of the Protestant community has looked more towards Scotland than London and an independent Scotland won't end that. It could even reinforce their deep-felt attitudes and emotions. I look at my father's side of the family whose Ulster and Scottish sides mingle to such an extent they are as happy living in County Tyrone and County Donegal as living in Fife.

My father's ancestors have been coming and going between the North of Ireland and Scotland since the 17th Century, 1643 to be precise. An ominous date I know. He knew his family history and could name relatives going back centuries. I dismissed his view of history because of my one-nation theory being preached by the Anti-Partition Movement in Belfast, which was reinforced when I joined the Connolly Association after arriving in London in 1954.

At my paternal grandmother's funeral in 1946 there were equal numbers of Scots and Ulster-Scots. In the horse-drawn carriage on the way to the cemetery I listened as they discussed their history as a 14 year old Catholic which made me feel I was among strangers. With my father joining in I felt even more alienated. My mother sitting in the *lady's* carriage said later she felt as if she had been taken hostage *by the alien talk of them*. With four sisters we were the only Catholics there. Just try making one nationality with those differences.

What to call this Scottish part of my family who went to live in the North of Ireland in the 17th Century—settlers? They were wheelwrights, carpenters, small farmers, and occasionally soldiers or wheelwrights working for various armies, maybe in the event of changing sides. The Irish/Ulster side of the family also settled in Fife. So in Fife you could find an mirror image of the same family that was living in Strabane, Sion Mills and outside Letterkenny in County Donegal, the same artisans and small farmers. They appeared to be very religious with a few generations of them playing the organ in the Presbyterian churches of Sion Mills, Strabane, Donegal and Fife, and still making their living as artisans and small farmers. To me this all sounded like quite a gloomy life, even depressing compared to the colourful Catholic church with its flowers, candles and the amiable blue-clothed Virgin Mary statue, and the Sunday dances in parochial halls in Catholic West Belfast which I attended as a teenager, after travelling from the shut-down Lords' Day Observant Society Carryduff.

Rampaging politics didn't seem to play a part in my father's side of the family, there were no reports of any of them putting their heads above the parapet. A couple of them died of starvation during the Siege of Derry and many of them put their names on the so-called Ulster Covenant of 1912 against what was indeed a very mild form of Home Rule. From the 1930s onwards you would find the modern North of Ireland side of the family in B-Special, RUC and British Army uniforms. But they still embraced us as the Catholic section of the family and were genuinely friendly, but the rest of the Catholic community was another matter.

If you kept quiet and took your *medicine* put forward as only a *geg* then work and social relationships was possible. The *medicine* (sectarianism) was sometimes twice or three times a day. But whatever you do don't *geg* back with your version of history. (*Geg*, meaning joke.) Some had an amazing capacity for repeating the same old mantra and singing the same old songs.

There are no known statistics for Protestant families having maybe a Catholic somewhere but Catholics in Protestant families is quite common and they can be loved. Having political arguments with Protestants sometimes comes to a head when someone might say: *'Ach sure my granny's a Catholic*. But this doesn't in the least lessen sectarian attitudes, and you can have all the mixed schools you want but two can't be made one. Well, in the end my father's oral encyclopaedia's memory of his family died with him. As I have said I dismissed his nationality, I didn't listen, I didn't learn while he was alive. But I know better now and that's a release for me.

Wilson John Haire

12 December, 2013

Ukraine

continued

up, the event is likely to be traumatic for the EU. If expansion is blocked, what will there be to hold it together? It has Moscow in its sights—like Napoleon and Hitler before it. But, if bourgeois-democratic Moscow becomes the centre of Eurasian development—As Tsarist and Bolshevik Moscow were before it—Europe would have to find something else to be than the vanguard of NATO. And it is obvious that it hasn't a clue what that might be.

And what about Ireland? Its official mind disintegrated in 1970 through inability to cope with the situation brought about by British misgovernment of the Six Counties, and it sought to escape from itself into Europe on Britain's coat-tails. And now its European refuge from itself is likely to be overcome by existential uncertainty.

Pat Cox, who played a prominent part in subverting the European Commission—the directing body of integrated EU economic development—by means of hysterical corruption scandals—was in Kiev on behalf of the EU, supporting the anti-Russian barricades, and propagating the illusory ideology which became the European stock-in-trade after the Commission was made ineffective. And the Taoiseach warns that, if Russia tries to deal through the Irish Stock Exchange in its financial assistance to the Ukraine—something from which the Irish economy would profit—he will consider intervening to prevent it. He will seriously consider cutting off his nose to spite his face.

The career of the EU, once it committed itself to unlimited expansion as the vanguard of NATO, was certain to end in failure. The only question was how catastrophic it would be.

Meanwhile, within the EU but essentially independent of it, there is a smaller body trying to develop—the Eurozone. If it succeeds, then something like the development envisaged by the Steel and Coal community back in the 1950s may yet be brought about.

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

Smithwick Tribunal

continued

charge of cross-Border liaison with the Garda. These were the two most senior police officers killed during the Thirty Year War. The two officers were ambushed a few hundred yards north of the Border, having attended a conference in Dundalk Garda Station.

GARDA MOLE?

The Provisionals claimed the killings. At the time both the RUC Chief Constable and the Garda Commissioner denied that the IRA had inside help from Dundalk Guards. Sir John Hermon was clear and unequivocal, saying:

"I can say now, categorically, that the evidence which we have firmly confirms that there was no mole, and we ask that it should be discounted very firmly and very clearly" (Irish Times 22.3.1989, Smithwick Report 8.1.2).

Subsequently Ulster Unionists claimed that Garda collusion had enabled the ambush to be mounted. Jeffrey Donaldson declared in Westminster:

"The meeting that he and Chief Superintendent Breen attended was arranged only on the morning of the day in question, and took place at 2 pm. How did the IRA know about a meeting involving such senior officers, and the timing of their return to Northern Ireland?" (13.4.2).

It was suggested that the IRA were tipped off when the officers arrived in Dundalk for a meeting they had arranged a few hours earlier. Unionists based this claim on Intelligence information.

According to the Smithwick Report, Donaldson (then in the UUP) was introduced to Intelligence Agent 'Kevin Fulton' by Willie Frazer (the Victims campaigner who goaded Fr. Reid into comparing Unionist rule with that of the Nazis). Whereupon Fulton—

"explained that on the day on which Harry Breen and Bob Buchanan were murdered, Patrick Joseph 'Mooch' Blair, in conversation with Mr Fulton, had revealed that the Provisional IRA unit who had murdered the two men had been given a tip-off, and the word "tip-off" was used{,} by someone in Dundalk Garda station who had provided the information about the movements of Chief Superintendent Breen and Superintendent Buchanan..." (13.3.8).

The MP made a speech under Commons' Privilege, naming Detective Sergeant Corrigan as a mole in Dundalk

Station, as the guard who had tipped off the IRA.

'Mooch' Blair was interviewed by the Tribunal and denied that any Garda officer ever assisted him or anyone else in the Provisional IRA "to his knowledge". Corrigan "was known to be anti-republican" (15.8.2).

'Kevin Fulton'—a British agent who was described as a "fantasizer" by RUC Special Branch (15.9.1) after he began campaigning for financial assistance at the end of the Provo War—gave evidence to the Inquiry and impressed the Judge. However his allegations did not amount to evidence, as Justice Smithwick was to admit. They were based on hearsay and deduction. Indeed, much of the 'evidence' given to the Inquiry—indeed some of it was "double hearsay".

'Intelligence' information is a portfolio term, which bundles together 'good' and 'bad' information. Things like observation reports, phone taps, bank account evidence, documentary interception are obviously tangible. But the term also covers reports from informants—people like 'Kevin Fulton'. These are paid by results. They report things that they hear and see. Some of the things they hear are stories that do the rounds.

Justice Peter Smithwick was reassured by the fact that the Garda tip-off story came to him from different Intelligence sources. However, there is no guarantee that these did not all originate from a single tainted source.

Credulous of Intelligence though he was, the Justice did not accept one claim made to the Inquiry by Force Research Unit agent Ian Hurst ('Martin Ingram')—that Garda Corrigan was reporting to "Stakeknife"—the British mole in the IRA, Freddie Scappaticci (16.3.4)

Understanding that he was being offered no 'hard' Intelligence, Smithwick found that the IRA had help from within Garda Station but declined to name names.

To make this finding of collusion, he had to reject testimony from the IRA team that carried out the Ambush. It insisted that it had no help, success resulting from a sustained military operation, with nine months of preparation. Its spokesmen were very cooperative with the Tribunal, providing a written statement and answering questions. As there has been so much misinformation about this matter, with the mainstream media more or less ignoring the IRA account, it is worth quoting from it at length.

VOLUNTEER STATEMENT

"22.2 IRA EVIDENCE

...

On March 20th 1989, RUC Chief Superintendent Harry Breen and RUC Superintendent Bob Buchanan were killed at Jonesboro by an Active Service Unit of the IRA, attached to the South Armagh Brigade.

This operation was executed as a result of lengthy and detailed surveillance initiated and conducted by IRA Volunteers.

At no time was there any input from the Gardaí or any other outside source or agency regarding the planning and execution of this operation.

In the late spring/early summer of 1988, one of our Volunteers spotted a red Cavalier car, registration no. KIB 1204, entering the (D.G.S.) Dundalk Garda Station complex from the Carrickmacross Road entrance. The car parked at the front of the station and two males got out.

The Volunteer immediately recognised the front seat passenger as an RUC detective who he believed was named Nigel Day, but was not certain of the name. He was approximately 40 years of age, 6ft tall, black hair with a hint of grey. He had a thick black moustache and was wearing a jacket, shirt and tie.

The Volunteer did not recognise the driver, although we now know it to have been Bob Buchanan. The Volunteer watched both men being admitted to the working area of D.G.S.. The Volunteer was able to leave the vicinity of D.G.S. confident at not having been noticed by either of the two men.

When this information was fed back by the Volunteer to the IRA structures, it was decided to mount a surveillance operation around D.G.S.. This was initially done by designated Volunteers driving and walking past and around D.G.S.. The focus was to locate the red Cavalier, but the presence of any Northern registered vehicles was also to be noted.

The red Cavalier was spotted on a number of occasions. It would be parked in roughly the same spot at the front of the Station, and would remain there for up to three hours.

At that stage it was decided to mount a more intense surveillance operation.

This continued throughout the summer and winter of 1988 to 1989.

During this period a derelict house, with a direct view of D.G.S., was identified and was used to conduct the majority of the surveillance on D.G.S. The house was No. 12 The Crescent, Dundalk. It's on the corner of The Crescent and Vincent Avenue (refer to sketch)...

Access was gained by scaling a garden wall at the back of the house at Vincent Avenue. The garden was

overgrown. A concrete path ran to the back door. This door was wooden and was unlocked.

This gave access to a kitchen area where on turning right you entered a rear living-room and from there onto the main entrance hall. On the left hand side of the hall was a wooden staircase.

The surveillance was carried out from a large front bedroom window on the Vincent Avenue side of the house. This window was covered with an old, dirty net curtain. It gave cover to those carrying out the surveillance while affording them a clear view of D.G.S.

There was no furniture in the room except for an old rolled up carpet sitting in the middle of the floor. The room was generally in a bad state of disrepair. There was no electricity supply to the house. Volunteers would enter and leave the house under cover of darkness, scaling the garden wall.

On those occasions when the car was spotted its make, colour and registration were always clearly identifiable and were noted.

After a period of surveillance a number of consistencies emerged: –

- * In the aftermath of any major incident in the South Armagh border region, the car would appear within days.

- * Monday and Tuesday were more regular days for it to be seen.

- * At one point we thought that we had lost the operation as the car was not noticed for approximately 6 – 8 weeks.

Information also came in that the car was spotted south of Dundalk, heading north. For a period casual surveillance was mounted around Drogheda Garda Station, with no results.

Two other Northern registered cars were noticed at D.G.S.. One was a black Audi. The other was a silver vehicle. We cannot recall its make or the registrations of either vehicle. We could not identify anyone linked to these cars and it was decided to focus on the red Cavalier.

After the 6 to 8 week gap we picked up the red Cavalier again around late summer, early winter 1988.

One of the surveillance teams made, what was for us, a significant breakthrough. The Volunteer met the red Cavalier in Meigh village at around 2 – 3 o'clock (pm). The car was travelling slowly through the village heading towards Newry. The Volunteer recognised the front seat passenger as Harry Breen. Harry Breen had a high media exposure following the ambush in Loughgall in 1987. We had video footage from news bulletins and photos from the press. He was, for obvious reasons, a target we had particular interest in. The car was also placed at D.G.S. earlier that same day.

Equally significant was that given its location, the car had to have crossed border crossings around the Forkhill area.

We assumed that they would vary their routes and because of previous operations along the main Dublin – Belfast Road at Killeen they would not use that stretch on a regular basis.

The surveillance operation was further intensified. We monitored D.G.S. more frequently and set up an elaborate communications system. That involved, among other things, radios and landlines. This enabled us to activate a wider surveillance team once the car was placed at D.G.S. The task for this team was to monitor and track the car as it left Dundalk to travel north and cross the border.

This was carried out successfully, and we soon established that they generally followed two routes...

We also established that they generally used three border crossing points...

We now moved from a purely surveillance-based operation to a military operation. This was around the end of 1988 into very early 1989. We proceeded on the basis that they could use any of the crossings between Tullydonnell and Killeen, inclusive, to return home.

The operation was planned around three stages: arrest, question and execute those on board.

Prior to March 20th, 1989, we mounted a military operation on three occasions. Twice the car didn't show, on the third occasion it was tracked using the Edenappa Road on the return journey. However, due to unconnected high levels of enemy activity in the general area we were unable to execute the operation.

On Monday, March 20th 1989, we again put the military operation in place.

We planned to keep it in place for seven days with a review after three days.

Surveillance was placed on D.G.S. from No. 12 – The Crescent. Other volunteers were in place to track the car leaving Dundalk town. The communications system, which had already proved efficient and reliable, was also put in place.

Two armed operational squads were put on the ground. One was based in the Forkhill area to cover the Carrickasticken and Tievcrum roads. The second squad was based in the Jonesboro area to cover the Omeath, Killeen, Flurry Bridge, Edenappa and Carrickbroad roads.

At approximately 12:30 pm the red Cavalier arrived at D.G.S. and parked in the usual spot. The communications system was activated at approximately

2:30 pm The car was tracked leaving D.G.S. via the Harp Brewery route, onto the Newry Road.

The car was tracked en route to the Edenappa Road. The Active Service Unit in the Jonesboro area had already been alerted and had moved into place, setting up a checkpoint at a pre-picked spot along the Edenappa Road.

The ASU intercepted the red Cavalier. The two male occupants were challenged to step out of the car with their hands up.

The car was put into reverse and attempted to escape. At that point both RUC Detectives were executed. The instructions to the ASU were to intercept the car, and arrest the occupants, but if that was not possible then they were to ensure that neither occupant escaped.

Documents of an intelligence interest belonging to both RUC men, found in the car, were removed from the scene by the ASU."

FURTHER INFORMATION

The Tribunal was provided with maps, including explanatory notes. And questions were answered. One of these related to the house used to watch the station. The Tribunal was told by the "former volunteer":

"The house was difficult to use because of neighbouring houses and the fact that you had to scale the wall to get in. If a volunteer entered, for example, at 5 a.m. in the summer and he would stay in the house until 10 p.m. at night. The volunteer would take lunch or whatever provisions that were necessary. If the neighbours had seen this activity, it would have compromised the entire operation."

In response to questions, the spokesman denied that the IRA had tapped phone lines into the Garda Station, as claimed by two very detailed articles in *Phoenix* magazine (which are reproduced in the Report).

Also, Smithwick was told: "It's not uncommon for the IRA to wait weeks" before acting (22.4.5).

Further:

"Garda Corrigan definitely did not have anything to do with the operation and was hostile to the IRA. He stated that the IRA had definitely not had any help from anyone else in Dundalk Garda Station and stated that he never heard of Leo Colton {another Garda}: "This operation had no help from anyone in the Garda. This was classic surveillance, hard dogged work, there was no help from anyone at all."

There was confirmation from other sources for some of the detail in the IRA account. For instance, RUC Inspector

Charles Day confirmed that he and Buchanan, in the red cavalier, had been followed from Dundalk to the Border just days earlier (Appendix p543).

PICKING HOLES

The Dublin District Court President was not satisfied with these explanations. He tried to pick holes in the story. For instance, as regards the house opposite the Garda Station:

"...Given the great care that had been taken, as described by the former personnel, to enter and leave No. 12, The Crescent under cover of darkness, it seems to me that a significant risk was being taken by the volunteer exiting just after 2:20 pm in broad daylight directly in front of the Garda Station. This does not necessarily sit comfortably with the significant volume of evidence I have heard in relation to the aversion to risk of the South Armagh Unit of the IRA" (22.6.4).

If South Armagh had been that risk-averse, there would have been no ambush at all! The fact is, with three aborted attempts to ambush the red cavalier, the small risk of discovery presented by a person leaving the derelict house at a quiet time of day was acceptable. It is a fine art, knowing when to take a risk, and this particular Brigade had mastered it. It was clear from previous observation that the RUC men would be leaving before long.

This meant that the Active Service Units had about an hour to get into position. One of the arguments deployed by those supporting the 'mole' theory is that an hour is not long enough to mount a complex ambush. These people are clearly thinking of the ponderous movements of the official military. It hardly applies to experienced guerilla units who had three dress rehearsals.

District Judge Smithwick's main ground for rejecting the IRA account is that it lays no particular stress on Chief Supt. Harry Breen, nor on 'Loughgall'.

The 1987 Loughgall Ambush was a classic 'Shoot-To-Kill' British Army operation, in which eight East Tyrone IRA volunteers mounting an attack on an unmanned RUC Station were gunned down by a 36-man SAS unit in a hail of bullets, with no chance to surrender, along with an unfortunate member of the public. The British ambush was possible because the plans had been betrayed to the British. Following this success, Sir Jack Hermon instructed Chief Supt. Breen to appear on television, with a display of the weaponry recovered from the dead volunteers. In the press commentary on the Smithwick

Report, it was said that Breen was reluctant to comply, knowing he would be identified as a target. He is said to have told his wife that, if he were killed, Hermon was not to be invited to the funeral (see Gerry Moriarty, *Link To Loughgall Ambush Sealed RUC Officer's Fate*, IT 4.12.13).

Justice Smithwick lays particular stress on the Loughgall aspect, saying that Breen must have been the target of the attack. He rejects the clear statement of the S. Armagh volunteers—

"that not even Bob Buchanan was the specific target of this operation, but rather that his car, which was known to have been occupied by RUC Officers and, on one occasion, to have been occupied by Harry Breen, was the target. I cannot accept this. The preponderance of evidence before me points to Chief Superintendent Harry Breen having been the specific target of this operation. In this regard, I rely on the intelligence received in the immediate wake of the murders, the evidence given by retired Detective Sergeant Seán Gethins and on the fact that the vast majority of the evidence suggests that the intention was to abduct and interrogate these officers. In the latter respect, the evidence keeps pointing back to the desire of the IRA to acquire information as to how the British Security Services had gotten advance warning of the IRA ambush on Loughgall Police Station in May 1987" (23.1.4).

The attack on an unmanned RUC Station can hardly be called an "ambush". That's woolly thinking.

Loughgall had happened two years previously, yet it is made the major factor in this particular strike by Smithwick. He says:

"Despite their denials in this regard, much of what the Tribunal was told by the former personnel of the Provisional IRA also tends to support this fact. Great significance was attached by them to the alleged sighting of Harry Breen in Bob Buchanan's car after the summer of 1988, and there was, in the wake of the murder, triumphalism in relation to the fact that the Provisional IRA had killed the officer who had appeared in that photograph "etched in every Republican's mind"..." (23.1.6).

He concludes:

"...Either the IRA did have an extraordinary piece of good fortune, or Harry Breen was the target of this operation. I believe that the evidence points to the latter conclusion. I also think that this makes it significantly more likely that the Provisional IRA knew that Chief Superintendent Breen was coming, and were not simply waiting on the off-chance that he might turn up..." (23.1.12).

But the IRA made it clear, that it was not waiting for Breen to turn up: it was the car that was being targeted on the basis that it carried high-ranking police officers, who were gathering information from their counterparts in the Republic.

Justice Smithwick finds confirmation that Breen was the target in the fact that there was an increase in "radio signals traffic between 11.30 am and 12 noon on the day in question" (23.1.12). That increase in radio traffic would have occurred before IRA observation reports showed that the two RUC officers were in Dundalk. If the radio was used by the IRA at that point, that would have confirmed that there had been a tip-off. But, as was pointed out on RTE radio (9.12.13) by the retired head of Border Security at Dundalk Garda Station, Superintendent Tom Connolly (a man whose father and grandfather had served in the Garda and RIC), it was smugglers rather than IRA who used radio freely. The Provos were very sparing in their use of radio. Connolly said it was entirely credible that the IRA, as they claimed, only used radio after 2 o'clock, when it had established that the targets had arrived at the Garda Station, to let units know that this was the case.

Supt. Connolly also questioned the MIS evidence which was given to the Tribunal very late in its deliberations, so late that its value could not be properly evaluated. He said it was not possible to examine where this Intelligence had originated. Because of that, its use was "fraught with danger"

It is unclear why the IRA should deny that it targeted Chief Supt. Breen, if that in fact was the case. As Supt. Connolly said, did the IRA "come to tell lies, what had they to lose?" What was to be gained by denial? If the IRA had received information, why should it conceal that fact now, 24 years later?

It seems that Smithwick considers that, if Breen was the target, that would lend support to the collusion theory. But it is hard to follow his reasoning here.

Supt. Connolly said he started an investigation into the killings immediately, and continued for a month. He believed that the IRA was capable of carrying out such an operation on its own without assistance. As for Smithwick, Connolly said he had found "no phone call, no smoking gun, no unusual transactions through a bank account". He exonerated "three {Garda} members mentioned for years" from having passed information but said "somebody did". As Connolly said, Smithwick's conclusions were based merely "on the balance of probabilities".

In relying so heavily on radio signals traffic, the Judge appears to be scraping around to find something other than intangible Intelligence information on which to base his collusion conclusions. In doing so, he rejects another theory which seems far more plausible, which is that *there was a leakage from the RUC!*

RUC COLLUSION

The focus of the Smithwick Inquiry was to examine whether there was Garda collusion in the ambush of Chief Supt. Breen and Supt. Buchanan.

While Dundalk Garda had a few hours' notice of the planned visit by the RUC men on 20th March 1989, the fact that Supt. Buchanan was going to Dundalk was known to quite a few RUC officers. Indeed he was canvassing for someone to go with him on this trip for around four days. Smithwick says that, in "the huge volume of documentation... only one document tends to support this alternative theory of RUC collusion" (20.9.1).

But that one document is in a Northern Ireland Office report, and the source named in it was Lady Sylvia Hermon, wife of Sir John Hermon, the Chief Constable at the time (now deceased). Smithwick describes the NIO note as being of "what transpired at a parliamentary meeting of the Ulster Unionist Party (at which the author of the note was not present)" (2.9.3).

She was involved in two ways: as the wife of the Chief Constable, she had some knowledge of his activities; and, as an Ulster Unionist Party MP, she had some input into the deliberations leading to the Weston Park Agreement. That deal was the reason for the Irish Government setting up the Smithwick Inquiry. It had no reason to do so otherwise, as two previous Irish investigations had found no evidence of Garda collusion in Dundalk.

The context of Weston Park was that David Trimble's UUP—then the predominant Unionist voice—had stalled implementation of the Good Friday Agreement. To save power-sharing, this supplementary agreement was reached, intended to reconcile Unionists to Sinn Fein participation in government. Concessions were made by all sides. The British conceded a preliminary enquiry into collusion allegations, to consider whether sufficient evidence existed to warrant full-scale Tribunals of Inquiry. This resulted in the Cory Commission, under the former Canadian Supreme Court Justice. (With the debacle of the earlier Stalker and Stevens Collusion Inquiries, Peter Cory had an idea of what he was up against. He

refused offers of accommodation and assistance from the Northern Ireland police, preferring to establish his office in the Canadian Embassy.)

Two of the topics he was to consider concerned the role of British collusion in the killing of solicitor Pat Finucane, and in that of Loyalist Billy Wright, who was curiously gunned down by an INLA prisoner inside the Maze Prison. (Billy Wright, furious at his imprisonment, had threatened to reveal his links with the security apparatus.) To counter-balance these investigations, David Trimble proposed that alleged collusion in the killings of Breen and Buchanan should be within Cory's remit.

According to the NIO document, Lady Sylvia tried to prevent Trimble from making this request. The document in question is a letter dated August 2002 from Peter Waterworth, then Principal Private Secretary to the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland. The Tribunal was allowed to see part of the letter (20.9.2), and describes it as follows:

"The letter was addressed to... a member of the British Security Service... entitled 'Follow Up Discussion with Sylvia Hermon'.

"What seems to have inspired {Sylvia} Hermon to speak out was Trimble almost divulging in front of {Jeffrey} Donaldson and {David} Burnside at the Parliamentary Party meeting, information she had given to {David} Campbell a year ago that the likely source of collusion in the Buchanan and Breen case was 'a senior Catholic RUC officer'. She did not have any more specific information about the individual's identity but had been sufficiently impressed by the evidence that she had sought and failed to persuade Trimble not to include the case on the Weston Park list. She feared the consequences for the PSNI if the story was to emerge from a review and had talked Trimble down when he had come so close to blurting it out" (20.9.4).

So Lady Sylvia was convinced that a Catholic officer in the RUC had betrayed Breen and Buchanan. If that was an embarrassing suggestion at that time, the issue has not become less sensitive down the years. And it would hardly do to raise it at this point, when the Unionist leaders were on the verge of getting official confirmation of a long-held illusion: that the Irish State had contributed materially to the success of the IRA campaign.

Called to give evidence by the Smithwick Tribunal about the NIO report, Lady Sylvia and other Unionists involved denied that there was any truth in the NIO document. Smithwick concluded: "there is no basis to support the possibility that the

IRA received assistance from a member of the RUC" (20.10).

Curiously, Lady Sylvia MP has gone on record rejecting the Smithwick findings. She said, if Sir Jack Hermon had had "*a shred of evidence of collusion between the garda and IRA, he would have said so and acted on it immediately... there wasn't evidence of collusion in March 1989*" (IN 9.12.13).

L'AISSER FAIRE

The Smithwick Report has been made the occasion of a third deluge of media black propaganda against Gerry Adams (the first two being the Liam Adams Case and 'The Disappeared'). In the Dail (4.12.13) Mícheal Martin excoriated Adams for having described the two officers as having taken a "*laissez faire*" attitude to their own security. Eilis O'Hanlon in the *Sunday Independent* found it was "*shocking*" that he had done so (8.12.13).

An examination of the facts shows the phrase to be well-chosen.

Supt. Buchanan was a regular traveller to the South. It was his car that was used on this trip, as on others. Other officers travelled with him. As Cross-Border Liaison officer, his work entailed visits across the Border, including maintaining contacts at Garda Stations, in search of Intelligence on the IRA. In the 20 or so trips in the months before the Ambush, he always travelled in a Red Cavalier. He took no precautions. This was no oversight, but the result of principle. Smithwick quotes a book by journalist Toby Harnden, who says of RUC Chief Constable Sir John Hermon that—

"he blamed Buchanan's belief in predestination for his failure to take basic security measures; the Superintendent had been a lay preacher{,} a member of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. 'The reason they died was so simple' he said. "There was no advance preparation, they just went. Bob Buchanan was a very devout Christian and he did not believe in taking precautions because God was in control. He did not follow basic, elementary security procedures. I still don't understand why no-one spotted he was going down there so casually. By the time they left Dundalk, the place was swarming with IRA men and there was no way they were going to get back"... (13.1.2, citing *Bandit Country*, 1999 edition).

The immediate reason for the final trip was an NIO instruction to put an end to smuggling across the Border, thought to be directed by Thomas Murphy. Apparent-

ly on one occasion 28 tanker lorries were seen leaving his farm over a 60 hour period, with an alleged profit of 14k per vehicle (Section 5). However Witness 18 told the Tribunal, "*the Chief Constable said that operational information should be sought from An Garda Stochána if possible, but that Sir John Hermon had said that there was no necessity for anyone to cross the border to obtain such information*" (2.7.3). This suggests that, not only were unnecessary risks taken as regards the car used, but there were more trips than strictly necessary. (Of course, Buchanan may have been going South to maintain other contacts, besides those with Garda, with people who couldn't be spoken to over the phone.)

In view of that fatalistic approach to personal security, Gerry Adams' "*laissez faire*" remark was spot on.

GUESTS OF THE NATION?

The two officers were unarmed. In the pages of hysterical commentary the *Sunday Independent* devoted to attacking the Provos after Smithwick reported, Eilis O'Hanlon was particularly emotional:

"Two men had come unarmed to a neighbour's house—and they had to be unarmed because of the provisions of the Anglo Irish Agreement which had been negotiated on behalf of the people—and they'd been struck down by evil. You only have to go back to the Icelandic sagas to see what a violation of hospitality is represented by killing men who come in good faith to your hearth..." (SI 8.12.13).

We'll leave aside the historical examples of British hospitality towards the Irish down the centuries and incidents such as Smethwick. Welcoming guests and killing them has been part and parcel of British practice in Ireland and elsewhere. That aside, the two officers were not the guests of the IRA, which was fighting a declared war with the British Government and its forces. They were the guests of those who were co-operating with the British in putting down the insurgency. The RUC officers in question were not coming to visit the Garda for tea and biscuits. They were operatives in the Thirty Years' War. To think the laws of hospitality applied to them is infantile.

Moreover, they were not killed in the territory of those offering hospitality, but back in the North—in 'Bandit Country'—to use the British description for an area of the British state where the British Government's hold was particularly tenuous.

It might be added that, if Eilis O'Hanlon had bothered to read the Smithwick Report, she would have discovered that RUC

officers refused the offer of armed garda escort to the Border. Of course, North of the Border security was their own business. With something like 10,000 British soldiers in the North at the time, in addition to the RUC's own generous resources, it might have been thought that arrangements could have been made for an escort through the danger zone, or for them to pick up weapons on the Border, or for a friendly helicopter in the vicinity, or something!

LEADER OR PARTY?

Martina Devlin, a columnist for the *Irish Independent*, seems to have thoroughly misunderstood the republicans—despite her origins in Omagh. Her commentary on Smithwick was entitled *Adams's Callousness Reveals Gulf Between Sinn Fein And Irish Public* (6.12.13).

The big achievement of the current leaders of Sinn Fein has been to carry over the fighting heritage, derived from thirty years of dogged struggle, into the political sphere. It has made compromises without a split, thus avoiding the big mistake of the 1921 negotiators. This unity will enable further development to take place—but it is also seized on by those, like Devlin, who want republicans to become Hibernian whingers like the SDLP. Taking up Adams' *laissez faire* remark, she writes:

"It's not just that Gerry Adams is a leader whose past is an impediment to his party gaining broad popular support in the Republic. It's that a certain ambiguity in the leader's attitude to murders carried out by the IRA during the Troubles has infected others in his party..."

"TD Pdraig MacLochlainn's credibility has taken a pummelling thanks to his vigorous support of the leader, and his refusal to accept or engage with criticism of a grotesque remark which met with public distaste on both sides of the border..."

"Chief Superintendent Harry Breen and Superintendent Bob Buchanan did not die because they adopted a casual approach to their safety, but because an IRA team targeted and shot them.

"They didn't seek to be shot. They didn't deserve it..."

All the context of the War is lost, it's just one-sided "*acts of violence*", mere criminal acts which thankfully "*belong to history*". The reason they are history—the fact that political structures have been established in Northern Ireland with which the 40% nationalist minority is reasonably content for the time being—is not examined. Presumably she'd be quite content if Unionists were still be running the North under a pseudo-democracy. Her career lies outside the North in any case.

She complains of Adams:

"Yes he called the RUC men "brave officers doing their duty as they saw it"—but he bracketed it with IRA volunteers doing their duty. It allows for ambivalence..."

A war was fought. The British Government tried to handle it as if it was an outbreak of crime but failed. Even Thatcher eventually had to admit it was war, but now the language of criminality is *de rigueur* in Southern Irish public life. Adams pays tribute to the fallen on the other side, but Martina can only see what happened through the eyes of the defeated Establishment. She indicates her sympathies when she says:

"I note how there was relatively little co-operation between the RUC and the gardai during the Troubles, and now we know why: the RUC didn't trust the gardai. On the basis of the Smithwick report, they were probably right."

In fact there was plenty of cooperation between the forces, North and South, during the War. The gardai told the RUC everything they knew about 'subversives'—and, when they asked for reciprocation on Loyalist paramilitaries, they got next to nothing.

Martina seems to think that the Sinn Feiners in the South should ditch Adams. This is a theme that occurs elsewhere in the Irish media. The hired prize-fighters of the Establishment suddenly have the best interests of Sinn Fein at heart! She says: "*there comes a point when loyalty to the leader becomes disloyalty to the party and its aspirations*". She wants Sinn Fein to become stronger and fears that Adams' leadership will hold it back!! But the only reason she is writing about Sinn Fein is that the Gerry Adams leadership has come South to make something of the party. Without that battle-hardened element, the party would soon slip back to fringe status.

Sinn Fein is the only party in Ireland today which has the battle-hardened political experience that Fianna Fail had in the past, and that Cumann na nGaedheal had before that. Its experience was gained in the North, where undemocratic and sectarian British government laid ample grounds for war. During that War the Establishment parties in the Republic professed to be concerned about the damage they said it was doing to the cause of Anti-Partition politics. But, now that the party which led the nationalist upsurge caused by the 1969 pogrom in the North through a phase of warfare to a workable peace arrangement has come South and given Anti-Partition politics a dimension it never had before, they panic. They hope

to break Sinn Fein and make it a Partition party like themselves by treating the Northern War as a murder campaign and having it subjected to ongoing police investigation and prosecution. They would like the populace to forget that all through the War they kept the sovereignty claim over the North in the Southern Constitution, and did not dare to propose its repeal until 1998, when Sinn Fein brought the War to an orderly end. Through all of this duplicity has become second nature to them in anything to do with the North. They and their media mouthpieces are incapable of thinking straight about it.

COLLUSION

The *Sunday Independent* was particularly angered that Sinn Fein should dare to bring up the whole context of the Smithwick Report, Collusion. Eoghan Harris instanced particular examples of British State collusion brought up during interviews (*Desperate Need To Tackle Sinn Fein's ham-fisted rewriting Of Our History*, SI 8.12.13). Eilis O'Hanlon follows suit. She suggests that Gerry Adams does not comprehend Southern thinking on such matters:

"...when he read the report, Adams saw only the word "collusion", and it transfixed him, rabbit-like in the headlights, because he instantly started thinking of collusion by the RUC and the British army. The people served by the Garda Siochana weren't drawing up profit and loss tables to decide who was "worse" in this way. They were instead measuring the force against the highest standards finding it wanting..."

It may be that "*The people served by the Garda Siochana*" do not understand the context of the type of war that was fought in Northern Ireland. One can hardly blame Sinn Fein from pointing it out, now that a single case of alleged collusion by Irish security forces has come to the fore.

The fact of the matter is that there really was Garda collusion—but it was with the Northern security apparatus. In the same issue of the paper, Jim Cusack—its Security correspondent who speaks authoritatively on behalf of the Garda—wrote an article entitled, *Dublin Gardai Didn't Trust Dundalk And Kept Them In The Dark For Years* (8.12.13). That is a very revealing statement. It confirms that senior Garda authorities themselves maintained a close relationship with British forces. And that chimes in with the views of Colonel John Morgan, in his military analysis, *The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings 1974*. In that book, he highlights the close relationship which British security operatives had with detectives in Monaghan Garda

Station. He also finds that senior Garda authorities had questions to answer about the way they left the South undefended during a period when Irish Government policy had caused the Northern authorities to lose control of the society, during the Ulster Constitutional Stoppage. And the way the same pro-British 'moles' had enabled the Bombers to escape with a defective security cordon put in place after the Bombings.

If the Dublin Garda authorities did not trust Dundalk—in the way they trusted Monaghan Garda Station, for example—that suggests that the Garda there were simply doing their job. They were co-operating—but not colluding—with the British security forces. There is a difference between the two. To co-operate suggests simple exchange of Intelligence information in compliance with Government policy. To collude is to break the law, by becoming directly involved in the War under the direction of a foreign Government.

There is another point to be made here, and it is an important one. Even if it were shown that one or two officers in Dundalk Garda Station 'colluded' with the IRA, that in no way compares with Collusion which was the policy of the British State in Northern Ireland. To use the same word to describe both is a travesty of the facts. State Collusion in substance refers to a policy of wholesale infiltration and deployment of Loyalist paramilitaries as an arm of the State, to carry out actions beyond the law, which the Security Forces themselves were restricted in doing.

That is not to say that the Security Forces themselves did not operate in clandestine ways, committing murders and other crimes directly. However, there were limits set on what they could do in this way. What they could not do themselves, they set their agents to do.

There is a world of difference between any assistance given by an odd garda here or there to Republican volunteers and the policy of wholesale State Collusion with Unionist paramilitaries, operated by the British State as an integral part of its war with the IRA.

Unionists see the matter differently. To them, the whole IRA campaign could have been put down in no time at all, if the Irish State had treated it as a hostile force, introduced Internment, and sealed off the Border. No doubt, if the Irish State had acted in this way, the IRA could have been broken; the Catholics in the North would still be second-class citizens; and there would be no resolution of the problem

created by Britain in the way it partitioned Ireland.

Unionists do not explain why an Irish Government should act in this way, with regard to its national minority caught in the undemocratic structures set up in response to an armed rebellion by the Unionists themselves.

TRIBUNALS

In an Afterword to Colonel Morgan's *The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings*, I wrote of the *Standards Of Proof Used In Tribunals*. Colonel Morgan gave evidence to the Barron Tribunal, bringing his military experience of 37 years to bear on the way those Bombings were carried out, along with other information he had succeeded in acquiring over a period of many years. However, his submissions on British military collusion with the paramilitaries who carried out the bombings and of Irish senior garda complicity were rejected by Justice Barron, on the grounds of insufficient evidence. As I wrote:

"Justice Barron rejected Colonel Morgan's Submissions, essentially on the ground that he did not present evidence that would suffice for criminal prosecution. The Colonel presented a strong probability, which is about as much as could be expected in a case like this, short of an admission of guilt by the perpetrators..." (*The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings*, p242).

Barron was within his rights in doing this. As Justice Murray put it in the Lawlor Case: "*there is no necessary standard of proof laid down in relations to Tribunals Of Inquiry*" (Ibid p240, Murray is quoting the High Court finding in that case).

If anyone turned to the Smithwick Tribunal, expecting it to apply a similar standard to that used by Barron, they would be in for a surprise. Smithwick makes a virtue of using the most liberal standard of proof possible. Here is his definition:

"... the issue of collusion will be examined in the broadest sense of the word. While it generally means the commission of an act, I am of the view that it should also be considered in terms of an omission or failure to act. In the active sense, collusion has amongst its meanings to conspire, connive or collaborate. In addition, I intend to examine whether anybody deliberately ignored a matter, turned a blind eye to it or pretended ignorance or unawareness of something one ought morally, legally or officially, oppose..."

Smithwick wide definition enabled

him to find that the IRA ambush of the two RUC officers was staged with the aid of a tip-off from person or persons unknown in Dundalk Garda Station. In doing so, he relied on deduction and amorphous Intelligence information. This method of proceeding has been castigated by Professor Dermot Walsh, a Professor of Law at the University of Kent. He wrote:

"It is highly questionable whether the sensational media headlines of Garda collusion in the murders of Chief Supt Breen and Supt Buchanan are justified. Several key points need to be borne in mind.

1. A tribunal of inquiry, even when chaired by a judge, is not a court of law. It is not a criminal trial leading to a verdict that someone is or is not guilty of collusion. It is merely an inquiry into the facts surrounding an incident or event.

2. A tribunal is not bound by the tried and tested rules on the admissibility of evidence applicable in a criminal trial.

3. A tribunal reaches conclusions on the facts by applying the 51/49 standard of whether something was more likely than not, rather than the criminal standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt. Its findings, therefore, cannot always be relied upon as a definitive statement of what actually happened.

4. The Smithwick Tribunal adopted a broad interpretation of what amounts to collusion, and proceeded on the dangerous assumption that silence was indicative of having something to hide.

Despite all these factors, the tribunal was not able to conclude that any identifiable member of the Garda actually colluded with the IRA in the murders. When placed in that context the sensationalist headlines lose their punch" (Irish Times letter, 5.12.13).

However, Smithwick was able to find support from a Linguistics lecturer, Dr. John Olsson of the School of Linguistics at Bangor University, who praised him for using such a wide standard

"I believe there may be some controversy regarding Judge Peter Smithwick's definition of collusion, and a criticism that he has perhaps drawn its frame of reference too widely. However, the law is a living thing, embodied in the lives of the people whom it affects, not a dry academic textbook where definitions must always be cast in concrete. Therefore, to adapt the term "collusion" to the peculiar circumstances then in existence in the island of Ireland, is both judicially creative and administratively necessary. Defining collusion, as the learned judge has, as "action or inaction by an individual or the police {or some other arm of the state}" is thus, in my view, absolutely appropriate. Moreover, it sits well in all legal frameworks, whether civil or common, where an act of omis-

sion is as justiciable as an act of commission..." (Ibid).

What is the difference between the Ambush of two RUC officers and the worst single atrocity of the Thirty Year War, that would justify rigorous standards applied in one Inquiry, and wide standards in the other?

In defending his use of a broad approach to his task, Justice Smithwick refers to the definition of Collusion used by the Cory Commission. But Justice Cory was quite justified in taking a wide view: he was not making any findings as to responsibility for particular events; he was merely establishing whether there were sufficient grounds to establish official Inquiries.

It might be added that the British Government did not vindicate Cory, in the sense that the Inquiry established into the killing of Billy Wright failed to satisfy those who had campaigned for such an Inquiry. It failed to reveal how a Maze prisoner could obtain a gun, nor did it answer other questions around the killing. The Finucane Inquiry recommended by Cory was never held, because the British State is unwilling to provide full Intelligence to a public Inquiry.

Of the three Inquiries to be established under Weston Park, only the Smithwick Inquiry has found in the way expected by those who had campaigned for its establishment. Is it an accident that British Government collusion would have been the finding in two of those Inquiries, whilst failings by the Irish State is the conclusion in the third?

CAPTAIN KELLY

Jeffrey Donaldson MP, who is the DUP's spokesman on Victims Issues, had a response to the Tribunal Report in the *Irish Times* (6.12.13). In Westminster he'd asked how the IRA could have mounted the Ambush at such notice. Because of the way the Tribunal dismissed the IRA explanation, Unionists had all their prejudices confirmed from an authoritative Irish source. Donaldson's article was called, *We Need To Know If There Was Any Further Collusion*. Writing of police accountability, he wrote:

"Never before has Juvenal's old maxim, *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?*—who guards the guards?—seemed more appropriate.

"It has been argued that the government headed by Jack Lynch assisted in the expansion of the Provisional IRA when it was in its infancy. There is now, for example, little doubt that Capt James Kelly, the Irish intelligence officer, was acting on the orders of the then Irish government in seeking to acquire and

import guns into the Republic for PIRA use. We also know that Capt Kelly and other senior members of the Irish government met with senior figures in the IRA as early as October 1969. We know that Charles Haughey met with Cathal Goulding, the IRA chief of staff. These documented facts point to a sometimes sympathetic environment for the IRA. They should be examined as part of any process agreed to deal with the legacy of our troubled past..."

In August 1969, having tried and failed to get the British Government to become more active and prevent the explosion threatening Northern Ireland, and having been vindicated by subsequent events in which NI security forces attacked Catholic areas, the Irish Government took steps to assist with Catholic defence in August 1969. At a given point, a Cabinet decision to send in the Irish Army hung on a knife-edge. In many ways, it is a pity that Lynch flunked that decision. Instead, in response to popular outrage throughout the South, it was decided to help the Northern Catholics to mount their own defence. About nine months after taking that decision, Jack Lynch renegeed on that policy under British pressure and put two of his Ministers, Captain Kelly and Albert Luykx on trial.

During that Trial, prosecution witness Defence Minister James Gibbons was unable to explain why his Government had been willing to give military training to Northern Ireland Catholics, who were allowed to briefly volunteer for the Irish Army, but was unwilling to give them guns.

Another prosecution witness, Director of Irish Military Intelligence, Colonel Hefferon, refused to perjure himself in Court. He said the Irish Government did authorise Captain Kelly to get arms for Catholic defence, and his evidence led to the only possible verdict, Not Guilty.

On the day following Donaldson's article, *Irish Times* Political Correspondent Stephen Collins, hastened to undo any unfavourable impression made by Donaldson's piece. He said nothing about the pogrom that led to the Irish Government acting out of character. On the contrary, he fed Unionist paranoia by saying: "*The IRA clearly had sympathisers at all levels of society in the Republic...*", adding that "*A disturbing book by respected academic Henry Patterson, Ireland's Violent Frontier... received little attention*" (which was certainly untrue as far as the *Irish Times* was concerned).

Collins also hastened to defend his hero against Donaldson's aspersions:

"While it is undoubtedly true that Kelly was acting on the orders of two ministers, Neil Blaney and Charles Haughey, the available evidence suggests they were defying the authority of the then taoiseach, Jack Lynch..."

"One way or another, though, there is no doubt that powerful figures in the government and outside it assisted in the creation of the Provisional IRA in 1969" (IT 7.12.13).

As I showed in *Military Aspects Of Ireland's Arms Crisis Of 1969-70*, there is documentary evidence in released State Papers to show that Jack Lynch knew of and endorsed the plan to arm the Northern Ireland Catholics for self-defence, and it is reproduced in the book.

Arming Northern Ireland Catholics for self-defence is not synonymous to forming or assisting the Provisional IRA, which did not exist in August 1969 and was only to come into being some months later.

That is a myth that has been spun by Official Republicans and others who desire to obscure what really happened.

There is a lot to be said for a full official Inquiry into those events, but it is unlikely to happen any time soon!

Angela Clifford

Mandela

continued

an avalanche of gutless gush, the *Guardian* obituary of December 5th, penned by David Beresford, did indeed acknowledge Mandela's greatness, but also delved into some historical issues of far greater import than how Adams should or should not have responded to the killings of RUC officers Harry Breen and Bob Buchanan. All wars are dirty, and Beresford wrote:

"Mandela was a flawed man, as all men are flawed, and in the face of this, one struggles to discover the roots of his greatness... And then, of course, there was Winnie, for whom he carried some burden of guilt, even if he was the one who divorced her. There was, too, Winnie's advocacy of 'necklacing'—execution by burning, with tyres around the victim's neck—which was hugely damaging to South Africa's liberation struggle. It was used primarily against alleged informers and public functionaries seen as collaborators, but other victims included people held guilty of minor infractions of community solidarity, such as breaches of a consumer boycott, and old women held to be witches. South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission has estimated that more than 400 people were killed by necklacing. In its final report, it observed

that 'although the official policy of both the UDF {the broadly-based United Democratic Front} and the ANC was to condemn necklacing, the public statements of the leadership of these organisations were sometimes ambiguous and appeared to give tacit, and sometimes overt, approval to the practice'. It has been long assumed that Mandela, in prison, would have strongly condemned necklacing. Indeed, it was reported, and widely believed, that after Winnie had raised the issue—in 1986, when she declared that South Africans would liberate themselves with matchboxes and tyres—her husband had summoned her to Pollsmoor prison, in Cape Town and reprimanded her for it. It has emerged, however, from a document that circulated among journalists and academics in South Africa, and which finally dribbled into print in 2005, that Mandela condoned his wife's statement. The document, the minutes of a meeting between Mandela, Winnie and (Mandela's lawyer) Ismail Ayob inside Pollsmoor prison, said: '*NM approved of WM's necklace speech. He said that it was a good thing as there has not been one black person who has attacked WM.*' It transpired that the document had been found by the renowned South African editor Anthony Sampson, while he was working on Mandela's authorised biography. Sampson has since died, but his chief researcher, James Sanders, said there had been a row over whether the document should be published, with threats from the Mandela camp to withdraw co-operation if he used it. Eventually, Sampson pulled the document."

But one does not need to have recourse to secret minutes to find Mandela defending Winnie to the hilt. In his 1994 autobiography, *Long Walk To Freedom*, he faced down charges far more serious than any allegations ever levelled against Gerry Adams in the Boston College tapes. The 14-year old ANC activist Stompie Moeketsi had been kidnapped, was accused of being a police informer, and had his throat cut on New Year's Day 1989, with his body being found on waste ground near Winnie Mandela's house. Winnie's bodyguard, Jerry Richardson, was subsequently convicted of Stompie's murder. Mandela wrote:

"Ever since my (February 1990) release from prison, the state had continued its campaign to discredit my wife. After the alleged kidnapping of four youths who were staying in the Diepkloof house and the death of one of them, Winnie had first been vilified by a whispering campaign, and was then charged with four counts of kidnapping and one of assault. The continuing aspersions cast on her character were such that both Winnie and I were eager for her to have her day in court and prove her innocence of the charges. My wife's formal trial began in

February 1991... I attended on the first day ... and I continued to attend as often as I could. I did this both to support my wife and to show my belief in her innocence... After three and a half months, the court found her guilty of kidnapping charges and being an accessory to assault. The judge, however, acknowledged that she had not taken part in any assault herself. She was sentenced to six years in prison, but was released on bail pending her appeal. As far as I was concerned, verdict or no verdict, her innocence was not in doubt" (2013 edition, pp 710 -11).

A couple of other contributors to the *Irish Times* supplement, unlike O'Toole himself, did at least venture to express some criticisms of Mandela's views on Ireland. Stephen Collins wrote of Mandela's first visit to Ireland in June 1990:

"However, the visit was not without controversy. Mandela made comments in a media interview about the desirability of talks between the British government and the IRA, with no reference to the requirements for a ceasefire... {and} Mandela repeated his views in a television interview. The *Irish Times* took him to task in an editorial {Conor Brady was the then editor—MOR}: "*Mr Mandela's remarks were dangerous. They were not informed. They have furthermore and regrettably overshadowed his thoughtful and valuable address delivered earlier in the Dáil...*" While Sir Bob Geldof opined: "The world was more complex outside those (prison) walls". So it was too with arguments over the murders of the IRA and their opposites. At times he (Mandela) was almost childishly naïve. It was clear how prison could distort the contextual relevance of events."

If Constable Brady and Sir Bob's-your-uncle sought to portray the only-just-released Mandela as both ill-informed and childishly naïve about Northern Ireland issues, it was a condition which continued to exist for Mandela's next two decades of freedom and which would determine one particular arrangement which he would make for his own funeral. The "*paper of record*" was the only Irish newspaper to send its own reporter out to South Africa to cover the Mandela funeral—Peter Murtagh, the 1980s *Irish Times* Security Correspondent. Murtagh now functioned more as a court reporter. In the issue of Saturday December 14th, his list of notables scheduled to attend the State burial of Mandela began with "*Britain's Prince Charles*" and ended with "*US civil rights activist Jesse Jackson*".

There was, however, one name Murtagh could not bring himself to mention in this report. But, when TV coverage on both Saturday and Sunday highlighted not

only the presence but also the honoured role assigned to Gerry Adams, Murtagh's report for December 16th could only mention Adams with a sneer:

"There were local and regional clan kings and princes; foreign royalty included Prince Charles of the United Kingdom and Prince Albert of Monaco... There were celebrities too, including ... the Rev Jessie Jackson... Mention was also made from the podium of Gerry Adams, described as '*the leader of Sinn Féin from Northern Ireland*'."

So much for Ireland's on-the-spot "*paper of record*". The *Irish Independent*, content to rely on British *Daily Telegraph* reporters, was somewhat more informative:

"Gerry Adams and the Rev Jesse Jackson were applauded warmly when their names were read to the assembled guests... Prince Charles, the Prince of Wales, representing the former colonial power, received no such accolade... There was a distinct anti-colonialist theme to many of the speeches..."

But the British *Daily Mail* was yet more informative again, with the same report also carried in the *Irish Daily Mail*. Inclusive of a sub-heading entitled "*PRIDE OF PLACE FOR ADAMS*", it told readers:

"The in-crowd included some intriguing names. Alongside Prince Charles, the Reverend Jesse Jackson and ... there was Gerry Adams, who we must presume had close dealings with the great man, though they weren't exactly advertised. For earlier, when the coffin was removed from a military plane, the Sinn Fein leader marched behind it, in the guard of honour."

But the *Irish Times* undermined its own Brady-Collins-Geldof thesis of Mandela's supposed "*ill-informed naivety*" by its publication of the Kader Asmal article that had finished with the Brechtian quote from Fintan O'Toole. It is an anecdote from the earlier part of that article that gives the lie to such a thesis. Asmal had written:

"When Nelson Mandela came to Ireland in June 1990, as part of his whirlwind world tour, he already knew everyone in the Irish Anti-Apartheid Movement (IAAM)... I was given the responsibility of providing him with a background briefing on Irish politics, especially in the context of political violence in Northern Ireland. In his direct, forthright manner, Mandela had said in an interview that the British government should negotiate with the IRA. This remark created quite a stir in the press and, oddly, even some resignations from the IAAM, but it was in keeping with his understanding that enemies must negotiate. '*You don't negotiate with your*

friends', he said. '*You negotiate with your enemies*'. Still, I had to tell him that the British government was not prepared to talk to the IRA. It would be like the sky falling. Six years later, when negotiations with the IRA, through their political wing, were under way, President Mandela phoned me: '*Hey Kader, is the sky falling on the British government?*' he asked."

Mandela could not have been better informed. A week after the *Irish Times* special supplement, the December 13th issue of *The Phoenix*, in its lead article entitled "*MANDELA/ANC: THE IRISH CONNECTION*", was provoked to point out:

"In all the coverage this week of the history of Mandela and the ANC, the local media fell over backwards to avoid mentioning the obvious Irish angle, that for many years ANC leaders regarded Sinn Féin—and the IRA—not only just as their allies, but as their tutors in armed resistance to oppression. Mutual contacts became more open during the peace process, although ANC reps had been attending as fraternal delegates to SF and fheiseanna for many years beforehand. In 1998 the head of the ANC during their war in South Africa, Cyril Ramaphosa, along with other senior ANC players visited Dublin, Belfast, Crossmaglen and other areas ... assisting the SF leadership to sell the peace agreement. But there were earlier, more clandestine contacts and mutual enterprises between the two movements and they concerned aid and advice sought from the IRA by the ANC's military wing, Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK)... {Next follow some quotations from Asmal's autobiography, *Politics In My Blood*, of which more anon—MOR}... The spectacle of coalition ministers, egotistical rock celebrities and other body snatchers basking in Mandela's reflected glory is only to be expected. But the airbrushing of SF and Adams from the frame ... is another example of the Irish media reverting to Section 31 mode. When Mandela passed away last week, the Irish media, normally on the look out for an Irish angle in global news stories, deliberately avoided the biggest one—staring them in the face—and airbrushed Adams out of the frame. It might be respectable politics but reputable journalism it is not."

Last October I was witness to a rather amusing act of sabotage against the attempt—in the interests of "*respectability*"—to quite liberally (in every sense) airbrush the South African armed struggle from historical awareness. The International Brigade Memorial Trust was holding its agm in Edinburgh, and we were given a civic reception by the Provost in the City Council chambers. But we were also invited to the civic reception that immediately preceded ours, for 80-year old South

African Denis Goldberg, due to speak at the Edinburgh World Justice Festival. Goldberg, a Jewish Communist, had been a co-defendant of Nelson Mandela in the Rivonia Trial of 1963-64, where he was sentenced to four terms of life imprisonment, of which he would serve 22 years. But when one of the Festival organisers sought to introduce him as a "*veteran human rights activist*", Goldberg immediately protested: "*I was not a human rights activist! I was a freedom fighter! I was the technical officer making the weapons!*"

But back to Asmal. The *Irish Times* Mandela supplement tells us that "*this previously unpublished article was written by the late Kader Asmal in 2007*". It does not tell us that Asmal subsequently recast and elaborated on the "*negotiate with the IRA*" anecdote for Chapter 6—"*Three Great South Africans*" (Luthuli, Tambo and Mandela)—of his memoirs published posthumously in 2011. He recalled:

"Well, not only the tabloids turned this into headline news; even the BBC led with the story... I visited Mandela's hotel early the next morning... '*Kader, why are you so uncomfortable?*' ... '*Madiba, we have a problem. It's like a ton of bricks falling on our heads.*' I explained that the British and US governments didn't talk to the IRA... While we did not want him to repudiate his words, the British Anti-Apartheid Movement was seriously perturbed... He was due to speak at a dinner that night with the Taoiseach (Irish Prime Minister), so we inserted a sentence into his speech. '*It is not my job to prescribe to anyone else how to behave in their own countries, but all my life I have believed ... you negotiate with your enemies.*' A few years later, of course, the Good Friday Agreement was signed in Northern Ireland. That day my secretary put through a call to me. She was taken aback. '*It's from the President.*' It was indeed Madiba, and he was chuckling. '*Hey, Kader, is there a ton of bricks falling on your head?*' He was as delighted as I was that negotiations had taken place in Northern Ireland and that they had ended in an agreement." (pp 158-9).

In that same Chapter 6, Asmal had told another story against himself:

"In the public eye, Nelson Mandela is most closely associated with reconciling white and black in post-apartheid South Africa, but long before that ANC President Oliver Tambo had made the case for reconciliation. I recall this vividly. I had prepared an opening speech for a conference in 1987 in Harare. My address was a legal indictment of apartheid's criminal leaders, based on the Nuremberg Principles underpinning the trial of Nazi leaders after 1945... I would call for the

prosecution of apartheid's leaders, after our freedom, for crimes against humanity and war crimes. Tambo took me aside before the opening session and, with quiet persuasiveness, informed me that Nuremberg was '*victor's law*'. There was already talk about negotiations with the apartheid regime, and he made it clear it would be provocative in the extreme to announce that we would negotiate with the regime and, following successful discussions, we would try them for crimes against humanity. The Nuremberg Principles were very important to me... But the facts on the ground in South Africa led all of us to a different conclusion, guided by Tambo. We were engaged in talks about talks... If the ANC had done this, there would have been no talks or settlement. For me, ten years' work went down the drain after Tambo's intervention and I hurriedly changed my speech. Subsequent events showed the correctness of Tambo's approach" (p 154).

But an armed struggle had first been necessary in order to force the apartheid regime to come to the negotiating table. It was in the wake of the commencement of that phase of the struggle that Asmal, a South African Indian Muslim whose marriage to his white wife Louise would alone have guaranteed him imprisonment in his native land, established the Irish Anti-Apartheid Movement while being employed as a law lecturer in Trinity College Dublin. In Chapter 3, "*Ireland*", he related:

"In 1963 the leaders of Umkhonto we Sizwe, the ANC's newly established armed wing, were arrested at Lilliesleaf farm in Rivonia near Johannesburg... In November 1963 a packed meeting took place in Trinity College. The meeting, which I had organised... was addressed by Arthur Goldreich, a South African communist, who was among those arrested following the Rivonia raid. He and Harold Wolpe had recently escaped from South Africa to Swaziland dressed as Catholic priests... After the meeting, an elderly but very friendly academic took me aside and told me: 'Never shit on your own doorstep'... But I disappointed my friend, as in my working hours Trinity College was to become the centre of my activities—apart from my academic life—focusing on civil liberties and apartheid... The Mansion House was redolent with history and perfect for the official launch of the IAAM... Speakers at the meeting in April 1964... included Michael Harmel, a South African of Irish extraction, who had fled the country the previous year while awaiting trial for contravening his banning orders. He was... a secretary of the South African Communist Party. Harmel completely bowled the audience over... It was remarkable that in the atmosphere of the times, in the continuing Cold War, an audience liberal-

ly sprinkled with nuns could applaud the secretary of the Communist Party. Irish anti-imperialist sentiments were stronger than anti-communist feelings" (pp 53-55).

A South African Jew, Michael Harmel carried an Irish passport because his mother had been born in Cork and his father in Dublin. Harmel's father had been won to Socialism in Dublin, no doubt influenced by the fact that in the 1902 local elections James Connolly had issued a Yiddish-language appeal to Dublin Jewish workers. The June 1974 Prague funeral oration for Michael Harmel was delivered by the Chairman of the South African Communist Party, Yusuf Mohamed Dadoo (a South African Indian Muslim, like Asmal), who pronounced:

"Born in Johannesburg on the 15th February 1915, son of an Irish Socialist immigrant, Michael Harmel became attracted to Marxism in his student days. He joined our Party in 1939 and for the rest of his life the Party was his master. He served it with discipline and loyalty as a full-time revolutionary until his untimely death on the 18th June 1974."

Kader Asmal was still putting the finishing touches to his autobiography when he died of cancer on 22nd June 2011. In the *Irish Times* of June 28th, Fintan O'Toole paid handsome tribute. Based in this case on an actual friendship, that tribute was genuinely insightful, as in his description of Asmal as "*the bossiest man I ever knew—and the least authoritarian*". Indeed, so taken was Louise Asmal with this appreciation of Kader, that she quoted liberally from it in her own address at the memorial meeting in Cape-town City Hall on June 30th, and not alone included that complete address as a concluding Chapter 11 when the autobiography was finally published that August, but paid O'Toole the honour of being the only person to be quoted on the book's cover.

Why, then, the *Irish Times*' continuing silence on that book, other than a news item in its issue of 29th August 2011? It could not, of course, have avoided mention of the sensation surrounding the publication of *Politics In My Blood*, since the BBC News headline that same day read: "*IRA 'aided' anti-apartheid bombing—Kader Asmal memoirs*". And O'Toole, as Assistant Editor, did nothing to alter an *Irish Times* headline suggesting that Kader might well have been lying on that score: "*IRA aided anti-apartheid bombing, claimed Asmal*". No wonder, having assumed the role of Grand Inquisitor against Adams, that O'Toole would now

wish to see Asmal's memoirs buried with him!

I was a 14-year old when I first met Kader Asmal at the November 1963 Goldreich meeting, and I became a founding member of the IAAM at the Harmel meeting the following April. At a 1968 IAAM meeting, Kader also introduced me to the outstanding South African Communist leader Joe Slovo, whom Mandela would appoint as Minister for Housing in South Africa's first post-Apartheid Government in 1994, with Kader himself serving as Mandela's Minister for Water Affairs and Forestry. (Over the course of more than two decades, Slovo would also become a close personal confidant of my father, Micheál O'Riordan, when meeting at international communist conferences).

Kader Asmal was South Africa's Minister for Education on the occasion of our last meeting in May 2006, when he and Louise hot-footed it from Dublin Airport to spend the afternoon with the O'Riordan family on the day of my father's funeral. There was, however, one Asmal-O'Riordan secret that my father had taken to the grave with him, and Kader certainly did not divulge it to any of us on that day. Indeed, it was only after Kader's own funeral—five years later—that their secret was first published in his memoirs, in that same Chapter 3 on Ireland:

"The 1980s opened with a spectacular *coup de main* against one of South Africa's most strategic installations... {which} did involve an Irish connection, a fact that till now has not been public knowledge... In the late 1970s, I was asked if it was possible to arrange military training for some MK combatants. I wanted very much to undertake this task, but it was a delicate one because it would of necessity involve the IRA... I went to see the general secretary of the Communist Party of Ireland, Michael O'Riordan, who was a man of great integrity and whom I trusted to keep secret the information at his disposal. He in turn contacted Gerry Adams of Sinn Féin, and it was arranged that two military experts would come to Dublin to meet two MK personnel and take them to a safe place for two weeks of intensive training... Later... we did arrange a successful meeting, the training was conducted, and I believe the expertise the MK cadres obtained was duly imparted to others in the ANC camps in Angola. Then on 1 June 1980, South Africa was shocked by one of the most daring and audacious acts of military insurgency in the struggle against apartheid. On that day the country's major oil refinery plant in the town of Sasolburg was bombed by explosives. Black smoke billowed over

the Highveld. Every newspaper and television station carried pictures, footage and stories of the attack... The propaganda value and its effect on the morale of the liberation movement were inestimable... I had again been approached by the MK High Command, who wanted us to find two people to conduct a reconnaissance operation and report back on the feasibility of attacking Sasol, South Africa's major oil refinery, vital to the maintenance of the apartheid state... Once again I arranged the task with Gerry Adams of Sinn Féin, through the intermediation of Michael O'Riordan... They laid the ground for one of the most dramatic operations carried out by MK personnel. Some months after we'd set arrangements in place, Louise rang me at work to say that I must come home immediately... I excused myself from an important academic meeting at Trinity College and drove as fast as I could in the Dublin traffic... There on the television was the extraordinary spectacle of Sasol in flames, lighting up the sky for miles around. We cheered and felt we had made a major contribution to the struggle. It was a huge morale booster, and must have been the same in South Africa... It was evident ... that the regime had suffered a demonstrable loss and embarrassment. Yet only Louise and I knew {plus, of course, O'Riordan and Adams!—MOR} that the attack on Sasolburg was the result of reconnaissance carried out by members of the IRA" (pp 65-67).

The Phoenix further observed:

"The Sasol bombing was regarded as MK's most successful operation and drew the admiration of ex-British foreign secretary David Miliband, when the BBC asked him some years later (2009) if political violence was ever justified. Answering in the positive, Miliband said, 'the most famous ANC military attack was on Sasol oil refinery in 1980. That was perceived to be a remarkable blow at the heart of the South Africa regime'."

Mandela fully approved of Asmal's revelations in *Politics In My Blood*, and penned an appreciation of Kader as a Foreword to that book. His debt to Adams was, in turn, repaid by his inclusion in the Mandela guard of honour this December 14th. Apoplexy was in order for the *Sunday Independent* on December 15th. A headline screamed: "*Gulf between Mandela and Provos: Sinn Féin is shamelessly using the late African leader for propaganda purposes, writes Ruth Dudley Edwards*". The honest option would have been for Edwards to denounce both Adams and Mandela. But, no. She wrote instead:

"In the Dail and in the media, Adams's narrative was of a long and close relationship between him and Mandela, and Sinn Féin and the ANC. Because it's in the

public domain, he mentioned that in his memoirs, Kader Asmal ... spoke of the help the IRA gave its military wing in the bombing of an oil refinery in 1980. Adams admitted that Asmal was not a supporter of the IRA, but didn't mention that he obtained the IRA help he wanted by having his friend Michael O'Riordan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Ireland, negotiate it with Gerry Adams."

Oh dear! When all else fails, why not try a bit of Red-baiting? But if Edwards knew anything beyond the superficial about the real Mandela, the last thing that anybody pretending to write sympathetically of him would attempt would be an appeal to Red-baiting instincts. As Mandela proclaimed in his speech from the dock at the Rivonia Trial in June 1964:

"It is perhaps difficult for White South Africans, with an ingrained prejudice against Communism, to understand why experienced African politicians so readily accept Communists as their friends... For many decades Communists were the only political group in South Africa who were prepared to treat Africans as human beings and their equals; who were prepared to eat with us; talk with us, live with us and work with us. They were the only political group which was prepared to work with the Africans for the attainment of political rights and a stake in society."

It was the South African Communist Party that had secretly purchased the Rivonia farm as HQ for the MK armed struggle, with Goldreich posing as the respectable white tenant, and Mandela posing as his black houseboy, 'David'. In *Long Walk To Freedom* Mandela recalled:

"I was joined for a brief time by Michael Harmel, a key figure in the underground Communist Party... Michael, a brilliant theorist, was working on policy matters for the Communist Party and needed a quiet and safe place to work on this full time. During the day, I kept my distance from Michael as it would have seemed exceedingly curious if a white professional man and an African houseboy were having regular conversations. But at night, after the workers left, we had long conversations about the relationship between the Communist Party and the ANC" (p 334).

What Harmel had been working on during his Rivonia sojourn with Mandela was *The Road To South African Freedom*, the SACP Programme adopted in 1962. Harmel was determined that the liberation struggle should be under no illusions about the enemy it was facing. It was not a colony of some external European power. The white racist apartheid regime represented another African nation in its own right:

"To seize control over the gold of the Transvaal British imperialism invaded the two Boer Republics, and after a cruel war, in which the Boers defended themselves with great heroism and resourcefulness, brought them within the British Empire. One of the pretexts for Britain's aggression had been the oppression of the African people under the Republics. Yet, following the British victory, the colonial status and subjugation of the indigenous peoples was continued and even intensified... In the exploitation of the non-Whites, British imperialism and Afrikaner nationalism found common ground. That was the basis for the establishment of the Union of South Africa in 1910..."

"South Africa is not a colony but an independent state. Yet masses of our people enjoy neither independence nor freedom. The conceding of independence to South Africa by Britain in 1910 {meant} ... a new type of colonialism was developed, in which the oppressing White nation occupied the same territory as the oppressed people themselves and lived side by side with them..."

"The Communist Party unreservedly supports and participates in the struggle for national liberation headed by the African National Congress, in alliance with the SA Indian Congress, the Coloured People's Congress {*et al*}... In view of the ravages wrought by the White colonialists, the Party demands exceptional measures to uphold the rights, dignity, culture and self-respect of all national groups inhabiting our country. All languages used by the people of South Africa should enjoy equal rights and status... The state should encourage in particular the unity of the African people and foster the spirit of unity of all South Africans. At the same time it should encourage and stimulate the development of healthy, non-antagonistic national consciousness and legitimate pride among all sections of the people... While standing for a united South African state, the Party recognises the rights of all national groups to develop and to determine their own future" (pp 24-25, 46 and 51).

Harmel also wrote under the Africanist *nom de plume* of "A. Lerumo", and this was the designated authorship of his 1971 history, *Fifty Fighting Years: The South African Communist Party 1921-1971*. Notwithstanding his Connolly Socialist father, it was to Afrikaners, and not Ireland's 1916 rebels, that Harmel gave credit for staging the first nationalist rebellion against Britain's 1914-18 Imperialist War:

"The Botha-Smuts government (of South Africa) decided in September 1914 to join Britain and invade German South West Africa (not without opposition from Afrikaner nationalists, some of whom even staged an ill-fated and brutally suppressed rebellion)." (p 35).

Mandela's capacity for making peace two decades later was undoubtedly influenced by his exchange of ideas with Harmel. While in prison, the proud Xhosa Mandela immersed himself in acquiring fluent Afrikaans. In July 1989 the imprisoned Mandela met with President P.W. Botha who, however, refused to release him because Mandela would not meet the State's pre-condition of renouncing the armed struggle. It was Botha's successor, President F.W. de Klerk, who would unconditionally release him in February 1990, while Mandela still remained committed to the MK armed struggle. But that initial Botha meeting had been of critical significance, as Mandela recalled:

"From the first, it was not as though we were engaged in tense political arguments but a lively and interesting tutorial. We did not discuss substantive issues so much as history and South African culture. I mentioned that I had recently read in an Afrikaans magazine about the 1914 Afrikaner Rebellion, and mentioned how they had occupied towns in the (Orange) Free State. I saw our struggle as a parallel to this famous rebellion, and we discussed this historical episode for quite a while. South African history, of course, looks very different to the black man and the white man. Their view was that the rebellion had been a quarrel between brothers, whereas my struggle had been a revolutionary one. I said it could also be seen as a struggle between brothers who happened to be different colours. The meeting was not even half an hour long, and was friendly and breezy until the end. It was then that I raised a serious issue. I asked Mr Botha to release unconditionally all political prisoners, including myself. That was the only tense moment in the meeting, and Mr Botha said that he was afraid that he could not do that... While the meeting was not a breakthrough in terms of negotiations, it was one in another sense. Mr Botha had long talked about the need to cross the Rubicon, but he never did it himself until that morning. Now, I felt, there was no turning back" (p 659).

Since Mandela further steadfastly refused to agree to the Botha-de Klerk demand that he sever his alliance with the South African Communist Party, he would have had the utmost contempt for the crude anti-Communist salvo fired by Ruth Dudley Edwards, in her "*gulf war*" with Gerry Adams, supposedly in the interests of protecting Mandela's "*good name*" from too much "*contamination*" through associating with the Sinn Féin leader! But if we have here a pathetic Ruth, there had also been a heroic person of that name. Communists had been central to Mandela's struggle, in both war and peace. He recalled his first meeting with Slovo as a university student:

"At Wits I met many people who were to share with me the ups and downs of the liberation struggle, and without whom I would have accomplished very little... In my first term I met Joe Slovo and his future wife, Ruth First. Then, as now, Joe had one of the sharpest, most incisive minds I have ever encountered. He was an ardent communist, and was known for his high-spirited parties. Ruth had an outgoing personality and was a gifted writer. Both were the children of Jewish immigrants to South Africa" (p 104).

On the orders of Major Craig Williamson of the South African Secret Police, Ruth First would be assassinated in Maputo, Mozambique, on 18th August 1982, when she opened a letter bomb addressed to her. (In June 2000, Williamson received an amnesty for his assassinations from South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission.)

Joe Slovo had, in fact, been born in Lithuania in 1926. In *Slovo—The Unfinished Autobiography*, published posthumously in 1995, he wrote:

"In the ghetto community in which we lived Yiddish was the mother (and for me the only) tongue. By the time I left at the age of ten I had learned to count only in Lithuanian and to sing the words of the national anthem, which ended with a claim for the return of Vilnius, the capital city, then under Polish rule... My father, Wulfus Slovo, took the first journey (to Argentina) in 1928 when I was only two years old. He left Lithuania to find a place for us somewhere beyond the village ghetto in which we were trapped... He joined the millions of unemployed during the recession of 1929 onwards. Disillusioned with Argentina, he decided to try South Africa. There he hawked fruit in the streets, and when he had saved enough money for our fare, we joined him in 1936. He was a man I first remember seeing when I was ten" (pp 3, 13 and 14).

A 1986 SACP profile had further stated:

"He has only the most fragmentary memories of his birthplace; his entire consciousness has been fashioned in South Africa... He is not a 'naturalised' South African, since 'naturalisation', applied for when he became an adult, was rejected on political grounds by the South African government. He is in every respect a South African—a 'natural' South African, devoted to its people and their future, steeped in its culture and its politics" ("A Man Of Our Time—Joe Slovo Elected Chairman of the SACP", *The African Communist*, Third Quarter 1986).

Like Harmel and Mandela, Slovo loathed the foisting by English liberals of their own racist sins on an all too con-

venient Afrikaner scapegoat:

"Bashing the Afrikaner is a popular pastime among certain English liberals and it gets my goat... It stems from a combination of English jingoism and an attempt to evade collective white guilt for our racist inheritance by oiling it all onto the Afrikaners... Mealy-mouthed shedding of responsibility and blaming it all on the Boers is, at best, ahistorical and, at worst, a form of racism. If any one group is to blame for the modern foundation of apartheid it is the non-Afrikaner upper strata which dominated the seat of power for more than 75 years before 1948. I am not arguing for one randlord, one bullet, but we must get our history straight." (Autobiography, p 194).

Yet an armed struggle against the apartheid state had nonetheless been necessary:

"In 1961 history left us with no option but to engage in armed action as a necessary part of the political struggle. It was a moment in which (to use Lenin's words) untimely inaction would have been worse than untimely action. We could not refuse to fight. We had to learn how to do so. And, in many respects, we had to learn on the ground, in the hard school of revolutionary practice" (p 192).

These were exactly the sentiments of Mandela himself, as revealed in his own autobiography:

"I, who had never been a soldier, who had never fought in battle, who had never fired a gun at an enemy, had been given the task (in 1961) of starting an army. It would be a daunting task for a veteran general, much less a military novice. The name of this new organisation was Umkhonto wa Sizwe (The Spear of the Nation)—or MK for short... Although the Executive of the ANC did not allow white members, MK was not thus constrained. I immediately recruited Joe Slovo and along with Walter Sisulu we formed the High Command with myself as chairman. {In 1985 Slovo would become the very first white member to be elected to the ANC Executive itself—MOR.} Through Joe, I enlisted the efforts of white Communist Party members who had resolved on a course of violence and had already executed acts of sabotage" (p 325).

But if Slovo had been so vital in the commencement and waging of Mandela's armed struggle, he was also central to its conclusion. Contrary to what the *Irish Times* believed Mandela should have said to the IRA in June 1990, Mandela had been unconditionally released that February. South African talks were proceeding without any pre-condition of a MK ceasefire, and political violence was still raging while Mandela was in Dublin. But

a decisive change had now to be considered. Mandela related:

"Violence in the country was worsening; the death toll in 1990 was already over fifteen hundred, more than all the political deaths of the previous year... In the middle of July, shortly before a scheduled meeting of the National Executive Committee, Joe Slovo came to me privately with a proposition. He suggested we voluntarily suspend the armed struggle in order to create the right climate to move the negotiation process forward. Mr de Klerk, he said, needed to show his supporters that his policy had brought benefits to the country. My first reaction was negative; I did not think the time was ripe. But the more I thought about it, the more I realised that we had to take the initiative and this was the best way to do it. I also recognised that Joe, whose credentials as a radical were above dispute, was precisely the right person to make the proposal. He could not be accused of being a dupe of the government or of having gone soft. The following day I told Joe that if he brought up the idea in the NEC, I would support him... There were some who firmly objected, claiming that we were giving de Klerk's supporters a reward, but not our own people. But I defended Joe's proposal, saying the purpose of the armed struggle was always to bring the government to the negotiating table, and now we had done so. I argued that the suspension could always be withdrawn, but it was necessary to show our good faith. After several hours, our view prevailed... On 6 August 1990 the ANC and the government signed what became known as the Pretoria Minute in which we agreed to suspend the armed struggle. As I was to say over and over to our followers, although we had suspended armed action, we had not terminated the armed struggle" (pp 701-2; Just like Gerry Adams put it on 13 August 1995, three years prior to securing the Good Friday Agreement: "*They haven't gone away, you know*".²)

But the South African Communist leader would go even further, as Mandela related:

"Just as Joe Slovo had taken the initiative concerning the suspension of the armed struggle, he again took the lead in making another controversial proposal: a government of national unity. In October 1992 Joe published a paper in which he wrote that negotiations with the government were not armistice talks in which we could dictate terms to a defeated enemy... Joe proposed a 'sunset' clause providing for a government of national unity that would include power-sharing with the National Party for a fixed period of time, an amnesty for security officers and the honouring of contracts of civil servants. 'Power-sharing' was considered a debased term within the ANC ... (but) after much discussion, I supported Joe's proposal and it was endorsed by the NEC

on 18 November. The NEC agreed to support power-sharing, provided the minority parties did not have a veto. In December we began a new round of secret bilateral talks with the government ... After five years, the government of national unity would become a simple majority-rule government. In February (1993) the ANC and the government announced an agreement in principle... Elections would be held as early as the end of 1993" (p 727).

Nothing could have better demonstrated the abysmally pathetic ignorance of Ruth Dudley Edwards than her attempt to establish a gulf between Mandela and Adams through Red-baiting the latter for having had the 'Red' O'Riordan as an intermediary. My father would have been the first to admit that his role in the South African struggle was minuscule compared with roles played by South Africa's own outstanding Communist leaders, Harmel and Slovo, shoulder-to-shoulder with Mandela in that struggle.

On that score, Edwards now proved to be an embarrassment to the *Sindo*, for a week later that paper's line was now arguing that, not a gulf, but a wee puddle, at most, separated Mandela from Adams. The *Sindo* resident 'thinker', John-Paul McCarthy, obviously considers Edwards to be intellectually flabby for, in the *Sunday Independent* on December 22nd, he attacked her "*gulf*" perspective through denouncing another media performer, proceeding to Red-bait Mandela himself:

"Take David Dimpleby's hour-long BBC documentary tribute to Mandela that aired shortly after his death... Dimpleby ignored the influence of the Communist Party of South Africa in the formation of ANC policy for decades... One other aspect of Mandela's death also jarred here at home. No one really reminded people here that Mandela and the ANC generally became a serious pain in the neck for successive Irish governments after 1995 when the decommissioning issue arose... The *Belfast Telegraph* ran a fascinating article recalling a dinner when Mandela was pressed by the late *Sunday Independent* editor Aengus Fanning for being too evasive on the matter of weaponry. And Mandela basically admitted to Fanning and company that he did not believe people should give up their guns until they got what they wanted."

But John-Paul's McCarthyism would have cut no ice with Mandela. As State President, he gave Joe Slovo a State Funeral on 15th January 1995, with thousands lining the streets of Soweto. And, on 18th September 1995, in his Foreword to Slovo's autobiography, Mandela summed him up:

"It has become a cliché to refer to a departed friend as having lived a full life. Yet one cannot think of any other way to describe the life of Joe Slovo. From his early days he committed himself to one major goal—the removal of the racist regime and power for the people... On 27 April 1994, with only eight months of Joe's life left, that object was achieved... To Joe and Ruth First, it was a target to be realised at all costs. That commitment sent them to detention, exile and finally claimed Ruth's life. But Joe, the commando, soldiered on until the mission was fulfilled. Joe did not only interpret the world; he helped change it. The South Africa to which the ten-year old Yossel Slovo immigrated in 1936 was completely different from the one he left on 6 January 1995... His dedication to the ideal of liberation saw him rise in the ranks of the ANC to become a member of its NEC and Chief of Staff of the People's Army, Umkhonto we Sizwe, while he served as General Secretary and later National Chairman of the South African Communist Party. This concentration of senior positions in one individual sometimes puzzled our friends and always infuriated our enemies. What they failed to understand was that Comrade Joe was not an armchair politician but a revolutionary who practiced what he believed in... As a founder of Umkhonto we Sizwe, Joe contributed to the building of the People's Army and, as its Chief of Operations, he was instrumental in opening infiltration routes for MK combatants. As its Chief of Staff he made a sterling contribution to establishing MK firmly inside South Africa... Despite the pain and agony of terminal and debilitating bone marrow cancer, Joe seemed to draw greater strength and evince even more energy and enthusiasm when he became Minister of Housing in May 1994... However, as the year drew to a close, it became clear that his robust will could no longer resist the rampant assault of the disease... I again visited Joe on 5 January 1995. His condition had worsened. He could hardly speak and was evidently in severe pain... Before I left, I kissed him on the forehead; and he bravely forced out the word, 'Cheers!' I could see his day had come... and that was the last time I saw him alive. At 3 o'clock that morning, he departed."

Nelson Mandela could never forget a debt owed by the South African liberation struggle, be that debt great or small. That is why in 2011 he approved of Kader Asmal's revelations about the role played by Gerry Adams, and why Adams was in the guard of honour at his funeral. In both life and death, that particular debt had been fully repaid.

Manus O'Riordan

See also, *Mandela The Revered*, on page 25

Roy Foster in Cork

"UCC Irish Studies" launched its new MA in *Irish Studies: Identities and Representations* on 5th December with a talk by Roy Foster, Carroll Professor of Irish History, University of Oxford. It was called "*Never so simple and clear again: The Memory of the Irish Revolution*".

Like so much of his work everything he says or writes begs questions. If the memory of the Irish Revolution is not so simple or clear now, then it is his job as a Professor of Irish history to clarify what it actually was in the first place. Wars and revolutions involve millions of people, as did the Irish one. People in those numbers do not fight and risk their lives for things that are not simple and clear to them. Otherwise we are dealing with mass stupidity—on a regular basis.

Foster relies on a mixture of fiction (the title of his talk comes from a Mc Gahern novel), diaries, letters, and comments by various people, to create a picture that the "*Irish Revolution*" was all a waste of time as it did not lead to what was wanted.

But what did the millions who participated want? That surely deserved a comment at least.

A revolution is a change of political allegiance by a people. That is what the Irish wanted and it's what they achieved. And the existence of an Irish Republic today stands as a monument to that "*simple and clear*" fact, despite whatever memory (or amnesia) may exist about its creation.

Revolutions do not satisfy a lot of people, ever and always. By their very nature they cannot do so.

Foster's lecture coincided with the death of Mandela. There are quite a lot of people very dissatisfied with the result of that revolution but it cannot be denied that the aim of the revolution has been achieved—there is majority rule in South Africa. And it won't go away no matter what.

Foster claims that we know very little about the Irish revolution—'when did it begin?', 'how far was it a revolution', 'how does it compare with others?' etc. This is an amazing admission for a Professor of Irish History, as it is one of the best documented events in history, with more information being made available all the

time.

His theme is that there were a whole lot of revolutionaries in Ireland before the revolution: secularists, socialists, feminists, pacifists, vegetarians, anti-vivisectionists and many middle class people, particularly women, who wanted "*self transformation*"; and these were "*well beyond the 1848 type*" of revolutionaries. Apparently these were not satisfied by the results of the revolution.

These demands are his criteria for judging the revolution and it is inevitable that it was disillusioning for the people concerned, because none of these caused the revolution and therefore it was not their revolution and was not for their causes. The revolution was not against any of the things they objected to. Nearly all of them happily piggybacked on the revolution as it happened. But it is absurd to judge a revolution by the criteria of those who did not cause it.

The revolution was caused by a combination of Britain's denial of political independence, after the electorate overwhelmingly voted for it, immediately after encouraging a quarter of million Irish to fight—and up to 50,000 to die—for "*the freedom of small nations*" and by the people's refusal to tolerate such behaviour by the Government of the day. That is the 'simple and clear' fact about the Irish revolution. It is not rocket science to understand it.

Foster refers to some participants whose ideals were not realised. And he spoke at length about what the revolution did not achieve and the resulting disillusion and despair expressed by some people. It was one long dreary view of the whole period with the usual sniping, sneers, snide remarks and cheap jokes that is the Foster trademark. Not a positive word was said about what was achieved and why it actually happened.

If this is the template for UCC's new course in Irish studies, pity the poor students who have to put up with such an unwaveringly negative, squinted view of Irish history with a determined effort not to appreciate the full context and the substance of an event such as the War of Independence.

Jack Lane

Shorts

from
the Long Fellow

BUYING IRELAND

RTE's *Who's Buying Ireland* programme (9.12.13) at first sight gave the impression that the country was being bought up by foreigners at knockdown prices. There is some truth in this, but it is not the whole truth.

A representative of *Allsop* auctioneers claimed that 85% of purchasers were Irish. Most of these were small investors, but there was some Irish among the big investors too. The Comer brothers from Glenamaddy in Co Galway, who were former plasterers and made their money in Germany and Britain, had invested 200 million euros in the past three years in Ireland. But the real big players appeared to be American.

The Californian property company *Kennedy Wilson*, whose chief executive Bill McMorrogh proclaimed pride in his Irish roots, has invested 2 billion in Irish property. The *Franklin Templeton* group holds 10 billion euro in Irish Bonds as well as hundreds of millions in Irish shares.

This is one side of the story. The other side is that foreign banks, such as Danske Bank, Royal Bank of Scotland, and Bank of Scotland, have lost billions in the Irish economy and are either pulling out or have drastically reduced their operations here.

One of the most interesting interviews was with the American investor, Wilbur Ross, who owns about 10% of Bank of Ireland. He said that he looked at the negative analysis of Ireland a few years ago and found it "very superficial". The value of his investment has doubled since then.

Following the broadcast of the programme, RTE interviewed two of the prophets of doom Fintan O'Toole and David McWilliams. Needless to say the programme did not give either of them pause for thought. O'Toole was incoherent. He thought that the new investors would push up rents. It is in fact the other way around: rising rents resulting from increased economic activity is stimulating investment in property.

PENT UP DEMAND?

Employment has increased by about 60,000 in 2013, which of course has a double benefit: national income goes up

and public expenditure on social welfare goes down. The unemployment rate is at 12.5% which is the lowest rate in three and a half years. And yet retail sales remain anaemic: a drop of 0.9% in volume terms in the year to October (and remember 2012 was considered a disastrous year).

So what is happening in the economy? This column has pointed out before that the increased income is being used to repay debt. For example, in the last 2 years, credit card debt has reduced from 2.6 billion euro to about 2.15 billion. In September 2008 the overall level of household loans was 203.2 billion euro; it is now about 170.3 billion. A similar pattern is evident in a reduction in corporate debt. We may be on the verge of a significant increase in consumption and investment as individuals and companies return to sustainable levels of indebtedness.

One of the clouds on the horizon has been the uncertain financial position of the banks. The recent Central Bank review of Irish banks suggested that there was no immediate need for recapitalisation. However, in the case of Bank of Ireland, it found that it may have under-provisioned for bad debts by 846 million euro. But it is possible that the progress that individuals and companies have made in reducing debt might mitigate the exposure of the banks to bad debts.

THIRD QUARTER RESULTS

One of the problems with economic predictions is that not only is the future uncertain, but we are not quite sure about what happened in the recent past, never mind the present. Nevertheless the third quarter figures on national income from the Central Statistics Office were encouraging. GDP was up 1.5% and GNP up 1.6% on the previous quarter. Personal expenditure was up a very modest 0.5%. Most of this was accounted for by car sales which received a boost from the new "132" registrations. But most encouraging was the dramatic increase in capital investment. This was up 10.9% on the previous quarter.

The ESRI thinks that GDP growth could be 0.3% in 2013 and 2.7% in 2014. The corresponding GNP figures are more encouraging: 2% in 2013 and almost 3% in 2014. (The difference in GDP and GNP is partly explained by the "patent cliff". A substantial amount of drugs produced by the multinationals are now off patent. This reduces the stream of income from this source, but since it accrues to foreign owners it does not affect the GNP figure).

Overall, it is possible that we are entering a virtuous circle of increasing

employment and income as well as reduced indebtedness.

NAMA

For some time now there has been a whispering campaign through the media against NAMA. The campaign has been ramped up with recent allegations by Senators Daragh O'Brien (Fianna Fáil) and Lorraine Higgins (Labour) concerning under-valuation of loans and information leaked to the media to the disadvantage of some developers.

The NAMA chairman Frank Daly and Chief Executive Brendan McDonagh decided to tackle this head on by the unusual step of demanding a hearing at the Oireachtas Public Accounts Committee.

Daly and McDonagh conducted a robust defence of their stewardship. McDonagh claimed the attacks on NAMA by developer interests were a "carefully orchestrated operation... to damage NAMA... designed to undermine its credibility with taxpayers of this country".

It was highly noticeable that its accusers—O'Brien and Higgins—did not turn up at the PAC hearing. Shane Ross TD, a leading journalist in the *Sunday Independent*, accused NAMA rather limply of not acting in the interests of the taxpayer. Frank Daly replied that he completely rejected that allegation. The normally voluble Ross was then struck dumb.

It is very encouraging that there is at least one State institution that is prepared to defend itself and doesn't run for cover when attacked.

The *Sunday Independent*, of course, devoted its front page story to NAMA (22.12.13). The story was headlined "Answer the questions NAMA—or face inquiry" and was accompanied by a picture of a smiling Senator Higgins.

But Daly and McDonagh have answered the questions that have been put to them. And they have not received any complaint from the developer Paddy McKillen, who seems to be the source of the story. Apparently, his allegations are being investigated by the Gardaí.

In all the acres of newsprint on the inside pages of the newspaper nothing of substance has emerged that would warrant an inquiry. But the Long Fellow was highly amused at the following sentiment from one of the *Sunday Independent* columnists, Ronald Quinlan. Apparently there was now an opportunity—

"...to open NAMA up to the kind of forensic scrutiny it requires to protect the rights of its developer clients and the interests of the taxpayer."

So the “*developer clients*” are put on a par with the “*taxpayer*”! You have to be joking!

TOM GILMARTIN

Anyone who attacks the State is lionised by the media. It was not surprising that Tom Gilmartin was eulogised following his recent demise and yet he was the only witness in any Irish Tribunal who sought and obtained criminal immunity. He gave Pdraig Flynn a IR£50,000 bribe in May or June of 1989, but claimed that the money was for Fianna Fáil even though the payee part of the cheque was left for Flynn to fill in. This event occurred after Gilmartin had denounced (he claimed) Fianna Fáil in February 1989 for making the “*mafia look like monks*” after party leaders (he claimed) had attempted to extract 5 million from him. Some hero!

NEWSPAPERS ON-LINE

According to *Comscore Datamine* the leading on-line newspaper in Ireland is *Independent.ie*. In September 2013 it received 998,000 unique visitors, which is up 5% on September 2012. The most surprising result is that the *Mail on-line* is the second most popular at 647,000. *The Irish Times* comes in third at 587,000, which is a fall of 18%.

As has been pointed out in this column *The Irish Times* printed edition has been losing market share in a declining market, but the Long Fellow hadn't realised that this was mirrored in its on-line edition. *The Irish Times* was in the forefront of on-line newspapers in Ireland and even boasted that it acquired the “Ireland.com” domain name—which it later sold back to the State. But it seems that, despite the millions it has invested, it has lost its way.

Its 2012 accounts make for grim reading. It made a loss on ordinary activities of 325k euro. A benign interpretation would be that the loss was less than the previous year (1,114k). Also, some of the expenses incurred in 2013 may not be repeated. However, for some years now the company has been in a downward spiral of cutbacks and declining market share. If it survives at all, it will have a much more modest influence on Irish society.

NELSON MANDELA

There can have been few political struggles of the twentieth century that have had a greater international dimension than the anti-apartheid struggle.

The ANC fought bravely, but their military campaign was not enough to overthrow the apartheid regime. The Pass Laws, which restricted the free movement

of labour, were antagonistic to global capitalist interests. The largely Anglo element in South Africa was prepared to abandon apartheid in exchange for the preservation of the economic system. Also, the collapse of the Soviet Union in the late 1980s weakened the impetus for an economic transformation in the post apartheid era.

Nelson Mandela saw that economics alone could not dissolve the apartheid system. The most substantial political element of the white population was the Afrikaaner tribe. In prison he took the trouble to learn Afrikaans with a view to understanding his oppressors.

The largely peaceful transition to majority rule was an extraordinary achievement. That and the fact that South Africa, with all its flaws is a functioning state, is the legacy of Nelson Mandela to South Africa and the world.

BRITISH INTELLIGENCE

An extraordinarily frank article in the *Daily Telegraph* (18.12.13) by Peter Osborne describes the collapse of British and American policy in Syria. Both countries accept that the survival of Assad “*may now be a better outcome than any of the alternatives*”.

Osborne believes that the fiasco is largely an Intelligence failure. From the start of the rebellion, the Intelligence services hadn't “*the faintest idea what was going on*”. They failed to understand:

a) **The stability of the Assad regime:** the strength of the army; the level of support among the population; the ruthlessness of the leader.

b) **The nature of the opposition:** that it was not liberal, secularist or pluralist.

c) **The nature of Al Qaeda:** that it had not been destroyed and on the contrary had penetrated the opposition.

Where did it all go wrong? Osborne dates the decline from ten years ago when New Labour degraded the traditional language and policy-making functions and “*put priority on management-speak, gender equality and ethnic diversity*”. Perhaps he is right. But the Long Fellow suspects that a more significant event occurred just over ten years ago in the lead-up to the Iraq War in March 2003. New Labour decided that there were weapons of mass destruction in that country and mobilised the Intelligence services to validate that fiction. The role of the Intelligence services had been transformed from providing objective information to underpinning the political whims of the Prime Minister.

Review:

THE DUBLIN/MONAGHAN BOMBINGS 1974. A MILITARY ANALYSIS by John Morgan, Lt. Col. (Retd) Published by the Belfast Historical & Educational Society. €20, £17.50

That Pro-Treaty Crowd

They didn't go away you know—that Pro-Treaty crowd. Back then some saw the post-Independence era as an argument of how to bring a new nation into being and then how to run that new nation, with dire results for the losers of the argument.

This scenario has been repeated since in Africa, for example. Kenya, which—despite the ravages of the beast of British Imperialism—remains pro-British with the British Army able to train there. Zimbabwe, on the other hand, came to live the dream of the Irish anti-Treatyites and is now the most dignified of the new African nations. Cathal Brugha and Liam Mellows now live there in spirit.

Today's modern Pro-Treatyites are as every bit as treacherous, cold-blooded, and uncaring about its people as back then. Col. Morgan has shown this in his book. Here is a patriot, a soldier, who is not afraid to mention the history of his own country. He shows us an Ireland in which the Proclamation of 1916 has almost become subversive, where raids by Special Branch on the homes of republicans and the finding of tricolours is viewed with suspicion. He is himself continually harassed by Special Branch, has his phone tapped, and at times, with justification, fears for his life. There is one frightening episode when in visiting Belfast he is met by a supposed taxi-driver who is in fact a member of a Protestant Para-Military group. But his soldierly instinct kicks in. This incident seems to be have been the result of a collaboration between disaffected elements of Garda Síochána, the RUC and a Protestant Para-Military.

He tells us how a British SAS unit (maybe unknown to the Irish Government) operated out of Dublin. There is no doubt that British Army expertise made the bombs. Protestant Para-Military units were incapable of this for, as he shows us, PIRA was fighting a war against the British State and all its element including MI5 and MI6 whereas the Protestant Para-Militaries were mostly the playthings of the British State, operating in its shadow and not in the same desperate situation of having to survive as PIRA were. No need then to advance technologically.

So an UVF/UDA collaboration becomes the delivery boys for the British

Military dirty-tricks-department. The Protestants, though willingly involved will get the blame, and in the long run will be discarded by the British military elite. Maybe PIRA will even get blamed because of the sophistication of the bombs and the military tactical placing of the car-bombs. But you can be sure the Irish Government will run for cover and write off the victims and the destroyed buildings so as not to damage relationships between two *friendly* nations.

I liked the quotations of the sadly neglected poet and Rising Leader P.H. Pearse, many of which are appropriate for today's conditions in the Irish Republic.

So what does this new modern crowd of Pro-Treatyites want? I suppose greater access to British plum jobs and monarchical titles, along with British adventures abroad. I remember once standing in the bar of the Abbey Theatre after seeing an Irish play about Ireland and overhearing a conversation in which the play was being discussed. One of the group is of the opinion that this play is good enough for the West-End. I thought of Dublin's West-End for a moment. But there isn't one where mainstream theatres operate. He is talking about London.

Will this attitude influence the Northern Protestant? No, these are probably laughing at them. What will the recent pictures shown on the Internet by the National Library of Ireland of Britain's efforts in WW1, specifying the role of the Royal Army Medical Corp in Italy do for the North? Nothing.

Does this new crowd see the Republic of Ireland, in becoming a British Commonwealth, expect to watch Britain, to their horror, remove the border? Will the Northern Protestant once again be used to control the Northern Catholic population, but on behalf of a Dublin Government this time?

Does this crowd think Britain will take to them when they say they had nothing to do with the various Irish rebellions against their rule and that they now wish all elements, all traces of it to be re-written according to British dictates? But history is your roots and without the roots the tree falls. England displays her morbid history with pride. The result is Britain never forgives. It is a vindictive nation. Yes, send over the British Queen to Belfast to shake hands with republicans and then visit Dublin and shake hands again. But those living in the real Britain only see their Queen as a dear old lady living in what is to all intents and purposes a

republic—a rubber-stamp, much like the Irish Presidents, who echo British monarchical ways.

And how will this new Ireland cope with the sharpness and experience of the over-lordship of the English mind? Not at all, they will be eaten alive for it is develop time for Ireland and not revise time.

Basically this crowd has danced on the old graves and are now dancing on the

graves of the '74 victims. If you haven't read this book yet do it now. What it says will stagger you.

This excellent book begins and ends with an introduction and an afterword by Angela Clifford which adds greatly to our knowledge of the political face of Ireland North and South.

Wilson John Haire
25 December 2013

Colonel Morgan went to an event at Wynne's, which featured Minister Jimmy Deenihan, Minister for Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht—who made some strange remarks. His speech sparked the following train of thought.

Amigos

I used to play the Triangle in a brass band. This explains my partial deafness. You've got to have patience. All that waiting.

I can remember O'Connell Street. All quiet. Like Ballybunion when it was closed down for the Winter. The tumble-weed scurrying. Loose boards clattering like a demented drummer, sniffing on the gangee.

O'Connell Street was full of cyclists then. A tram or two, Swaying clickety-clackety. Rickety-rackety. Up and down Europe's widest thoroughfare. Outside the GPO, fellas would be calling across the street:

"Crowda Culchies. Cute Kerry hoors".
"Red-necks."
"Boggers."
"Puck-goats!"

Outside The Metropole, more fellas were waiting for girls who wouldn't turn up (Noses only). We'd stand outside The Gresham, looking at the Yanks. Fat and wobbly. Wallets stuffed. Loaded. We'd pass up and down. They'd be sitting on cushioned chairs, surveying the denizens. They might as well have thrown us peanuts. They'd be dressed in colourful open-necked shirts. Wearing Bermuda Shorts. Sandals. Bare-legged, like when we'd roll up our trousers, paddling in Ballybee. Or when we'd go on a donkey-ride. Up and down the beach, a tanner a go. Later, we'd get a right scalding from our mothers.

"Look at that *bostoon!* That trousers has to do him when he goes back to school to the Brothers."

"Ruinated!"

"Cost a fortune in The Munster Warehouse."

Horatio Nelson was still on the Pillar. Still on his perch. Keeping one eye out for the Spanish Armada. A party was painting 'arrows' on paths, so that the cute Kerry hoors would find their way to Croke. In September!

"Ballyferriter to Ballybough. 209 miles."

Sometimes we'd take a dekkko at the Yanks. In and out of The Shelbourne. Real big-shots Admiring themselves. Ignoring us. They'd come from Willow Springs, Idaho. Or Butte, Montana. We'd be striking bets on the ones with the Paddy Potatoheads. Springfield, Mass.; or Brooklyn, N.Y., N.Y.

Then we'd make for Wynne's Hotel. A change of location. Everywhere were clerics. Stiff, white collars. They looked like magpies. The wider the collar, the higher the eminence. A Bishop was spotted once, but never confirmed. They were all in a rush. In and out of taxis, jig-time. Down-town Manhattan wasn't in it. Broadway, how are you? Dollars in their wallets. Stars in their eyes.

Wynne's was famous for its grub. No *crubeens*. All cabbage and bacon. It's said to be the same still. Though the white-collars are not as stiffly-starched Now, more open. Welcoming. *Egalite, fraternite, liberte*.

It was a bit like *Brideshead Revisited*. Dinner in Wynne's. Well, more like Brideshead Debated. There am I. Starving myself all day. Ready to go. Knife and fork at the ready. I can hear stomach-rumbles. We were to be addressed by a Government Minister before being fed. He began, "*H'm, h'm*". The lighting was dim. I think he was wearing an azure shirt. Rousing words began to emanate from him. He was warming up. His face had become more animated. His hands gesticulating. He spoke in the accents of a Cute Kerry Hoor.

We were sitting there. Attentive. Numbed. He went on and on. I thought he might be J.B.K.* He was talking of the Irish freedom struggle. I was sticking out my chest. I drew in my stomach. Then the rumbles returned. They could be heard

* John B. Keane. Ed.

nearby. He was a bit too far away, I think. I hope. I'd overdone things. I'd fasted too long. I held my breath.

A big, bony, awkward fellow sat closeby. He was sprawled all over the place. He had glasses like Eric Morecambe. He'd pushed me aside. Ignored me. (I'm used to that.) He could be a Shelbourne Yank. The Minister was in full flow. You could hear a pin drop. In fact, I think I heard one. I was hoping the big fellow wouldn't drop a clanger. Upon me. I was having a bad time. Again. They had no Bisodol in the bar.

Then the Minister went yackity-doo-doo. A lot of poppy-cock. My botanical studies have been restricted of late. Poppy-cock! Maybe he was referring to Papaver Cambrensis. The Welsh Poppy-cock. John Redmond was reddening. I had found myself lost. Flanders' Fields. I felt for my lapel. Fiddling. Nothing there. No Papaver. I looked about. Not a poppy to be seen.

Maybe I'd strayed. Maybe I should have been at the Royal British Legion. I'd mixed up my hotels. Maybe I should have gone to the Gresham. Hardly the Shelbourne. But, I'd wound up in Wynne's. The Minister couldn't stop. Very articulate. The gift of the gab. He might as well have been in a pub in Finuge. After closing-time. It was all "*parity*". I think he said Nietzsche. Or maybe he just sneezed. I was afraid he might go on about Camus. Or Sartre. I worry a lot.

I wanted to hear about the Paddy Rebels. I wanted to hear more about them. Not those Poppies. I don't like Poppies. That violent red. Not for me. I don't like garish colours. I only want to see the Fire Brigade when my house is on fire. I never cheer in the Munster Final for Cork. I like things muted. Soft, like. Know what I mean, like. I like the Green and Gold. But he wouldn't stop. Gawd! Popping away. Heavy into *egalite*. A puppet on a string. Could this be Sandie Shaw? No. Everyone was wearing shoes. Shoes for the footless children of Dublin.* I looked closely. There was no puppet about. I think I could smell Brussel Sprouts.

I took another gawk. The bony fellow was humming away. A different tune. I began to like him. Sometimes I go on long journeys. A few people had developed florid complexions. They were in paroxysms. Except that I can't spell it. Neither can they. I think.

The Minister was in full spate. People were looking uneasy. He was getting

hoarse. I was out of lozenges. He cleared his throat. The mike went into spasm. A few sparks flew. I got a bit of a shock. I nearly knocked over the big, bony fellow. He had elbows like a corner-back. I'm accident-prone. I'd have to exercise care. Usually I hang on to the stair-case rails. The bony fellow was looking funny. I think he was looking at me.

An t-Aire was getting worse. I was thinking Rod Stewart. "*Sailing*." But—the wrong nose. And Rod's hair. A stand-out. Or, a stand-up. By the way, I once sat in Rod's seat in Celtic Park, before they moved me on—to The Jungle! Where I'm most at home.

An t-Aire was sent out to do a job. The Taoiseach and his Ministers are of one voice. His Master's Voice. It's all about job-lots. They all had to do the same. Scripted. Everyone is equal. No matter who you fought for. No matter what you fought for; who you fought against or what you fought against. Got it? All the same. Everyone is up for everything. Everything is up for everyone. (No, I shouldn't have said that.) But all the Ministers have the same message. We may have fought the Brits for a little while. But, most of the while, we fought for them. Well, what they're now saying is that most of us did. Or would, or could, or should. Well some. Maybe. If.

Anyway, things have changed. Now we're *amigos*. Pa - - pa - - parity. Pop - - - pop - - - poppies and Easter Lilies. Bo - - - bo - - - botany, again. Different conditions. Different soil. But you can change the acidity or the alkalinity. There I go again. Getting mixed up. Complicating matters. Getting myself into trouble. Me getting oiled; then getting me isled; everyone getting riled.

The waitress asked for my order, Or request. I asked for soup; the roast beef and veg; the vanilla ice-cream; a coffee Americano. Everyone asked for the same. They ran out of beef. I should have asked for turkey and ham, but Christmas was coming. I'd already written to Santa—I'd asked for football boots. (In fact, they gave me a crubeen.) I'm tired of Brussel Sprouts, too.

The Minister had to leave early. I mean when he finished speaking. He put his speech into his pocket. Full of deletions and insertions. Like,

"This great country . . . society/club/association, etc"

"Your good self/selves at . . . this . . . famous . . . in . . . on . . . occasion/occasionally."

"Your organisation is very . . . much . . . appreciated/trusted/honoured by/an example to, . . . your present/former/elect Chairman/Secretary/Treasurer/President. . . and the Minister for . . ."

"The present Taoiseach joins with whomsoever is Tanaiste at . . . in time . . . hopefully . . . at the moment . . . depending upon . . ."

"Remembering always/sometimes/of course/naturally/periodically . . . in these straitened/acclaimed/recovery times . . . the people are always/often/sometimes sovereign"/"Hail Glorious Saint Patrick/Andy/Georgie/Billy/Dave/Uncle Sam."

I went to the bar and sank a quick one. With a mate, we rushed out to the Luas stop. The last Luas. We made it. I thanked C.J.H., again.

And we were off. Middle Abbey Street, The Four Courts, Margadh na Feirme, An Muesaem, Heuston, Fatima (a bit of a miracle), Rialto, Suir Road, Bluebell, and out to the Red Cow, the middle of the world. Then, on our merry —hic/— way to Tallaformia. The Luas is a whiz. Me and my *amigo*. Tamhlachtmaolruan here we come. *An stopa deireannach san líne dearg. Go n-éirigh libh, go léir.*

The Minister. Where was he? Had he arrived? Wherever? More parity. I'd Enough. I had an upset stomach. I'd taken too much Parity. Too much parity is superfluous. An equaliser means game on. There's still hope.

When I got home, I found my keys were lost. I scrambled in a back window. I stood on the cat's tail. Ouch! The central heating was out of juice. The doorway was snowed under 'fliers'. The TV was on the blink. (Must ring Rupert.) My stomach was acting up. Still no Bisodol. I checked out front. Not a sight of a poppy. The electric blanket was bust. I thought I could still hear the Minister talking. I nodded off. My lips moved slowly. Getting slower. Pa . . . pa . . . parity of esteem. Pa . . . pa . . . parity of esteem. I've . . . Ivan Yates was yapping on the radio. Pa . . . pa . . . parity. ZZZZ

When I awoke, my teeth had become discoloured. The dentist says it's the coffee. And the Brussel Sprouts.

Next morning my *amigo* rang. They had Bisodol in Lidl's. They have everything in Lidl's. I'm the guy going up and down the aisles in Lidl's, looking for Bisodol. By the way, I'm wearing mufflers. If I hear that word "*parity*" again!

Adios Amigos.

John Morgan (Lt. Col. retd.)

* The phrase of a former Mayor of Dublin, Alfie Byrne. Ed.

A Connolly Association Meeting

A Connolly Association public meeting, held at the Irish Centre, London on November 9th to commemorate the anniversary of the founding of the Connolly Association in 1938 and the centenary of the birth of its leader from soon after its formation, C.D. Greaves, was in substance an anti-European Union meeting. It was addressed by Anthony Coughlan, formerly of Trinity College; Alex Gordon, a former President of the RMT Union; Ruan O'Donnell of Limerick University; and John Callow, an official of the GMB Union, who is, or was, in charge of Marx House, where he found a neglected manuscript of parts of Connolly's *Reconquest Of Ireland*. The meeting was chaired by Tony Donoghue, also a former President of the RMT.

It was well-attended for a Left or Socialist meeting in London these days. The audience of about 40 appeared to be drawn from Communist Party/Irish circles of an older generation. It was certainly Left or Socialist in that sense, but it is problematic whether it could be so described in terms of current politics. A theme of the meeting was that the Left must try to seize the ground of nationalism from the Right. In Poppy-wearing Britain that raises problems of Left-Right classification.

THE SPEECHES

Anthony Coughlan said that internationalism was based on recognition of national rights; that democracy was only possible within nations; and that the EU was hostile to nationality and was therefore doomed. It was also anti-socialism, because what socialists wanted was control of capitalism, while the EU existed for the free movement of capital. There was conflict between the EU and the Eurozone. The Eurozone can only be saved by closer integration, which the peoples of Europe do not want, therefore it is doomed to failure, and the collapse will mean the collapse of the EU. The biggest mistake the Irish State ever made was joining the Euro in 1998. There was no prospect of the United Kingdom joining the Euro, so the Six Counties would be with Britain against the Twenty-Six Counties. The Irish question was now inextricably bound up with the issue of the Eurozone.

G.D. Greaves was both a theorist and an activist on the question of nations. He pioneered Civil Rights propaganda in Northern Ireland. It was a pity that civil

rights had been sidelined by military adventurism. Greaves thought the military campaign was mistaken because its aim could not be achieved. The balance of forces made war for Irish unity hopeless. It took on NATO when Britain had to have bases in Northern Ireland. The chief task today was to encourage Britain to move for Irish unity. But now there was also the issue of standing for the independence of all European states.

Alex Gordon spoke about the Lisbon Treaty, against which he had worked along with Coughlan. He had given a graveside oration on Marx in 2010, relying on Greaves. Greaves was an elucidator of genius of the writings of James Connolly.

The collapse of Irish nationalism when the Liberals turned against the Parnellists led Connolly to deepen Marx's work and in this he anticipated Lenin. The British working class can emancipate itself, through Irish nationalism, from turbo-capitalism with its astonishing financial instruments. Greaves would have grieved at the departure of the socialist countries from the world scene. The EEC had now become a Superstate. The right of the country to determine its Budget had been taken away. Greaves couldn't have anticipated the smashing of of the Yugoslav Federation into its component parts.

Regarding Scotland: its choices were limited to the UK and the EU. Scotland outside the UK would be under the control of the Franco/German capitalism of the EU. So national separation within the EU is problematic.

Ruan O'Donnell, of Limerick University, said that Anthony Coughlan had been his mentor. He had recently become fully convinced that Coughlan's view of the destructive effect of the EU on Ireland was right.

He said that the Dublin Lockout of 1913 was being sanitised for the purpose of the Centenary Commemoration and that Eamon Gilmore's criticism of the role of the Catholic Church in 1913 was a cop-out, as was his statement that the demands of 1913 had been largely met. But President Higgins was better than expected. He didn't speak at the Commemoration. Parallels with today were too close to enable him to say anything relevant.

The reading at the Commemoration was from a piece of fiction, a play. The Commemoration was well-intentioned but it was a whitewash.

1913 was what brought the Rising, and Dublin was exceptionally active in the War of Independence.

Jacobs was not locked out.

Republicans must be socialists, but Nationalists can be anything.

There is now no talk of class in Ireland. What there is at the top is a self-perpetuating elite as a permanent stratum. That was a sort of quasi-fascism.

Ireland was going backward under EU membership. Trade Union membership halved in the last 40 years. European workers were being let in and that destroying what existed. Dubliners were being eased out. In Ireland you can hardly get a decent job, and if you do they tax you within an inch of your life. Those who are forced out do not come back, unless it was to the UK. He now agrees with Tony Coughlan about the EU though he had reservations in the past.

There was very bad governance in Ireland and it was thought the EU would save us. It hasn't. They've stolen all our assets, our oil and gas, our territorial waters, and are forcing us to do dangerous things like fracking, and wind farms.

The Labour Party has been colonised by Official Republicans and it is factionalist as never before. It has disavowed connection with the Lockout, apart from the Stickies. It doesn't want to touch past radicals for fear of the present.

The Programme of the 1st Dail is forgotten, along with the fact that the Free State assassinated Mellowes.

The EU is strangling us. It won't let us take our fish. And the Royal Family owns mineral rights.

John Callow of the GMB spoke of the lack of the radical gene today.

He said that everyone who criticises Greaves' biography of Connolly only exposes themselves, such as Morgan, the revisionist.

When he was running Marx House he found a cache, including the manuscript of part of the *The Reconquest Of Ireland*, a letter from Markiewicz and Connolly's SDF tie-pin.

He also spoke of the destructive effect of the decision of the German Social Democrats to vote War Credits.

DISCUSSION

The platform speeches were followed by a short discussion. It was started off by a Dublin woman who protested strongly at Ruan O'Donnell's suggestion that the influx of foreign workers permitted by EU membership was destroying the Dublin working class. It was the last kind of thing she expected to hear at a socialist meeting and it struck her as a sort of racism. Her family had not been forced out of Dublin by the influx of foreigners. They moved

to England to better themselves.

Ruan O'Donnell said she had taken him up wrong, and that was not what he had meant. She replied that she had listened to his words and that was the meaning she got from them.

The Connolly Association *As Seen From Another Viewpoint*

The B&ICO originated in the mid-1960s largely because of discontent with the Connolly Association. I would say that it was formed chiefly through a collaboration between Pat Murphy and Liam Daltun. I was present but I doubt that, if it had been up to me, BICO would ever have existed.

Daltun had played some part in the 1956 Campaign and, when it petered out, he had gone to London to be a Communist Republican. He went naturally to the Connolly Association, which the Bishops warned emigrants against. As far as I could gather, he got on very well with Greaves, was initiated into secrets, and was being groomed as second-in-command. But then there was a fierce rupture between the two on the issue of the extent to which the Association was to be socialist—or openly socialist—in the *Irish Democrat* commentary on 26 County affairs. According to Daltun Greaves insisted that there must be no criticism of the Irish state in the presence of the British.

So he parted company with Greaves. And he became acquainted with Pat Murphy, who was the most original observer of the world and its ways that I have ever known. And a meeting was arranged with a view to forming an Irish organisation that would be Republican and Marxist. (It was generally taken for granted that such a venture would be impossible in Dublin.)

Daltun had rebounded towards Trotskyism following his rupture with Greaves. The people attending the first meeting—apart from Daltun's associate, Gery Lawless, and myself—were members of the Communist Party of Great Britain who were also members of the Connolly Association and who were fed up with being under CP discipline to enable Greaves to hold the CA to the political line he had devised for it.

Those were the days when migration from Ireland to England was running at 60,000 a year, and the influence of the Catholic Hierarchy was increasing, facilitated by the Cold War division of the world. Many of those emigrating naturally

There was further discussion about what was implied by the Left taking over the ground of nationalism from the Right (which was taken to be UKIP), and whether the conflict was to be the UK against the EU or was to include national separatism within the UK.

looked in the first instance towards the organisation denounced by the Bishops. And they naturally wanted a radical critique of the set-up in Ireland that had squeezed them out. But this was not in accordance with CA strategy. So discontent built up in Branches in which there were groups of new members, radicalised by recent immigration. In such a situation Communist Party initiates, who were members of the CA but played little part in it at other times, were mobilised to ensure that control did not slip away from Greaves.

This procedure meant that the CA could not build up a large membership, and any tendency for it to become a movement was curbed.

So our first meetings of the Irish Workers' Group were attended by CP members who were no longer prepared to do this, and also by some who had tried and failed to persuade the CP leadership to desist from ballot-rigging in the Electrical Trade Union before it was found out, especially Gerry Golden.

Those meetings were unique in that they consisted of CP members and Trotskyists who overcame their antipathy to each other in the hope of doing something real, and Pat and myself who were neither.

The combination split eventually, and one side decided to publish a magazine called *The Irish Communist* and sell it openly in Dublin—which was said to be impossible but wasn't.

I knew little about Northern Ireland. I went with Pat to a meeting about it given by Greaves at Marx House. Greaves delivered an exhaustive breakdown of the religious composition of the Six Counties in all its parts. Pat questioned him about the purpose of what he called sectarian analysis. Everybody knew that there was a Protestant majority, that it ran things, and that the Catholic minority was badly done by. But how did elaborating the sectarian analysis in exhaustive detail enable one to do anything about it?

I knew little about Irish life outside

Slieve Luacra, and it was borne in on me that Slieve Luacra was far from typical. So I went to take a look at Ireland—at Dublin and Belfast. My superficial impression was that Dublin was brittle and Belfast was solid, in both its parts. Then, through publishing the *Irish Communist*, we made contact with members of the Communist Party, Northern Ireland. I got to know Belfast a bit better, which only confirmed my first impression.

I suggested that the division in it should be treated on the ground of nationality rather than religion. Pat was agreeable to this but the prevailing view was that what I saw in the Protestant community was only a delusion. It was not until September 1969, after we had taken part in the defence of the Falls in August, that we decided to go on record decisively with the "*two nations theory*". And, as far as I recall, I set out the Two Nations view against a quotation from Greaves that there were not two nations.

It seemed to me that Greaves, who is described by Anthony Coughlan as the "*theorist of the national question*", was so immersed in a system of committees that he could not see what was beyond the committees.

This was understandable enough on the part of a CP initiate. The Bolshevik seizure of power in 1917 set off a spontaneous tendency towards anarchy—Lenin's *State And Revolution* was a kind of anarchist manifesto—which was countered by the construction of a state system as a network of Party committees—what Trotsky called *bureaucratisation*. In Trotsky's hands, the revolution would have run its course as a demagogic anarchy. Trotsky had berated Lenin as a Party dictator by Committee for a decade before 1917. Lenin had then fostered anarchy against the bourgeois state in 1917. And, after the seizure of power, he set about curbing the anarchy and harnessing its enthusiasm by constructing a committee system. Trotsky didn't seem to notice until 1922-3, when Stalin continued the Lenin system without Lenin.

Greaves' attempt to grasp Northern Ireland by means of Committees was genuinely subject to the criticism which Trotsky directed vainly against Lenin's system after Lenin was no longer there to enthral him.

Although the Communist Party was not a serious electoral force in Britain, it did exercise a degree of real power through the Trade Union system. Its members were on the whole the most active and capable Trade Unionists. They had a

presence in Trade Union committees of all kinds from bottom to top and they were in tune with the Trade Union membership at large, even though that did not translate into Parliamentary votes.

Workers on the whole did not want to be bothered with the business of running the Trade Unions. When Michael Davitt tried to do with the industrial working class in England what he had done with the peasants in Ireland, he found that ambition to master the means of production was sadly lacking in the English working class. The ambitious element gravitated towards the CP and tended to the Trade Union business of the class while hoping to raise political ambition in it.

It had little political success, but its attention to Trade Union affairs which were widely understood to be necessary was much appreciated. On that basis the CP could get resolutions on a wide range of issues passed at committee meetings and Trades Councils. These resolutions were adopted by handfuls of people representing thousands of people. The thousands, as far as they bothered to be aware of them, tolerated them, or approved of them as worthy sentiments, or allowed them as perks that those who tended to the necessary but tedious business of keeping the Unions functional were entitled to.

In Belfast the CP did the necessary Trade Union business, as in Britain, and was allowed the perks of resolutions in the Union committees and the Trades Council. During the Second World War, the Party had divided itself so that it might be pro-War in the North and neutral in the South. During the War—and the alliance with the Soviet Union—it became proportionately stronger in Belfast than in most other British cities. It was *de facto* Unionist. After the War it was gradually shifted onto an Anti-Partition orientation. Greaves played a part in bringing about this shift. I knew that it was resented by some Party members, but dissent was prevented from expressing itself publicly by the sense of discipline that went with Party membership.

The shift in orientation was accomplished, putting the Party somewhat out of tune with the sentiments of its own membership, and wholly out of tune with the bulk of the Trade Union members in whose name it got resolutions adopted in the committees.

Greaves built a Committee house-of-cards on this reality. It collapsed in an instant when things began to move.

Anthony Coughlan, in a document circulated at the CA meeting writes:

"Greaves held strongly that movements in Britain should not organise in Ireland,

North or South, and that movements in Ireland should not organise or interfere in Britain, he had considerable personal influence on some of those associated with the foundation of the civil rights movement... It was in response to a suggestion from Greaves that Betty Sinclair, secretary of the Belfast Trades Council, and Billy McCullough its chairman {leaders of the CP,NI—BC}, proposed that the Trades Council hold an important civil rights conference in Belfast on 8 May 1965, at which the launching of a campaign for civil rights was discussed, with the Republicans for the first time putting their grievances to the Labour men. This came to nothing because of stalling by the Northern Ireland Labour Party, which was reluctant to take up such a seemingly –nationalist” issue. Greaves later considered that the tragedy of the Northern civil rights movement was that it did not get going in 1965, under the auspices of the mainly Protestant workers of the Belfast Trades Council. For over the subsequent three years Paisleyism became stronger, the Republicans grew more impatient and much inflammable sectarian tinder was given time to pile up. When the Northern civil rights marches commenced in 1968 Greaves was a strong critic of the student-based Peoples Democracy. As he put it in his *Reminiscences of the Connolly Association* “Looking back I would say the Civil Rights movement failed to achieve its object because between 1965 and 1968 control passed from the Trade Unionists to the Republicans. Whereas the Trade Unionists would have known how to resist the ‘ultra-left’, the Republicans did not”...”

At the time I could only understand Greaves's strategy as one of circumventing the organised Protestant working class by means of committees established in their name at which resolutions would be adopted which were tolerated while they only existed on paper with little publicity but which they would rebel against if they ever led to practical action. I thought it was deviously futile—and that if it ever got going, it would not lead to consequences in keeping with the intentions of the schemer.

When things did get going, the brute realities of the Northern Ireland situation, semi-detached from the state—a condition of which Greaves approved—quickly manifested themselves.

The Republicans and the Peoples Democracy did not usurp the leadership of the reform movement from the Trade Unionists. The Trade Unionists were not an active force in the situation—their unrepresentative Committees did not have the power to activate them.

The Peoples Democracy had its day.

Something like it was bound to happen when things began to move. I attended its mass meetings and gave great offence by trying to bring it down to earth. The CP had no presence there. It was out of its element in debate.

When PD did come down to earth much of it went to the Provos and some of it to BICO. I do not recall that any of it went towards the Official Republicanism, in which Greaves was an influence. His scheme required that Stormont should be preserved because it was something Irish—and that went right against the experience and the sentiment of the nationalist 40%, which had become the driving force.

Coughlan writes:

"It is a tribute to Greaves's political genius that he formulated this Bill of Rights conception {i.e. as implemented in the Good Friday Agreement, BC} at a time when, if it had been adopted, it might have prevented three lost decades of harm in Anglo-Irish relations..."

And:

"When in February 1971 the left-wing weekly *Tribune* advocated “Shut Down Stormont”, Greaves wrote in the *Irish Democrat*: “This is Labour assuming the mantle of imperialism. Imagine the difficulty of getting a united Ireland if the whole administration of the North were fused with England. Does *Tribune* want a new fifty years of bitterness as anti-partition leagues, labor organisations and the IRA direct their energies to getting the direct rule administration removed? Every issue would be automatically transferred from Belfast to London”...”

But the GFA is not a Bill of Rights settlement which restricts what the majority can do in a reformed version of the old Stormont which Greaves wished to preserve. It is a war settlement established in the light of the fact that the Westminster Government found it could not win the War. A profound social and political evolution occurred in the nationalist community in conjunction with the War.

The War was not a war between the IRA and Ulster Unionism. Britain did its best to make it so, and revisionist historians try to present it as such, but it remained a war between the IRA and the British State in which Ulster Unionism was marginalised, and was bullied into sullen acquiescence when Whitehall concluded that it must do a deal with the IRA. The deal was not power-sharing or weighted majority rule subordinate to a Bill of Rights. It was a division of the devolved powers of the state between the elected representatives

of the two communities, in which the devolved executive authorities were not subject to the devolved legislature—assuming that the Assembly deserves to be called a Legislature. And it was, as even Martin Mansergh was driven to admit, a settlement on 'two nations' lines.

It did not deliver a United Ireland but it certainly was not a step away from it. And it was its clear 'two nations' feature that enabled the Unionists to be pressured into accepting a degree of cross-Border arrangement.

The Chinamen and the Connolly Association

During the Mao period in the 1960s the Connolly Association held a number of marches through London with the slogan on the leading banner: ONE NATION, ONE PEOPLE—that was a message for Northern Ireland and for Ireland generally.

You would be walking along when suddenly out of doorways would come maybe a dozen Chinese, most likely from the Chinese Embassy. They would join the rear of the march. Greaves didn't know what to do about it so we were told to keep looking straight ahead and ignore them. After a time the Chinese would disappear as mysteriously as they had come.

Greaves was constantly taunted in Hyde Park by Irish hecklers who called him: "A fuckin' Chinaman", because of his eyes and sallow skin. The Chinese also plagued his Hyde Park meetings much to his annoyance. Maybe the Chinese mistook the hecklers' reference to his eyes as something to do with ideology.

You couldn't call Desmond Greaves Republican. Many in the Connolly Association left to join Sinn Fein. It was an organisation mainly to do with lobbying MPs on the Irish question and being active in Trade Union branches. The English public weren't interested in Ireland anyway. MPs with large Irish populations in their constituencies naturally took an interest in the CA.

I'm not sure if Maoist China had any great interest in Irish Republicanism, not unless you went over to Maoist thinking which would then probably cancel out your Republicanism. The Chinese Embassy back then was very active in looking at various organisations that might be influenced by the Thoughts of Mao. We political activists of course had the Little Red Book but I could make no sense of it applying to the UK or Ireland. Greaves was a member of the CPGB so he was unlikely to go over the Maoism which would have seen the demise of the CA even quicker than has happened.

Why shouldn't the Chinese have genuinely believed he was right? Probably their news media would have supported the Republican cause.

Wilson John Haire

November 2013

Regarding the European Community—the population of the 26 Counties, having been in continuous decline since the Famine, has bulked out under its influence. It relieved dependence on the British market, and provided opportunities for development that were not otherwise available after the advance fostered by Protectionism had gone as far as it could and the Irish economy was slipping back into the British free trade area.

Ireland was reverting to an Anglo-centric mentality at the moment when it joined Europe along with Britain, and therefore was not in a fit condition to grasp the opportunities that became available. But the availability of those opportunities made themselves felt and were seized almost by accident at a number of critical moments caused by Britain's difficulty in scaling itself down from a world Empire to a European state. At one point Ireland suddenly had its own money for real, and had an exchange rate with sterling—a thing which in the 1960s could only have been envisaged in fantasy.

The take-off point came when Haughey convinced a number of European leaders that Ireland had ceased to be a *de facto* British dependency. Within the protected European market, funding was made available for the development of the entrepreneurial abilities which had always been there but had been stifled by dependence on Britain.

Irish benefit from Europe was so obvious that I could only understand Greaves' hostility to it as an expression of Soviet foreign policy.

John Regan's Myth

John Regan's *Myth And The Irish State*, published by the Irish Academic Press, is a record of an academic dispute. Regan, who is based in a Scottish University and is therefore not subject to the West British hegemony that prevails in Universities in Ireland, feels free to point to the obvious fact that what is produced in the History Departments of Irish Universities is not history but propaganda in support of policy. He does so in the tortuous mode that seems to be obligatory for academic writing about Ireland. Good luck to him. It seems to be an exhausting way of making a simple factual point, which is what it always comes to in the end. But—every man to his taste.

There is, however, one plain paragraph in the book—an intrusion into the dialectic mode of argument—and it is plain wrong.

"The Aubane Historical Society... is a

I assume that the Official Republican line, that by joining Europe Ireland was submitting itself to the depredations of a second Cromwell, came from Greaves. It made absolutely no sense in terms of how membership of Europe was actually experienced.

In the 1970s I still read the London *Times*, which had once been a very informative paper. One day I found myself reading in it an article by Raymond Crotty—the only Irish academic that I regarded as a real historian—in which he appealed to the British ruling class to come and take Ireland in hand once more because it was incapable of looking after itself. (This article was reproduced in the February 2012 issue of *Irish Political Review*.) Crotty was the founder of the Irish Sovereignty Movement, directed against Europe though Britain was the only serious obstacle to Irish independence and Europe provided it with the means of relieving dependence on Britain. And ISM campaigns against Europe always seemed to fit in with the British Euro-scepticism which would not let go of the Empire vision. It struck me as bizarre.

Ireland is obviously having difficulty today maintaining itself in the degree of prosperity to which Europe accustomed it. And Europe is not what it once was, having lost its original integrity under British encouragement, usually supported by Ireland. But, if Ireland pulled out of the EU along with Britain and reverted to sterling, what would we have? The British Isles, with Ireland voluntarily resuming its subordinate position in it?

Brendan Clifford

spin-off from the British & Irish Communist Organisation, which now professes a united Ireland nationalist agenda, whereas it was once the best known Marxist exponent of the "two nations" approach to Irish history." Arguably, it is the purest institutional advocate of the kind of "reactionary mythologies" O'Farrell railed against in 1993. The society interests itself in opposing what it calls the "revisionist movement in Irish history". And associated with the publisher Athol Books, it promotes authors like Brian P. Murphy and Brendan Clifford who are critical of Irish academic historians. But in Hart's work their local, national and historiographical interests combined, and his corpus has remained the focus of sustained and, it has to be conceded, increasingly damaging counter-arguments" (p182).

The "two nations" view was not adopted as an approach to history, but as a description of current political fact of the Northern situation in 1969. Social facts are the product

of historical development, and the history of this fact was traced after the existence of the fact itself was asserted.

The fact itself led to no necessary policy about the North. We spent a couple of years trying to persuade political opinion in the Republic that the Ulster Protestant community would act under pressure like a stubborn nation, and that a necessary precondition to dialogue with it was a frank acknowledgement of its existence, and an end to telling it that it was part of an all-Ireland nation. When all parties—and all academics—refused to adopt that approach, condemned us for suggesting it, and held to the view that Ulster Unionism was a brittle remnant of feudalism and religious bigotry which would crumble under pressure, we adopted another policy—that of establishing common political ground for Catholics and Protestants by bringing the Six Counties within the party-political system (the democracy) of the state, which was never anything but the British state.

The Six Counties were excluded from the democracy of the British state at the same moment when they were separated from the rest of Ireland and retained as part of the British state. After twenty years of trying to undo that exclusion we concluded that it was hopeless. We then became commentators on developments in the North in the light of the experience we had gained through trying to democratise it. There was never any question of denying the fact of two nations. It would have been absurd to do so at a time when events were tending towards a settlement based on the fact of two nations. The Good Friday Agreement is a two-nations settlement.

The asterisk reference given by Regan above, to substantiate his assertion that we gave up the two nations view, is *Explaining Northern Ireland* by B. O'Leary and J. Mc Garry. O'Leary said nothing so ridiculous. And my last effort in the attempt to democratise the North was a pamphlet replying to that book and to a spin-off pamphlet from it which O'Leary wrote for the British Labour Party, arguing that the North had democratic British government because it had "facsimiles" of the British parties.

Brian Murphy is not a member of BICO and he disagrees strongly with its basic two nations position.

And I am not an "author", but a hack writer for BICO. (O'Leary in his book described me, as far as I recall, as an Orange Marxist, and Lord Bew as a Green Marxist.) And I am far from keeping up a fixed hostility to Hart. I would have praised his book on Collins at a public meeting in Belfast if the chairman, Richard English, had not studiously failed to notice my arm raised.

Though Regan did much of his academic training in Belfast and Derry, with war going on around him, he doesn't seem to have asked what Northern Ireland is. How can the political history of the South be dealt with if Northern Ireland is left out of it? Only by dialectics. But in the end dialectics only

The Great War (Part of an ongoing dispute in the *Evening Echo* (Cork))

In his letter ('Why it's right to remember all war dead', Dec 11) Mr Gerry White of the Western Front Association says the Great War "happened", and that it "should not have happened". Since millions died, including thousands of Irish, it is irresponsible of Mr White not to explain to us WHY it happened.

Britain was not attacked or invaded by Germany, or Austria, or Hungary, or Bulgaria, or Turkey. Nor was Ireland. Yet Britain declared war on these countries and Ireland blindly followed. Why? They could have stayed out of it. If they had, around 4,000 Cork people might have lived peaceful, blameless and constructive lives. And many of the people they killed might have done the same. So why did they not stay out of it? This is the question Mr White will not answer. If this is a stupid question, unworthy of a straight answer, will Mr White please explain to us WHY it is stupid?

The recent war in Iraq "happened" and hundreds of thousands died. Why and how did it "happen"? Well, British Prime Minister Blair told his people they were in immediate danger of destruction, with as little as 30 minutes' warning, and to remove this danger they had to invade Iraq and set it free from its evil government.

This was a lie, and hundreds of thousands died because of it. In 1914, Britain declared it was going to fight a war for the freedom of small nations. John Redmond gave his assurance that this promise of freedom included us, and we joined in the war. That is how and why Ireland's Great War "happened". Millions died, but when it was all over Ireland got, not freedom, but the Black and Tans. And instead of freedom many more peoples became captive in a vast expansion of the British empire into Africa and the Middle East. Like the Iraq War, Ireland's Great War was a Great Fraud.

The Great Crime of Iraq was brought about by a government lie. But the actual physical destruction of the country and thousands of deaths were the work of the young men of the invasion force itself. Without them, there would have been no bombing and killing. Only the willfully blind can be ignorant of their many atrocities. They were not forced to go, they could have stayed at home. Like the Irish in 1914 they went there for the money, for the excitement, or they believed they were "serving their country". Did they believe they were, as Mr White puts it, "doing the right thing" in Iraq? Of course they did. Otherwise they would have just stayed at home.

Should "the fallen" of Iraq be remembered? Certainly the crimes of the invaders should never be forgotten. But should "the fallen" be "remembered"? Remembrance ceremonies honour soldiers of all the British wars: the Great War, the Black and Tan war, Palestine, Kenya, Aden, Bloody Sunday, Iraq, and all the rest. Official Remembrance ceremonials bestow on these crimes a solemn and uncritical aura of respect, dignity and veneration in which their country honours all those who serve it in arms, no matter what they did or why they did it.

Whatever the real reason for the killing, in the words of Mr White they "did the right thing".

So instead of evaluation, criticism and understanding to prevent war, these public and religious ceremonials provide protection, cover and justification for killing. Remembrance and poppy-mania nurture a public tolerance and appetite for war, future as well as past.

Mr White claims his Western Front Association has nothing to do with the British Army. But it is an integral part of the annual November 11 Remembrance ceremonies at London's Cenotaph. Its emblem consists of poppies. Its list of luminaries includes names like Kitchener, Haig and Farrar-Hockley...

Pat Maloney, Editor, Labour Comment
(*Evening Echo*, 28.12.13)

beats the air.

One of the few definite statements made by Regan concerns May 1974. A Power-Sharing Government was set up under the Sunningdale Agreement:

"Resisted by the loyalist led Ulster Workers' Council strike... this government collapsed. Loyalist disruption of vital services, alongside the British army's unwillingness to challenge the strikers, meant that the best chance of a political solution was forcibly overthrown" (p256).

The Strike was not called against power-sharing but against the establishment of a Council of Ireland, after Dublin had reasserted the sovereignty claim which Unionists though had been withdrawn under the Sunningdale Agreement. It was effective because it was trade-union organised, on a reasonable point. The only force used was the withdrawal of labour. Picketing was less than was often seen in England. And the Army could only have broken the Strike by turning itself into a blackleg workforce.

Regan's comment is made in a polemical

chapter against Conor Cruise O'Brien's assault on liberals who were soft on nationalism. But O'Brien at the time was Government spokesman on the North and his line on the Strike both in public and in Cabinet was that "Not an inch" should be conceded to Unionists on the Council of Ireland.

Regan then turns to a supposed British intention of withdrawing from the North and Dublin panic about the catastrophe this would cause. He says it is important to know whether this was an earnest intention or a manipulative bluff. That is a matter of practical judgment, for which one must know something about the British State and its ways. I was certain that Britain had no intention whatever of discarding its six counties, and took it to be ploy by which it was hoped to displace the Provo/British war with a Protestant/Catholic war—over which it could preside piously. Regan does not see this at all because he does not see Northern Ireland.

Brendan Clifford

Mandela: the 'revered' O Bradaigh: the reviled!

Ruairi O Bradaigh, a former President of Republican Sinn Fein—a previous President of Provisional Sinn Fein, a TD, and IRA Chief of Staff—passed away on 5th June 2013, during a week when Nelson Mandela's life appeared to be ebbling away. An *Irish Times* obituary on the day of O Bradaigh's funeral described him thus: "...he was driven by a fundamentalist commitment to the tenets of incendiary nationalism" (8.6.2013).

While on Mandela's death, the *Irish Times* wrote:

"Madiba is no more. We have lost a giant of our time whose death impoverishes us all ...{His defence before the South African Supreme Court} remains one of the most enduring and eloquent speeches from the dock, a moving *apologia pro vita sua* for those like him who had turned only when all else had failed to armed struggle..." (*Irish Times*, 7.12.2013).

"I do not, however deny that I planned sabotage.

"I planned it as a result of a calm and sober assessment of the political situation that had arisen after many years of tyranny.

"The initial plan was based on a careful analysis of the political and economic situation of our country.

"We felt that planned destruction of power plants, and interference with rail and telephone communications, would tend to scare away capital from the country.

"Attacks on the economic lifelines of the country were to be linked with sabotage on government buildings and other symbols of apartheid.

"These attacks would serve as a source of inspiration to our people."

No, not Ruairi O Bradaigh but Nelson Mandela adding a little incendiary spirit in his 1964 appeal from the Pretoria dock to his downtrodden people!

Ah! but he changed since then, did he not?

NO FREEDOM! NO WEAPONS!

"The late Aengus Fanning {then Editor of the *Sunday Independent*} asked Nelson Mandela: "But what was your position, Mr. Mandela, on decommissioning weapons? And what advice would you give Gerry Adams?"

"Mandela's mood turned suddenly steely. He looked seriously and sternly at Fanning. "My position, my position... my position is that you don't hand over your weapons until you get what you want..."

"The editors around the table were stopped in their tracks. Here was the other Mandela, unflinchingly gritty, never to be taken lightly, who commanded the respect of a huge revolutionary force inside and outside his prison cell."—Nelson Mandela speaking to a small group of newspaper editors from the 26 and Six-Counties who had been invited to lunch with Mandela at Tony O'Reilly's home in Dublin's Fitzwilliam Square before delivering the annual *Irish Independent* lecture at Trinity College in April, 2000 at O'Reilly's invitation, quoted in the *Belfast Telegraph*, 2 July 2013, article by Ed Curran.

"His imprisonment was not the consequence of a flash of youthful zeal like so many revolutionaries. He reflected upon what actions were necessary and committed to them. He stood as the first accused and was committed to living for his beliefs but also if necessary to die for them because he fully appreciated their immense value." (Dail Statement of Fianna Fail leader and Spokesperson on Northern Ireland, Micheal Martin on the death of Nelson Mandela, 10.12.2013)

"After the Good Friday Agreement, Martin Mansergh, adviser to Fianna Fail Taoisigh, published a tirade against O Bradaigh in the *Times Literary Supplement*. Mansergh could not tolerate Anti-Treaty dissidents having a public voice in the state. But Mansergh did not say that the War, as diverted towards a secondary objective by Adams, had been legitimate. And, at the same time, Mansergh was covering over the Anti-Treaty origins of Fianna Fail and tracing the legitimacy of the 26 County state to the Treaty.

"In the presence of such chicanery, one could only applaud Ruairi O Bradaigh for his stubbornness in presenting a clear Anti-Treaty record of events monthly in *Saoirse*." (*Irish Political Review*, July, 2013)

POWER AT ANY PRICE

The fear in Dublin is that Sinn Fein is gaining traction in the South and this is the context for the new-found love of Fianna Fail from the Dublin media that slaughtered them a few years ago. One example of this is summed up in the headline: "*Soldiers of Destiny emerge from shadow of annihilation and look to a brighter future*" by Arthur Beesley (*Irish Times*, 26.4.2013).

Martin again attacked Republicans at Arbour Hill: "*Martin claims SF and Provisional Movement sullied the name of Republicanism*". This was the headline in *The Irish Times* above the following:

"Mr Martin asserted that if people wanted to know where the men and

women of 1916 would have stood in later years, they would find out by looking at what they did: taking the route of constitutional republicanism" (22.4.13)

"But surely that—"taking the route of constitutional republicanism"—is what Adams is actually being damned for by Martin's partners in the 'Get Adams' coalition: Which only goes to show the multi-dimensional character of the campaign" (*Irish Political Review*, June, 2013).

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

"If the Fianna Fail leader, Micheal Martin could get rid of Adams at the cost of undermining the Northern settlement, who can doubt that he would do it? So apparently would the SDLP. And the Official Unionists (politically advised by Lord Bew and other members of the IRA in the critical years following the signing of the Good Friday Agreement), are acting as a fundamentalist pressure on the DUP. So it is conceivable that the Adams variant on Republicanism might be destroyed. And we gather that arrangements for reconstituting the IRA as an effective force in case of that eventuality are quietly being made by main-stream Republicans who have little in common with the mentality of the super-revolutionaries who have joined with Fianna Fail *et al* in the propaganda against Adams that is facilitated by the two States" (*Irish Political Review*, June, 2013).

Mandela's "*long walk to freedom*" looks like a trot compared to what the Dublin politicians expect of Gerry Adams and Sinn Fein.

CORK SAYS 'NO'

At its meeting on Monday, 12th January 1987, Cork County Borough Council (Cork Corporation), rejected a motion proposed by Cllr. Kathleen Lynch (Workers' Party), seconded by Cllr. John Kelleher (W.P.) that the Freedom of the City of Cork be conferred on African National Congress leader, Nelson Mandela. The motion was rejected by eight votes to five.

Supporting the motion were: Cllr. Frank Nash, (Labour Party), Cllrs. Donal Counihan and Micheal Martin (Fianna Fail).

Opposing the motion were the Lord Mayor, Cllr. Gerry O'Sullivan (Labour Party); Cllr. Jim Corr, Cllr. Liam Burke, TD, Cllr. Ted McCarthy (Fine Gael); Cllr. Paud Black, Cllr. John Dennehy (Fianna

continued on page 28

Mandela continued

Fail); Cllr. Pearse Wyse, TD (Progressive Democrats) and Cllr. Curtin (Independent).

DUBLIN SAYS 'NO'

According to files just released (27.12.2013) by the National Archives of Ireland, Dublin City councillors shot down plans to honour Nelson Mandela with the Freedom of Dublin just five years before he was eventually awarded the accolade.

The late South African leader was conferred a Freeman of Dublin in 1988—the first capital city in the world to do so—despite councillors dismissing the idea in 1983.

Dublin's Lord Mayor, Dan Browne (Labour Party) wrote to Kadar Asmal, Chairman of the Irish Anti-Apartheid Movement on January 21, 1983, to say there was no consensus on the plan. Freedom was only conferred where there was unanimous agreement. The Labour Party and the Workers' Party are believed to have supported the proposal.

AND DERRY SAYS 'NO', 'NO'

To the knowledge of the present writer, the SDLP councillors on Derry City Council on two occasions voted against conferring the Freedom of Derry on Nelson Mandela. The proposal on both occasions came from Sinn Fein councillors.

CORK FREEDOM

The conferring of Freedom by the Burgesses of Cork has a very mixed history. Recipients include Dean Swift, William Gladstone and Woodrow Wilson.

Swift was made a freeman in January, 1736. In August that year he wrote to the Common Council of the City of Cork: expressing surprise "at having received the freedom of Cork and states that he is returning the silver casket because 'there is not so much as my name upon it, or any one syllable to show it was a present from your city' (*The Freedom of Cork*, Aodh Quinlivan, Collins, 2013).

President Wilson was made a freeman in 1919, however the month prior, he received an invitation to visit the city and subsequently declined. A delegation from the councillors was sent to Paris but never met Wilson—the inclusion of Eamon de Valera, who had just escaped from Lincoln Prison may have sent Yankee bells ringing. At the time a Dail delegation was seeking admittance to the so-called Peace Con-

ference at Versailles and were eventually refused. The Zionist Organization submitted their draft resolutions for consideration by the Peace Conference on 3rd February 1919.

It is unclear if Wilson ever received his freedom of Cork casket.

The great Gaelic scholar, German-born Kuno Meyer has the distinction of twice being elected a freeman of the city of Cork. He was initially granted the honour on 25th September, 1912 (along with Canon Peadar O Laoghaire) but his name was expunged from the Freedom Register in January 1915 as a result of anti-German sentiment during the First World War. {At the behest of the Redmondites and their Loyalist allies}. In May, 1920, seven months after his death, Kuno Meyer was restored to the register.

Perhaps it was better that Madiba didn't enter the Cork Hall of Freedom, after inviting Gerry Adams to his funeral, he too, could have suffered a fate similar to Meyer.

MANDELA AND AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

"Amnesty international has said in a letter to the magazine *Human Events* that it will not campaign for the release of the leader of the African National Congress, Nelson Mandela, as he advocates the violent overthrow of the South African government.

"As Amnesty International said in its letter dated June 19, 1985, to *Human Events*: 'Amnesty International opposes torture and executions in all cases and seeks fair and prompt trials of political prisoners.

"It works for the release, however, only of 'prisoners of conscience'.

"These are defined in the Statute of Amnesty International as people detained anywhere 'by reason of their political, religious or other conscientiously held beliefs or by reason of their ethnic origin, sex, colour or language, provided that they have not used or advocated violence.' Supported Violence

"Amnesty International does not believe that this definition applies to Nelson Mandela."

"He was sentenced to life imprisonment in 1964 after acknowledging in court his participation in the planning of acts of sabotage as a leader of the African National Congress.

"Mandela was in no way convicted on 'trumped up' charges.

"At the beginning of his trial he admitted his guilt in a speech titled 'I am prepared to die', before the Pretoria Supreme Court.

"In that speech Mandela said:

I do not, however deny that I

planned sabotage. I planned it as a result of a calm and sober assessment of the political situation that had arisen after many years of tyranny. I admit immediately that I was one of the persons helped to form Umkonto we Sizwe {the military wing of the ANC}, and that I played a prominent role in its affairs until I was arrested in August, 1962. The initial plan was based on a careful analysis of the political and economic situation of our country. We believed that South Africa depended to a large extent of foreign capital and foreign trade. We felt that planned destruction of power plants, and interference with rail and telephone communications, would tend to scare away capital from the country. Attacks on the economic lifelines of the country were to be linked with sabotage on government buildings and other symbols of apartheid.

"These attacks would serve as a source of inspiration to our people. In addition they would provide an outlet for those people who were urging the adoption of violent methods. I started to make a study of the art of war and revolution, and whilst abroad, underwent a course in military training. If there was to be guerilla warfare, I wanted to be able to stand and fight with my people and to share the hazards of war with them. Summaries of books on guerilla warfare and military strategy have also been produced. I have already admitted that these documents are in my writing, and I acknowledge that I made these studies to equip myself for the role which I might have to play if the struggle drifted into guerilla warfare. I also made arrangements for our recruits to undergo military training', he said.

"While Mandela denied that the ANC was communist-dominated, he acknowledged that some members of the ANC were member of the South African Communist Party.

"Earlier this year, Mandela said in a letter to followers in Soweto that the only condition on which he would accept the South African government's offer to release him from jail was if the ANC was legalised.

"In January, {1985} he informed Lord Nicholas Bethell, Vice-Chairman of the European Parliament's Human Rights Committee, that he still supported violence" (*News Weekly*, Melbourne, 14.8.1985).

See also
The Real Mandela
in *Church & State*,
No. 115, First Quarter, 2014

TRADE UNION NOTES continued

using these evidence-based studies when implementing a workforce plan.

"These metrics give them real data to blend with their 'gut feel' when making key HR decisions. Who should be promoted? Who is most likely to retire? Who should we hire into our company?"

Mr. Pollock said US-based companies are also using analytic metrics to compare their performance with their competitors'. This approach is useful for internal HR decisions; it is also vital when competing for investment, or making a compelling case for decisions, such as where to locate a European HQ or R&D centre.

Irish workers come in at a 208,000 annual cost per full-time equivalent (FTE). This compares poorly with Western Europe (162,000), and even worse with Central and Eastern Europe (123,981).

Again, another simple view shows the 52,000 average Irish salary in a bad light, when it is compared with the 16,000 being earned by Eastern Europeans.

Happily, this doesn't tell the full story. The average Irish FTE delivers more profit, and he/she is working in a more productive and cost-efficient environment. The salaries are three times higher; the profits are six times higher. And, proof of the pudding, the recessionary shift to lower-cost environments simply didn't work for many MNCs (Multi-National Corporations).

As Mr Pollock said, they've learned the hard way that people are the core asset.

"In Ireland, HR directors are using metrics to measure their staff absences and turnover, etc, but many are not doing the blend", said Ms Fallon.

"We are seeing that Irish companies are struggling to get on the map, as far as data analytics are concerned. We are trying to get the message out, to show that large corporations are making decisions in a different way. This study shows that Ireland really is punching above its weight in terms of talent, but we also need to learn to use what this study says about our workforce, when it comes to competing for FDI.

"There is a great story to tell about Ireland, and it is backed up with data. Ireland has a high level of technical capability. We have a lot of talent in delivering new services to global markets. These metrics show Ireland's maturity curve. We can use those data sets to improve performance."

* FTE: A full-time equivalent, sometimes

abbreviated as FTE, is a unit to measure employed persons or students in a way that makes them comparable although they may work or study a different number of hours per week.

The unit is obtained by comparing an employee's or student's average number of hours worked to the average number of hours of a full-time worker or student. A full-time person is therefore counted as one FTE, while a part-time worker / student gets a score in proportion to the hours he or she works or studies. For example, a part-time worker employed for 20 hours a week where full-time work consists of 40 hours, is counted as 0.5 FTE. (European Commission, Eurostat)

Labour Taxes

Labour taxes paid by Irish employers are lower than the European average, according to a new report, *Paying Taxes 2014—The Global Picture*, which was produced by PwC and the World Bank, found that Irish companies pay an average of 12.1% of total commercial profit in labour taxes.

Labour taxes represent 47% of the total taxes paid by companies in Ireland compared to 65% of the total tax take for the EU region. According to the study, the total tax rate comprises profit taxes, labour taxes and other taxes and represents the tax rate paid on commercial profits" (*Sunday Business Post*, 8.12.2013)

Entitlements

"An estimated 185 public servants have won Supreme Court orders directing the ministers for agriculture and finance to pay them wages and pension entitlements over a 12-week period when they engaged in limited industrial action and later all-out strike 10 years ago.

"The Supreme Court ruling was made on the basis that both ministers, having failed to advance any defence to the effect that the law does not entitle striking workers to be paid in the first successful case by the workers, were not entitled to advance such a defence to the workers' second set of proceedings aimed at compelling payment" (*Irish Examiner*-28.11.2013).

Pension Age

"Research by Trinity College, Dublin shows that the Government's decision to hike the age of eligibility for a State pension to 66 in January, 2014; 67 in 2021 and 68 in 2028, has not caused Irish people to change their retirement goals. Research found people are happy to work beyond the age of 65 if most of their peers were also working" (*Evening Echo*, 23.12.2013).

The Irish labour giant snores on! The new German Government intends to introduce earlier retirement on full

pension, from the age of 63 for anyone who has worked for 45 years. This applies to those starting work at 18, which would mean that the academics and the professionals would work into later years. Here! Here!

Mistake Of Partnership?

"Fianna Fail leader Micheal Martin admits he praised public sector pay deals while in cabinet, even though he now says social partnership was former Taoiseach Bertie Ahern's "greatest mistake".

"Mr Martin, who served in the big spending departments of health and education under Mr Ahern, said: "The conventional wisdom at the time was supportive of social partnership" (*Irish Independent*, 28.9.2013).

He told RTE Radio's *Today with Sean O'Rourke* that Mr Ahern's "unquestioning faith" in the pay deals' process was his former leader's "greatest mistake".

But Mr. Martin later admitted he made speeches praising the deals, which fixed wage levels to achieve industrial peace.

Benchmarking was meant to link private and public sector wages, but was compared to an ATM for public sector workers. The public sector wanted to be paid the same as the private sector, but without the same terms and conditions, while retaining their job security and pension entitlements.

PRESS RELEASE

McGrath Blasts Economic Sovereignty Myth

Deputy Finian McGrath TD has strongly challenged the Taoiseach on our economic sovereignty following his address to the nation. "*Of course I welcome the bail-out exit but to say that we regained our economic sovereignty is a myth*", said McGrath. "*The E.U. still control our budgets and we will still have more cuts to the disabled, mass unemployment and youth emigration*", said the Independent Dublin Bay North TD. He also said that the Taoiseach needs to change his direction to kick start the economy. Speculation and greed is still going on under his watch as seen in the latest C R C scam and the top-ups for Government advisers. Finally Deputy McGrath challenged the Taoiseach on the debt issue. "*It will weigh this country down for years*", said McGrath.

16 December, 2013

TRADE UNION NOTES

Value Added

"Each Irish worker delivers six times more profit per annum than his/her Western European counterpart—only American workers are comparable, a new study shows" (*Irish Examiner*, 1.11.2013).

PwC Ireland's inaugural study on human, capital metrics, unveiled at the American Chamber of Commerce business summit, in Dublin, on October 31, 2013, shows that Irish workers cost more, but they have markedly lower absenteeism and lower staff turnover and, crucially, they deliver the profit results that keep FDI (*Foreign Direct Investment*) interest focused on these shores.

Ireland has a high cost base, but this is balanced by high profit per FTE. Costs per FTE (*full, time equivalent, see below*) in Ireland are 208,000, which is higher than Western Europe. However, Ireland's profit per FTE is considerably higher, at 24,000, compared to just 4,000 for Western Europe.

In addition, Ireland is on top compared to our European peers—the profit per FTE is 2,729 in the UK, 4,801 in the Netherlands, and 11,482 in Switzerland.

Crucially, for every single unit invested in Ireland, the employer gets back 1.36—significantly better than in other European states.

Based on the 2012 performance of 25,000 Irish-based workers, PwC's study also offers a fascinating insight into how upper-tier employers are now using human-capital metrics to support their core business decisions.

But, while Irish workers top the performance leagues, Human Resources Directors in many Irish-based multinational corporations (MNCs) have yet to significantly utilise these new metrics to underpin the investment pitches they make to their global headquarters—in Ireland's case, this most often means back to their US headquarters, where use of such metrics is gaining pace.

"From a U.S. perspective, we are seeing that companies are realising the need to drive on with these kind of metrics", said Scott Pollock, leader of workforce metrics at PwC's nerve centre in Saratoga, USA. He was in Dublin for the American Chamber event.

"Businesses are realising the truth in the mantra that 'people are your most important asset'. In the U.S., people are

continued on page 25

PILLARS continued

states on page 310: "*The Judiciary... became the principal means by which popular legislatures were controlled not limited*".

The development of corporations was a great form of propulsion in bringing this thinking to be the predominant logic for American jurisprudence. It arose because the previous method of getting good leading citizens to build public infrastructure for the good of the nation in exchange for monopolies or further privileges was found to be inefficient in the rapidly-growing continent, filling with new men. In the case of Jefferson he thought the old system immoral in any case. Again remembering Wood, page 297:

"For even as late as the eve of the revolution, the modern distinction between public and private life was still not clear."

He draws further on the dilemma in page 300:

"In republican America, government would no longer be merely private property. Could the people's personal rights meaningfully exist apart from the people's sovereign power expressed in their assemblies."

PRIVATE PROPERTY

After the Constitution the idea of corporation were hugely transformed and their number mushroomed. Again going back to Wood on the subject in Chapter 11, page 312:

"At the same time as these corporations increased in number, shed their exclusivity, they lost most of their earlier public character as well and were more regarded as private property. As private property as might be vested by the legislatures in private individuals, these corporations now became exempt from further legislative interference; (**charters their forfeiture belongs solely to the courts of Justice.**)"

We might recall there was subsequently the Dartmouth College case of 1819, regarding "...corporations which judges eventually transformed into private rights bearing persons!" (Gold, page 314).

There has been a presumption in free countries like our own of a constitutional necessity to follow in an American tradition going back to the early days of their republic to balance power between the executive and legislature on one side and the Judicial system on the other. While

there might be a tweak from time to time, the generally-perceived wisdom at every critical juncture has been that the balance was even and benign. Politicians in particular lined up to say how much they respected the independence of the Judiciary.

I submit that we have indulged ourselves in complete deception. When we start to unwind the weave of the late twentieth century and in current Western governance it becomes much more obvious that the balance is very much tilted in favour of the Judiciary. Vincent Browne, for all his faults, discovered this some time ago. It is also clear that the realm of the Judiciary is not about people *per se*, but rather identities of personalities. Amongst the identities are the Judges themselves, a group of elite lawyers who are a sort of choreographer in the courtroom theatre where the senior barristers are the main dancers. The barristers' clients are petty criminals in cases i.e. causes that have been passed on to them by solicitors. Other identities include giant corporations (as persons), often huge beasts of the multinational blue chip flavour. Parliament and Government are also identities who are respected on this plane but I would suggest very much in the role of junior partners.

So a corporation can sue a Government perhaps on the basis that they might have lost what was potential future profits based on parliamentary legislation. Or they might appeal to the European Court of Justice so as to make sure the necessity of the almighty Market not to be curtailed. It is this type of thinking that the only reason for existence or for culture or social organisation is to serve this market where the *unseen hand* takes care of all.

We have also become a heavy litigious society whereby other methods of arbitration are by-passed so that the legal people don't miss out on business. Also politicians operate with a form of thinking whereby all of the logos is a form of legalistic metaphor. We have been fooled into thinking there is an expanding machine stretching out which will in time encompass all our needs and problems as the natural justice lives strong in the tabernacle of the law house architecture. Hence there is plenty of scope for new parties to take positions that will make people sit up and think.

(All quotations from Gordon S. Wood, Chapter 11, *A History Of Rights In The Idea Of America*, Penguin, 2011.)

Seán Ó Riain

PILLARS continued

Meanwhile, on the Net, the reporter has to constantly be on the hop to keep up with competition with ever more colourful technical gimmicks and attention-grabbing methods, to keep the attention of a browsing audience with short, snappy and vibrant reports. If you want more detail you have to mine for it. The consumer has never had so much items and detailed discussion material but never less time to give it extended consideration.

NEWS HARVESTERS

Let us go back to our idea of news harvesters. We will give a name now to a particular link in the production chain. It may have a few members but we will make a composite example which we will call Alpha. Alpha does several things. It gives background to the challenges facing a given sector and lists the critical successes that have accrued from the sector. Alpha also broadcasts to news outlets and Government the resumes of key recommended people who are the main actors in the field. Alpha can quote reports explaining why a regrettable mistake in a sector in the past was not as bad as it seemed. Other modes often held up as better alternatives produce bad results just as frequently. Of course Alpha reminds those that need to know, how the sector is unfairly suffering from the lack of due recognition and adds reassurance that the key decision-makers in the sector know what they are doing.

Currently, in our information sphere if you are an expert or you control the purse strings of experts, you can trump all counter arguments. So who are Alpha's clients? This is a field that is truly remarkable. Banks, Employer groups, Universities, even Charities give their custom to firms such as Delta. Delta commissions reports, sponsors conferences, provides series of seminars with cross-disciplinary character, usually of an international flavour. At the same time, giant corporations like oil companies, speculators, some Governments, and foundations do their own research that is not for public consumption. The latter store this knowledge with a service-provider called Gamma. This entity sifts through the data : highlights the good points but also retains salient points regarding what might be perceived as bad points.

Now, in the interest of furthering human knowledge and in being helpful to Govern-

ments, the market, and the interest of the general public, Gamma and Delta cooperate and thus coming up with best practice, offering internships and seeking partnerships in business, science and public administration to achieve the optimum result. One of the guests at the twin pillars conference is our old friend, Alpha. Of course, by networking, Alpha deals with independent experts and research foundation. Alpha now provides most of the news stories that are carried by professional journalists. People buy news products. The Governments fund Universities and industrial relations infrastructure where employers groups are a partner and some other foundations. Then the experts tell us what to think.

How can a journalist with a deadline be expected to sift through all the information to try to ascertain its credibility and where and how he/she can access alternative, reliable information in a very controlled period of time? It may be argued that today, journalism attracts a number of people with less spine than in previous times and do not seem to follow the calling of standing up to authority but rather cooperate with the levers of influence. Some may argue a solution lies in maximum enforcement of plurality of separate information suppliers and that they would have to compete and tender for Government business. No one group would have the right to control more than a certain percentage of the lobbyist and market research industry and beneficial ownership would be transparent. Others might argue the Government should spend more on research but be more selective and perhaps nationalise the entire process, subject to having a strong review committee which could provide a healthy critical commentary. What is certain is that at present the Establishment is brushing all of this under the carpet.

THE JUDICIARY

Another of the issues providing an immediate challenge is the Judiciary. Is it made to work for society's current needs? On what basis does it derive its legitimacy? Do we base our presumptions about it through a series of myths and misconceptions? One may reflect on how the private opinions of judges usually leak out (never accredited) through university theocrats and legal experts in the media. What begins as a brief fluttering of leaves in a gentle breeze builds up momentum (little challenged, barely debunked) until such time as a public discourse is so

dominated by a hurricane of intensity that no serious contradiction of the self-same stated wisdom will be tolerated.

Ambitious young solicitors are unlikely to bring the displeasure of 'me wise and honourable lords' upon themselves. The above trait is particularly **widespread** in Ireland and Britain. So for example, with a penal and probation system to study, one can elicit the *status quo* has developed a soft sentencing policy on hardened criminals. I am not proclaiming any preference for the above policy or the hardline policy adopted by a jurisdiction like the state of Texas. (Both have their advantages and disadvantages.) The point is that in Britain and Ireland going back to the 1970s there was never a proper discussion or debate or any sort of consultation with the population at large. It is amazing how there was such simultaneous independent **unanimity** coming to a similar enlightenment and accidental consensus of perceived wisdom by the justices. This all emerged a bit like the selection of the new leader of the Tories at informal gatherings in rural England mansions up until the early 1960s.

THE U.S. SYSTEM

Most legal systems in the West derive some or a lot of inspiration from the American system which arose out of the revolution on that continent over two hundred years ago. Yet the system they developed would have been impossible without the existence of the American constitution. While thinking about this, I was drawn back to the excellent book by Gordon S. Wood: *Reflections on the birth of the United States*. On drawing up that document such diverse people as Adams and Madison wished to make that *magnum opus* the strong pillar of society in the United States. Adams felt there was too much democracy about and that in the State Assemblies the representatives were not enough cut from the cloth of exceptional men. Madison feared that any form of government could potentially develop into a form of repression. As Wood states on page 309:

"Indeed they perceived that the liberties of individuals that is negative liberty... could actually be turned against positive liberty or self-government. The courts... concerning individual rights exclusively, they involved private matters, not public and private matters concerning individual rights required adjudication not legislation."

So democracy in the classical sense can never be the last word. Further on, he

continued on page 30



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 32 No. 1

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

The Pillars Of Society

Are they proved correct—those that claim in the early twenty-first century that ideology is dead, all philosophy is bunk and that parties dividing on points of principle are due for extinction? Perhaps it is the case that society and groups of people who continue to invest their hope in democracy, State institutions, structures for civil disagreement and pursuit of grievances now require parties to strongly contest and give proper due scrutiny on redesigned platforms considering current realities. Thus we live in societies based on new points of difference where the shaping of stable localities, the underwriting of social infrastructure and to some degree the exercise of a level of fairness in human habitual conditions is painted and redrawn on a daily basis.

It is arguably of prime importance to recognize that some issues and the design framework in our order of power and administration have been ignored or untested for far too long. In the case of Western politics, if explained to a visiting Martian in a few sentences, we could say the second half of the twentieth-century amounted to a discussion on the need to provide a necessary base of welfare entitlement to the bulk of the population, to be provided by taxation enacted in democratic parliaments. The main disagreements were based on: the amount needed in cash, what way to raise the taxes needed to pay for it, what conditions should be attached, and how it would be administered with a view to minimize waste and or political coercion.

THREE PILLARS

I might shortlist a sample three pillars that are amongst a cluster of matters that should be looked at as a matter of priority. We would hope that a plurality of suggestions would be taken up on how progress might be made on each and every one of

the issues. One of the three issues I wish to list I will not deal with in detail here, but will return to in a later article, namely Democratic health. Where once we had Cardinals and Bishops today it is nigh on impossible to tackle the elites in the medical profession. To seek to rectify for poor treatment as an ordinary individual is a lonely furrow to plough. This is a particular nightmare if one has to overcome institutional ill treatment by the Mental health service. In my modest offering I will begin to address News making and the Judiciary in the latter case tracing some of its historical development that came to dominate the Western mindset.

MEDIA

When I speak of News making, I am not referring to the well-worn argument of plurality of ownership of the media and in particular the best-selling organs in the traditional print media. Nor indeed, am I treating of the tension between public and private, or the means by which one can pursue libel—or the other side of the coin as to how a select few might try to bully editors with threats of libel writs and

disagreement about who should suffer liability. Rather I am discussing (what some would describe as) the post-modern phenomena of the harvesting, distribution and husbandry of news items or banks of discussion material.

Lobby groups, public relations consultants and a myriad of market analysis-behaviourist Researchers and communication promoters acquire and store vast quantities of data. A portion of it is objective data, though open to all kinds of interpretation. Another portion is based on early preparatory study, or is related to surveys or case studies which can be limited in scope, only holds the water of credibility until another report contradicts it six months later on equally valid parameters. A particular problem for any of us is sifting through the immense density of the data along with the sectoral and work-based jargon.

At the same time, we have the public indulgence of the experts with their official stamps. Specialists are protected by a University or a foundation or a peer review. A third portion is composed of pure lies and phantoms. The most important portion which we can call D, is a mixture of A+B+C but with added hyperbolae and fantastic hard sell that can simultaneously cause one to react with projectile traffic sick and just as easily get carried along by the sheer excitement and infectious energy.

By a process of evolution in the media, world professional journalists—be they in print, TV or on the Net—have less and less time to check facts, or to sub-edit themselves. We are living through a paradoxical phenomena where print media have more and more empty pages to fill, TV stations are on around the clock and get news feeds constantly from across the globe, which they in turn transmit to all our living rooms on demand.

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 31